



**HAL**  
open science

## Safe apples for baby food production:search for pesticide preparations leaving minimum residues

Jana Ticha, Jana Hajslova, Tomas Kovalczuk, Martin Jech, Jiri Honzicek, Vladimir Kocourek, Miroslav Lansky, Jana Kloutvorova, Vladan Falta

### ► To cite this version:

Jana Ticha, Jana Hajslova, Tomas Kovalczuk, Martin Jech, Jiri Honzicek, et al.. Safe apples for baby food production:search for pesticide preparations leaving minimum residues. Food Additives and Contaminants, 2007, 24 (06), pp.605-620. 10.1080/02652030601013703 . hal-00577510

**HAL Id: hal-00577510**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00577510>**

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.



**Safe apples for baby food production: search for pesticide preparations leaving minimum residues**

Journal:	<i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2006-116.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Aug-2006
Complete List of Authors:	Ticha, Jana; Institute of Chemical Technology, Food Chemistry and Analysis Hajslova, Jana; Institute of Chemical Technology, Food Chemistry and Analysis Kovalczuk, Tomas; Institute of Chemical Technology, Food Chemistry and Analysis Jech, Martin; Institute of Chemical Technology, Food Chemistry and Analysis Honzicek, Jiri; Institute of Chemical Technology, Food Chemistry and Analysis Kocourek, Vladimir; Institute of Chemical Technology, Food Chemistry and Analysis Lansky, Miroslav; Research and Breeding Institute of Pