



HAL
open science

A GC/MS method for the determination of 16 European priority polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked meat products and edible oils

Wolfgang Jira, Katja Ziegenhals, Karl Speer

► To cite this version:

Wolfgang Jira, Katja Ziegenhals, Karl Speer. A GC/MS method for the determination of 16 European priority polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked meat products and edible oils. *Food Additives and Contaminants*, 2008, 25 (06), pp.704-713. 10.1080/02652030701697769 . hal-00577433

HAL Id: hal-00577433

<https://hal.science/hal-00577433>

Submitted on 17 Mar 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



A GC/MS method for the determination of 16 European priority polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked meat products and edible oils

Journal:	<i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2007-226.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Aug-2007
Complete List of Authors:	Jira, Wolfgang; Federal Research Centre for Nutrition and Food (BfEL), Institute for Chemistry and Physics Ziegenhals, Katja; Federal Research Centre for Nutrition and Food (BfEL), Institute for Chemistry and Physics Speer, Karl; Technical University Dresden, Institute of Food Chemistry
Methods/Techniques:	Extraction - ASE, GC/MS
Additives/Contaminants:	PAH
Food Types:	Meat, Oils and fats, Smoked food

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **A GC/MS method for the determination of 16 European priority polycyclic**
7
8 **aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked meat products and edible oils**
9
10

11
12
13
14
15
16 Wolfgang JIRA¹, Katja ZIEGENHALS¹, Karl SPEER²
17

18
19
20
21 ¹ Institute for Chemistry and Physics, Federal Research Centre for Nutrition and Food,
22
23 Location Kulmbach, E.-C.-Baumann-Str. 20, 95326 Kulmbach, Germany
24

25
26 ² Institute of Food Chemistry, Technical University Dresden, Bergstr. 66, 01069 Dresden,
27
28 Germany
29

30 Correspondence: W. Jira. E-mail : wolfgang.jira@bfe1.de
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

A GC/MS method was developed for the analysis of 15 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) highlighted as carcinogenic by the Scientific Committee on Food (SCF) plus benzo[c]fluorine [recommended to be analysed by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA)] in fat-containing foods such as edible oils and smoked meat products. This method includes accelerated solvent extraction (ASE) and the highly automated clean up steps gel permeation chromatography (GPC) and solid phase extraction (SPE). Using a VF-17ms GC column, a good separation of benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene and benzo[k]fluoranthene was achieved. Furthermore, the six methylchrysene-isomers and the PAH compounds with a molecular weight of 302 daltons in fat-containing foods attained a better chromatographic separation in comparison to a 5ms-column. The reliability of the analytical method for edible oils was demonstrated by the results from a proficiency test. Measurements with GC/HRMS and GC/MSD led to comparable results. A survey of the 16 PAHs in 22 smoked meat products showed concentrations in the range of < 0.01 µg/kg to 19 µg/kg. The median concentration for benzo[a]pyrene was below 0.15 µg/kg.

KEYWORDS: edible oils, GC/MS, HRMS, PAH, smoked meat products

INTRODUCTION

For the first time Jung and Morand reported the presence of PAH in vegetable oils and fats in 1962. Further investigations followed by Sagredos et al. 1979 and 1988, Speer and Montag 1988 and Dennis et al. 1991. Investigations of the contents of individual PAH in smoked and barbecued meat products (Simko 2002, Jira 2003) were primarily focused on benzo[a]pyrene (Kazerouni et al. 2001) or the 16 PAH compounds approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA-PAH) (Mottier et al. 2000).

Since 1 April 2005 the Commission Regulation (EC) No 208/2005 of 4 February 2005 has been restricting maximum levels for benzo[a]pyrene in different food groups: Oils and fats 2 µg/kg, foods for infants and young children 1 µg/kg; smoked meat and smoked fish 5 µg/kg; unsmoked fish 2 µg/kg; crustaceans and cephalopods 5 µg/kg and bivalve molluscs 10 µg/kg. Furthermore, the European Commission (2005/108/EC) recommended that the member states should investigate not only the contents of benzo[a]pyrene in these food groups but also other polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) seen as carcinogenic by the Scientific Committee on Food (SCF). These are 15 PAH compounds which, due to their toxic properties, are of major concern to human health and should be monitored to make possible long-term exposure assessments (SCF, 2002). These 15 "SCF-PAH" are: benzo[a]anthracene (BaA), benzo[b]fluoranthene (BbF), benzo[j]fluoranthene (BjF), benzo[k]fluoranthene (BkF), benzo[ghi]perylene (BgP), benzo[a]pyrene (BaP), cyclopenta[cd]pyrene (CPP), dibenzo[a,h]anthracene (DhA), dibenzo[a,e]pyrene (DeP), dibenzo[a,h]pyrene (DhP), dibenzo[a,i]pyrene (DiP), dibenzo[a,l]pyrene (DlP), indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene (IcP), chrysene (CHR) and 5-methylchrysene (5MC). In addition, the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) identified benzo[c]fluorene (BcL) as a PAH compound that should be monitored as well (JECFA 2005). These 16 EU priority PAH need to be analysed in different food groups. EFSA has established an on-line analytical database in collaboration

1
2
3 with European Union Member States in order to collect data for these 16 EU priority PAH
4
5 (Wenzl et al. 2006).
6
7
8
9

10 Lately, the total contents of the 15 SCF-PAH were analysed in different Danish meat products
11
12 by Duedahl-Olesen et al. 2006. After saponification, liquid liquid extraction and solid phase
13
14 extraction, the chromatographic separation was carried out via a 60 m J&W DB-5 capillary
15
16 column. Then in 2007, the results of 27 PAH including the 15 SCH-PAH in oils were
17
18 presented by Rose et al. Again, the sample preparation included saponification, liquid liquid
19
20 extraction and solid phase extraction. Also here a 60 m 5% phenyl capillary column and a low
21
22 resolution mass spectrometer for separation and quantification were used.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 This paper describes an analytical method without saponification for the determination of the
30
31 16 EU priority PAH compounds in the fat-containing food groups, edible oils and smoked
32
33 meat products. The method includes accelerated solvent extraction (ASE) and the highly
34
35 automated clean up steps gel permeation chromatography (GPC) and solid phase extraction
36
37 (SPE). The determination of the PAH was carried out by applying HRGC in combination with
38
39 a high resolution mass spectrometer. For separation of the individual components a 60 m 50
40
41 % phenyl capillary column was found suitable.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 This new method is based on the method (Jira 2004) developed at the Institute for Chemistry
49
50 and Physics, Federal Research Centre for Nutrition and Food (BfEL), Kulmbach, Germany,
51
52 and was adapted to the recommendation of the European Commission (2005/108/EC). The
53
54 performance of the analytical method for edible oils was demonstrated in a proficiency test
55
56 (IRMM 2006). Its suitability for meat products was shown by investigating suspicious
57
58 samples. Smoked salts and smoke flavourings can also be analysed by using this method (Jira
59
60 et al. 2006).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Materials

The native PAH standard solutions (BcL, BaA, CHR, BbF, BkF, BjF, BaP, IcP, DhA, BgP, DiP, DeP, DiP, DhP, 1-methylchrysene (1MC), 2-methylchrysene (2MC), 3-methylchrysene (3MC), 4-methylchrysene (4MC), 5MC, 6-methylchrysene (6MC), triphenylene (TP), dibenzo[a,c]anthracene (DcA), benzo[a]fluoranthene (BaF)) were obtained from Dr. Ehrenstorfer GmbH (Augsburg Germany). The isotope labelled PAH standard solutions were purchased from Promochem (Wesel, Germany) and the fluorinated PAH standards from Biochemical Institute for Environmental Carcinogens Prof. Dr. Gernot Grimmer-Foundation (Grosshansdorf, Germany).

All solvents were obtained in picograde quality from Promochem (Wesel, Germany). The drying material (poly(acrylic acid), partial sodium salt-graft-poly(ethylene oxide)) was purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Munich, Germany), Bio Beads S-X3 (200 - 400 mesh) from Bio-Rad Laboratories (Munich, Germany) and silica gel from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany).

Glass microfibre filters (18 mm i.d.) were obtained from Dionex (Idstein, Germany). The PTFE-Filters (1 μm pore size, 25 mm i.d.) and the SPE-Cartridges (12 mm i.d.) were purchased from Alltech (Unterhaching, Germany).

Sample preparation for the analysis of meat products

Accelerated solvent extraction (ASE): About 5 g homogenised meat product were levigated with the same amount of the drying material poly(acrylic acid), partial sodium salt-graft-poly(ethylene oxide). The resulting material was poured into 33-mL cells, which were locked with glass microfiber filters at the outlet end of the extraction cells. Afterwards, 50 μL of a PAH standard mixture containing isotope labelled (^{13}C and ^2H) and fluorinated PAH

1
2
3 compounds (5-fluorobenzo[c]fluorene, benzo[a]anthracene-¹³C₆, chrysene-¹³C₆, 5-
4 methylchrysene-d₃, benzo[b]fluoranthene-¹³C₆, benzo[k]fluoranthene-¹³C₆, benzo[a]pyrene-
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

compounds (5-fluorobenzo[c]fluorene, benzo[a]anthracene-¹³C₆, chrysene-¹³C₆, 5-methylchrysene-d₃, benzo[b]fluoranthene-¹³C₆, benzo[k]fluoranthene-¹³C₆, benzo[a]pyrene-¹³C₄, benzo[g,h,i]perylene-¹³C₁₂, dibenzo[a,h]anthracene-d₁₄, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene-d₁₂, dibenzo[a,e]pyrene-¹³C₆, dibenzo[a,i]pyrene-¹³C₁₂ and 13-fluorodibenzo[a,l]pyrene in isooctane) were added. The extraction was performed with an ASE 200 from Dionex (Sunnyvale, USA) and carried out with n-hexane at 100°C and 100 bar at a static time of 10 min. The flush volume was 60% and the purge time 120 s. Two static cycles were accomplished. The solvent of the extract was evaporated in a water bath (40°C) using a nitrogen stream.

Gel permeation chromatography (GPC): The evaporated ASE-extract was dissolved in 4.5 mL cyclohexane/ethylacetate (50:50 v/v) and filtered through a PTFE filter with a pore size of 1 µm. The GPC column (25 mm i.d.) was filled with Bio-Beads S-X3 (weight of filling 60 g). Samples were eluted at a flow rate of 5 mL/min applying cyclohexane/ethylacetate (50:50 v/v) (Dump time 0 - 36 min, Collect time 36 - 65 min). The solvent was removed with a rotary evaporator, and the eluate was dried in a nitrogen stream.

Solid phase extraction (SPE): This clean-up step to remove more polar substances was performed automatically with a modified ASPEC Xli (Automatic. Sample Preparation with Extraction Columns) (Kleinhenz et al. 2006) from Gilson (Bad Camberg, Germany). This system was modified with a fitting rack, teflon funnels and teflon tubes. Silica, dried for 12 h at 550°C, was deactivated with 15% water. 1 g dried deactivated silica was filled into commercial 8-ml SPE columns (12 mm i.d.). After conditioning the columns with 3 mL cyclohexane the samples were applied and eluted with 10 mL cyclohexane.

Preparation for GC/MS analysis: The dried eluate of SPE was dissolved in 1 mL isooctane and 50 µL of the PAH-recovery standard mixture (benzo[a]anthracene-d₁₂ and benzo[a]pyrene-d₁₂ in isooctane) and transferred to a 1 mL tapered vial. The remaining sample was carefully concentrated in a nitrogen stream to a volume of about 50 µL.

1
2
3 Reagent and procedural blanks were simultaneously analysed for to detect present PAH in
4
5 parallel to each series of samples passing the extraction and cleanup procedures using drying
6
7 material instead of real samples.
8
9

10 11 12 **GC/MS analysis** 13

14
15
16
17 The *GC/HRMS analysis* of PAH was performed on a HP 5890 II gas chromatograph with a
18
19 split/splitless injection port. The GC was equipped with a VF-17ms capillary column (60 m x
20
21 0.25 mm i.d., 0.25 μ m film thickness) purchased from Varian (Darmstadt, Germany). Helium
22
23 was used as carrier gas at a constant pressure of 27 psi. The injection temperature was 300°C
24
25 and the injection volume was 1 μ L (splitless). The following temperature program was used:
26
27 isothermal at 50°C for 1 min, at 25°C/min to 280°C, at 1°C/min to 330°C, isothermal at
28
29 330°C for 30 min.
30
31
32

33
34 The quantification of PAH by GC/HRMS was performed by using a VG Autospec (Waters,
35
36 Manchester, UK) working in the EI positive ion mode using an electron energy of 35 eV. The
37
38 transfer line temperature and the ion source temperature were maintained at 280°C and
39
40 250°C, respectively. The resolution of the MS was tuned to 8000 (10% valley definition). The
41
42 PAH were analysed in a 4-function Selected Ion Registration (SIR) experiment.
43
44

45
46 The *GC/MSD analysis* was performed on an Agilent 7890 GC coupled with an Agilent 5975
47
48 inert mass spectrometric detector. The GC was also equipped with a VF-17ms (Varian,
49
50 Darmstadt, Germany) capillary column (60 m x 0.25 mm i.d., 0.25 μ m film thickness).
51
52 Helium was used as carrier gas at a constant flow rate of 1 mL/min. 1 μ L was injected while
53
54 the injector port was held at 325°C and operated in pulsed splitless mode. Initially, the oven
55
56 temperature was set to 50°C (1 min hold), then to 280°C at 30°C/min, to 340°C at 1°C/min
57
58 and to 350°C at 1.5°C/min kept constant for 2 min. The mass spectrometer was operated in a
59
60 selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode with an electron impact ionization of 70 eV. The

1
2
3 temperatures of the ion source and the quadrupole mass analyser were kept at 300°C and
4
5 150°C, respectively.
6

7
8 For the determination of the ratio of TP and CHR with GC/MSD a VF-Xms (Varian,
9
10 Darmstadt, Germany) capillary column (60 m x 0.25 mm i.d., 0.25 µm film thickness) was
11
12 used. The oven temperature was initially set at 50°C (1 minute hold) and heated to 320°C at
13
14 3.5°C/min. Helium was used as carrier gas at a constant flow rate of 1 mL/min. 1 µL was
15
16 injected while the injector port was held at 325°C and operated in the pulsed splitless mode.
17
18

21 22 **Sample preparation for the analysis of edible oils**

23
24
25
26
27 Approximately 0.9 g of edible oil was dissolved in 3.5 mL cyclohexane/ethylacetate (50:50
28
29 v/v), 50 µL of the internal PAH standard were added and the mixture was chromatographed
30
31 by GPC. The following clean up steps were carried out as described for meat products.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Applying the GC/MS method (HRMS and MSD) developed here it is possible to achieve gas chromatographic separations of isomers which are otherwise difficult to separate. First, a sufficient chromatographic separation of CPP and CHR was achieved (see Figure 1A). Although CPP (MW = 226) has another molecular weight than BaA and CHR (MW = 228, each), a sufficient chromatographic separation of CPP and CHR is required for a reliable quantification of CPP because BaA and CHR also show fragment ions with the molecular weight MW = 226 (Nyman et al., 1993). Therefore, an unsatisfactory chromatographic separation would adulterate the quantification of CPP. In contrast, a chromatographic separation of CHR and TP on such a column is not possible. Second, with the help of this method a satisfactory chromatographic separation of the six methylchrysene-isomers is achievable (see Figure 1B). Therefore, the exact quantification of 5-methylchrysene (5MC) is possible. Third, an important chromatographic challenge is the separation of the benzo[fluoranthenes. The base line separation of benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene and benzo[k]fluoranthene is possible by means of a 60 m VF-17ms GC column (see Figure 1C). Also, benzo[a]fluoranthene does not coelute with the benzo[fluoranthenes. Fourth, DhA can be detected independent of dibenzo[a,c]anthracene (DcA) (see Figure 1D). Fifth, also the quantification of dibenzopyrenes (MW = 302) is easier to carry out with a GC column with 50% polyphenylsiloxane than with 5% polyphenylsiloxane because in this way a better chromatographic separation of the isomers is achievable. It is well known that there are a number of isomeric PAH compounds with MW = 302 amu (Schmidt et al. 1987, Schubert et al. 2003). In Figure 2 the chromatographic separation of PAH isomers with $m/z = 302$ in strongly smoked raw sausage on a VF-17ms is presented.

1
2
3
4
5
6 For the qualitative detection of the different PAH compounds using GC/MSD, in addition to
7
8 the retention time and the molecular ion (M^+), a third criterion is needed to identify a
9
10 substance with a high selectivity because of the low resolution of the MSD. A second ion in
11
12 addition to the quantifier ion is called qualifier ion and was used for the purpose of
13
14 verification (Simon et al. 2006). The ratio between the quantifier ion and the qualifier ion had
15
16 to match a specific ratio (see Table I) to show a positive result. The ratios need to be
17
18 determined by measuring an external PAH standard solution. The quantification of the
19
20 different PAH compounds is based on the comparison of the peak area of the most abundant
21
22 ion (M^+) of the native PAH compound with the peak area of the corresponding deuterated,
23
24 ^{13}C -labelled or fluorinated internal standards. As not all of the 16 PAH compounds are
25
26 commercially available as isotope labelled standard compounds, it was necessary to use
27
28 response factors for the quantification of PAH with no corresponding internal standards
29
30 (cyclopenta[c,d]pyrene, benzo[j]fluoranthene and dibenzo[a,h]pyrene). These response factors
31
32 were determined by the analysis of a PAH standard mixture containing the 16 PAH
33
34 compounds. The range of linearity of both GC/MS-systems was determined by an automated
35
36 statistical test and ranged from 1 or 5 to 1000 pg/ μl . GC/HRMS and GC/MSD show different
37
38 limits of detection (LOD) and limits of quantification (LOQ). The LOD, which is defined as
39
40 the lowest concentration of an analyte detectable in a sample (signal-to-noise ratio = 3:1) and
41
42 the LOQ, which is defined as the lowest content of the analyte that can be measured with
43
44 reasonable statistical certainty (2007/333/EC) (signal-to-noise ratio = 9:1) for the different
45
46 PAH compounds in smoked meat products, are shown in Table II. Two groups are defined: 1)
47
48 PAH with a lower molecular weight which can be detected more sensitively than 2) PAH with
49
50 a high molecular weight. The two different groups are:
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. BcL, BaA, CHR, CPP, 5MC, BbF, BkF, BjF, BaP, BgP

2. IcP, DhA, DIP, DeP, DiP, DhP

Since a gas-chromatographic separation of the two isomers TP and CHR could not be obtained with a VF-17ms capillary column, a VF-Xms capillary column had to be used. With a low heating rate of 3.5°C/min not only a separation of TP and CHR but also a sufficient separation of BaA, CPP, TP and CHR was achieved (see Figure 3).

PAH in edible oils

The reliability of the described analytical method was demonstrated by participation in a proficiency test (IRMM 2006). Three edible oils spiked with PAH, sunflower oil, olive oil, maize oil and one native sunflower oil, were analysed in duplicate. The results of GC/HRMS were submitted to IRMM. Subsequently, the same extracts were measured by GC/MSD. These results were not submitted to the IRMM. Both results determined were compared with the real spiked concentrations (Table III). In the case of the native sunflower oil the results were compared to the median of the PAH concentration of the different participants of the collaborative trial.

The results determined by both GC/MS-systems were in a good agreement. The recoveries for different PAH compounds ranged from 75% to 95%. The repeatability was better in the case of MSD. The averaged relative standard deviations (RSD) of all PAH compounds were 17% for MSD and 22% for HRMS.

PAH in smoked meat products

1
2
3 In order to test the suitability of the described GC/HRMS method developed at the BfEL
4
5 Kulmbach, 22 smoked raw meat products (mainly raw smoked hams) which looked like very
6
7 strongly smoked products were collected from different producers at the end of 2005.
8
9

10 The resulting benzo[a]pyrene contents of these products were in the median below 0.15 µg/kg
11
12 and therefore classified as being relatively low. With the exception of one sample, which
13
14 showed a benzo[a]pyrene content of 18 µg/kg (Table IV), all of the samples were below the
15
16 new maximum level of 5 µg/kg. Including the sample with a BaP content of 18 µg/kg four
17
18 samples were above the old maximum level in Germany of 1 µg/kg. The sample with a
19
20 benzo[a]pyrene content of 18 µg/kg was a smoked belly of pork with a strongly fading, black
21
22 surface.
23
24
25
26

27 For the clarification of the question, in which quantitative ratio the present leading substance
28
29 benzo[a]pyrene is compared to the other investigated PAH compounds, the contents
30
31 determined for the 15 priority PAH compounds and the JECFA-PAH benzo[c]fluorene were
32
33 added to calculate the percentage contributions of the single PAH compounds to the total
34
35 content of the 16 PAH compounds. The result of these calculations is presented in Figure 4.
36
37 Hereby, the results were differentiated between PAH with a higher (marked dark) and a lower
38
39 (marked bright) carcinogenic potential. The differentiation between these two groups resulted
40
41 from the toxic equivalent factors (TEF) in the literature (Müller et al. 1995). In this way a
42
43 higher carcinogenic potential was assumed for PAH with a $TEF \geq 0.89$ and a lower
44
45 carcinogenic potential for $TEF \leq 0.11$. The results clearly show that within the group of PAH
46
47 compounds with a higher carcinogenic potential benzo[a]pyrene (BaP) represents the largest
48
49 contribution to the total content of the 16 investigated PAH compounds. The contribution of
50
51 BaP in these samples was 8% of the total PAH content (median) and varied from
52
53 approximately 6% to 12%. The contributions of the other PAH compounds with a higher
54
55 carcinogenic potential (dibenzo[a,h]anthracene (DhA), dibenzo[a,e]pyrene (DeP),
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dibenzo[a,h]pyrene (DhP) and dibenzo[a,l]pyrene (DIP)) were significantly lower and were in
4 the median range of about 1% and lower. Consequently, benzo[a]pyrene was the dominating
5 compound within the group of PAH with a higher carcinogenic potential and therefore, seems
6 to be justified to be used as the leading substance in smoked meat products. The percentage
7 contributions of the other PAH with a low carcinogenic potential show relatively high
8 variations.
9

10 After developing the method for the separation of TP and CHR the ratios of these isomers
11 were analysed in 25 samples from different meat products. Some of these samples were the
12 same samples that looked like very strongly smoked products because of their black surface.
13 But some of the samples that looked very strongly smoked had very low concentrations,
14 which could not be analysed by using the GC/MSD. For these measurements the MSD was
15 not sensitive enough. Therefore, samples of bacon were analysed additionally.
16

17 The results showed that the ratio of TP/CHR varied also within the ham and bacon samples
18 (Table V). The maximum value was reached for wild boar ham.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONCLUSIONS

With the help of both GC/MS methods (HRMS and MSD) a reliable determination of the 16 European priority PAH compounds in smoked meat products and edible oils is possible. Except for chrysene the 16 EFSA-PAH can be detected separately from each other and from interfering isomers not classified as priority. This method also allows an analysis with low limits of quantification (LOQs). Such a sensitive analytical method is necessary for the determination of PAH in smoked meat products with low PAH contents. Otherwise, a quantification of PAH in meat samples with lower concentration is very difficult. (Reinik et al. 2007).

The contents of the 16 European priority PAH compounds in the analysed suspicious samples of smoked meat products point out that BaP can be used as the leading substance in smoked meat products. However, the suitability of BaP as a marker for carcinogenic PAH compounds in smoked meat products has to be confirmed by the investigation of representative samples. In particular, next to a representative study it is important to get more information about the content of DIP in meat products. DIP has been in the spotlight of scientific interest recently because toxicological investigations indicated that DIP probably shows a hundredfold higher toxicity in comparison to BaP (McClure and Scheny 1995, Müller et al. 1995). In consideration of this potentially extremely high toxicity DIP should not to be underestimated – although the contents in the investigated smoked meat products were very low. The GC chromatograms show that a 50% phenyl capillary column is superior to a 5% phenyl capillary column (Jira 2004, Rose et al. 2007), especially because of a better chromatographic separation of the high number of PAH compounds with MW = 302 (Schubert et al. 2003).

Toxicological investigations indicated that CHR has a much stronger carcinogenic potential than TP (Müller et al. 1995). CHR und TP elute on polar columns at the same retention time. Because of their identical molecular mass they could only be quantified in sum. Most studies consider only the content of CHR. For the determination of the TP/CHR-ratio a separate

1
2
3 method was developed. Applying this method, differing ratios of TP/CHR within different
4
5 samples were analysed and as a result the content of TP is not to be neglected. Because of
6
7 these results, the previously description “CHR” should be replaced by “TP and CHR”, to
8
9 avoid an over-evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of the sample.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

REFERENCES

Commission Recommendation of 4 February 2005 on the further investigation into the levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in certain foods (2005/108/EC).

Commission Regulation (EC) No 208/2005 of 4 February 2005 amending Regulation (EC) No 466/2001 as regards polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

Commission Regulation (EC) No 333/2007 of 28 March 2007 laying down the methods of sampling and analysis for the official control of the levels of lead, cadmium, mercury, inorganic tin, 3-MCPD and benzo(a)pyrene in foodstuffs.

Dennis MJ, Massey RC, Cripps G, et al. 1991. Factors affecting the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon content of cereals, fats and other food-products. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 8 (4): 517-530.

Duedahl-Olesen L, White S, Binderup ML 2006. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) in Danish smoked fish and meat products. *Polycyclic Aromatic Compounds* 26 (3): 163-184.

IRMM, Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements, Joint Research Centre (JRC), European Commission, 2006; Interlaboratory comparison: PAH in edible oils. http://www.irmm.jrc.be/html/interlaboratory_comparisons/index.htm

Jira W 2003. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) in smoked meat products and liquid smokes. *Fleischwirtschaft* 83 (3): 160-163.

1
2
3 Jira W 2004. A GC/MS method for the determination of carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic
4 hydrocarbons (PAH) in smoked meat products and liquid smokes. *European Food Research*
5 and Technology 218 (2): 208-212.
6
7
8

9
10
11
12 Müller P, Leece B, Raha D. 1995. Fifteenth International Symposium on Polycyclic Aromatic
13 Compounds, Belgirate, Italy, 19-22 Sept, 159-160.
14
15
16

17
18
19 Jung L, Morand P 1962. Chimie vegetale – presence dans differents huiles vegetales dune
20 substance donnant le spectre de fluorescence du benzo-3,4-pyrene. *Comptes Rendus*
21 *Hebdomadaires des Séances de L Academie des Sciences* 254 (8): 1489.
22
23
24
25

26
27
28
29 Kazerouni N, Sinha R, Hsu CH, et al. 2001. Analysis of 200 food items for benzo[a]pyrene
30 and estimation of its intake in an epidemiologic study. *Food and Chemical Toxicology* 39 (5):
31 423-436.
32
33
34
35

36
37
38 Kleinhenz S, Jira W, Schwind KH 2006. Dioxin and polychlorinated biphenyl analysis:
39 Automation and improvement of clean-up established by example of spices. *Molecular*
40 *Nutrition & Food Research* 50 (4-5): 362-367.
41
42
43
44

45
46
47
48 McClure P, Scheny R 1995. Fifteenth International Symposium on Polycyclic Aromatic
49 Compounds, Belgirate, Italy, 19-22 Sept, 161.
50
51
52

53
54
55 Mottier P, Parisod V, Turesky RJ 2000. Quantitative determination of polycyclic aromatic
56 hydrocarbons in barbecued meat sausages by gas chromatography coupled to mass
57 spectrometry. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 48 (4): 1160-1166.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Müller P, Leece B, Raha D 1995. Fifteenth International Symposium on Polycyclic Aromatic
4
5 Compounds, Belgirate, Italy, 19-22 Sept, 159-160.
6
7
8
9

10 Nyman PJ, Perfetti GA, Joe FL, et al. 1993. Comparison of two clean-up methodologies for
11
12 the gas chromatographic/mass spectrometric determination of low nanogram/gram levels of
13
14 polynuclear aromatic-hydrocarbons in seafood. Food Additives and Contaminants 10 (5):
15
16 489-501.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Figure 1. Structures, abbreviations and molecular weights of the 16 priority PAH
4
5
6
7

8 Sagredos, AN, Sinharoy D 1979. Method for rapid-determination of polycyclic aromatic-
9 hydrocarbons in fats and oils via coffein complexes. Deutsche Lebensmittel-Rundschau 75
10
11 (11): 350-352.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Sagredos, AN, Sinharoy D, Thomas A 1988. On the occurrence, determination and
18 composition of polycyclic aromatic-hydrocarbons in crude oils and fats. Fett Wissenschaft
19
20 Technologie - Fat Science Technology 90 (2): 76-81.
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 SCF, Scientific Committee on Food 2002. Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food on
28 the Risks to Human Health of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Food (expressed on 4
29 December 2002). Available: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/food/chemicalsafety/
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/out153_en.pdf)
contaminants/out153_en.pdf

59 Schmidt W, Grimmer G, Jacob J, Dettbarn G, Naujack KW 1987. Polycyclic aromatic
60 hydrocarbons with mass number 300 and 302 in hard-coal flue gas condensate. Fresenius
Journal of Analytical Chemistry 326: 401-413.

Figure 5. Linear range HRMS (1 – 1000 pg/μL)

Simko P 2002. Determination of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked meat products
and smoke flavouring food additives. Journal of Chromatography B-Analytical Technologies
in the Biomedical and Life Science 770 (1-2): 3-18.

Table II. LOD und LOQ in meat products

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Speer K, Montag A 1988. Polycyclic aromatic-hydrocarbons in native vegetable-oils. *Fett Wissenschaft Technologie - Fat Science Technology* 90 (5): 163-167

Summary and Conclusion of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, Sixty-Fourth meeting, Rome, 8-17 February 2005, JECFA/64/SC.

Wenzl T, Simon R, Kleiner J, et al. 2006. Analytical methods for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in food and the environment needed for new food legislation in the European Union. *Trac-Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 25 (7): 716-725.

1
2
3 Figure 1. Chromatograms of the priority PAH and some isomers on a VF-17ms
4
5

6
7
8 Figure 2. Chromatographic separation of PAH isomers with $m/z = 302$ in a smoked raw
9
10 sausage on a VF-17ms
11
12

13
14
15
16 Figure 3. Chromatogram of the separation of triphenylene (TP) and chrysene (CHR)
17
18

19
20
21
22 Figure 4. Percentage contribution of single PAH to the total content of the 16 EFSA-PAH in
23
24 smoked meat products (N = 22)
25
26


27
28
29 Table I. Ratio qualifier to quantifier ion of different PAH compounds
30
31

32
33
34 Table II. LOD und LOQ in meat products
35
36

37
38
39 Table III. Contents of PAH determined with both GC/MS-systems in three spiked and one
40
41 native oil
42
43

44
45
46
47 Table IV. Contents of PAH in smoked meat products
48
49

50
51
52 Table V. Ratios of triphenylene to chrysene in smoked meat products
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Chromatograms of the priority PAH and some isomers on a VF-17ms 190x94mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Review Only


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Chromatographic separation of PAH isomers with $m/z=302$ in a smoked raw sausage on a VF-17ms 252x120mm (150 x 150 DPI)

For Review Only



Chromatogram of the separation of triphenylene (TP) and chrysene (CHR)
267x131mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Percentage contribution of single PAH to the total content of the 16 EFSA-PAH in smoked meat products (N=22)
214x167mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Table I. Ratio qualifier to quantifier ion of different PAH compounds

<i>Qualifier/Quantifier Ion</i>		
BcL	<i>108/216</i>	10.0
BaA	<i>114/228</i>	11.0
CHR	<i>113/228</i>	11.5
CPP	<i>113/226</i>	16.7
5MC	<i>215/242</i>	11.9
BbF	<i>126/252</i>	12.5
BkF	<i>125/252</i>	9.5
BjF	<i>125/252</i>	12.6
BaP	<i>126/252</i>	13.2
IcP	<i>138/276</i>	21.7
DhA	<i>139/278</i>	13.8
BgP	<i>138/276</i>	18.7
DIP	<i>150/302</i>	28.8
DeP	<i>150/302</i>	15.0
DiP	<i>150/302</i>	9.7
DhP	<i>150/302</i>	10.3

Table II. LOD und LOQ in meat products

$\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	meat products			
	5 g sample weight			
	MSD		HRMS	
	LOD	LOQ	LOD	LOQ
group 1	0.01	0.03	0.003	0.009
group 2	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.03

Table III: Contents of PAH determined with both GC/MS-systems in three spiked and one native oil

	spiked sunflower oil			spiked olive oil			spiked maize oil			native sunflower oil		
	HRMS	MSD	median conc.*	HRMS	MSD	median conc.*	HRMS	MSD	median conc.*	HRMS	MSD	median conc.*
benzo[a]anthracene	0.9	0.8	0.9	2.7	2.7	2.9	7.9	8.1	7.8	5.6	5.5	5.7
benzo[a]pyrene	1.0	0.8	0.9	2.5	2.2	2.3	7.6	7.1	7.5	4.8	4.3	4.7
benzo[b]fluoranthene	6.3	6.3	6.6	1.2	1.1	1.1	2.1	1.9	1.9	5.0	4.6	4.6
benzo[c]fluorene	1.6	1.4	1.5	6.7	5.9	6.9	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.8	1.5
benzo[ghi]perylene	8.6	9.2	9.5	1.6	1.3	1.5	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.7	3.2	3.6
benzo[j]fluoranthene	2.8	2.7	2.7	10.2	10.6	10.0	1.4	1.2	1.1	2.7	2.6	2.6
benzo[k]fluoranthene	1.0	0.7	0.8	2.3	2.2	2.3	7.3	7.3	7.4	2.6	2.4	2.4
chrysene	1.1	1.0	1.0	10.1	10.0	9.9	2.3	2.5	2.3	8.1	7.6	7.5
cyclopenta[cd]pyrene	7.1	8.2	6.3	1.1	1.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	1.8	2.5	2.4	2.6
dibenzo[a,e]pyrene	2.0	1.6	1.7	1.1	0.7	0.8	6.3	6.2	6.8	1.0	0.7	0.8
dibenzo[a,h]anthracene	1.3	1.0	1.0	3.1	2.8	2.9	8.9	9.3	11.0	1.1	0.8	0.8
dibenzo[a,h]pyrene	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.1	0.7	0.8	7.0	7.1	6.8	0.6	0.1	-
dibenzo[a,i]pyrene	1.0	0.6	0.6	7.2	7.2	6.8	2.1	1.8	1.9	0.9	1.0	0.3
dibenzo[a,l]pyrene	7.3	7.0	7.5	1.9	2.0	2.1	1.1	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.6
Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene	1.9	1.6	1.8	6.2	6.1	6.9	2.8	2.3	0.8	3.0	2.8	3.2
5-methylchrysene	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.8	3.6	2.5	3.5	-	-	-

* recovery corrected median concentration of all participants.

Table IV. Contents of PAH in smoked meat products

$\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	BcL	BaA	CPP	CHR + TP	5MC	BbF	BjF	BkF	BaP	BgP	DhA	IcP	DeP	DhP	DiP	DIP
smoked ham	1.59	2.02	1.42	2.22	0.38	0.87	0.94	0.66	1.03	0.61	0.20	0.62	0.10	<0.03	0.05	0.07
smoked ham	0.19	0.32	0.41	0.36	0.05	0.20	0.22	0.15	0.23	0.21	0.06	0.20	0.04	<0.01	<0.03	<0.03
smoked ham	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.14	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.10	<0.03	0.08	<0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.03
smoked ham	0.79	0.84	0.91	0.78	0.06	0.38	0.42	0.29	0.50	0.39	0.08	0.35	0.05	<0.01	0.04	0.03
smoked ham	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.20	0.02	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.12	0.15	0.03	0.11	<0.03	<0.01	0.03	<0.03
smoked ham	0.36	0.93	0.36	3.55	0.39	0.80	0.64	0.29	0.54	0.79	0.17	0.47	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	0.12	0.49	0.48	0.65	0.03	0.41	0.38	0.25	0.40	0.37	<0.03	0.27	0.03	<0.01	<0.03	<0.01
smoked ham	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.11	<0.03	0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	0.18	0.15	0.16	0.20	0.01	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.09	0.16	<0.01	0.10	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	0.95	0.79	0.56	4.29	0.2	0.59	1.29	0.43	0.76	0.26	0.03	0.16	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	0.12	0.12	0.03	0.15	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.06	<0.03	0.05	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	4.60	4.70	2.93	4.99	0.96	5.00	1.14	2.49	2.31	1.34	0.17	1.25	0.20	<0.03	0.12	<0.03
smoked ham	2.25	4.47	4.04	4.27	0.34	2.66	3.14	2.25	3.89	2.60	0.27	2.57	0.48	0.06	0.32	0.05
smoked ham	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.15	0.03	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.18	0.20	<0.03	0.18	0.04	<0.03	<0.03	<0.01
smoked ham	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.08	<0.03	0.04	<0.03	<0.01	<0.03	<0.01
smoked ham	0.09	0.10	0.04	0.19	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	<0.03	0.03	<0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.04	<0.01	<0.03	0.005	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
smoked ham	0.09	0.07	0.02	0.11	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.004	0.02	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03
smoked ham	0.13	0.15	0.04	0.18	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.07	<0.03	0.05	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03
smoked ham	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.05	<0.03	0.03	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03	<0.03
belly pork ham	13.88	13.48	13.04	13.69	2.54	16.04	19.38	16.46	17.63	19.29	6.21	21.03	3.09	0.27	1.93	2.88
smoked wild boar ham	0.86	0.82	0.23	3.22	0.21	0.61	0.51	0.24	0.49	0.52	0.13	0.41	0.09	<0.03	0.07	0.06

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table V. Ratios of triphenylene (TP) to chrysene (CHR) in smoked meat products

meat product	ratio TP/CHR	meat product	ratio TP/CHR
raw ham_1	0.39	bacon_8	0.37
raw ham_2	0.11	bacon_9	0.49
raw ham_3	0.51	bacon_10	0.28
raw ham_4	0.24	bacon_11	0.25
raw ham_5	0.32	bacon_12	0.46
belly of pork	0.12	bacon_13	0.36
bacon_1	0.37	wild boar ham	2.70
bacon_2	0.34	smoked ham_1	0.46
bacon_3	0.25	smoked ham_2	0.20
bacon_4	0.53	smoked ham_3	0.18
bacon_5	0.54	smoked ham_4	0.17
bacon_6	0.47	smoked ham_5	0.35
bacon_7	0.28		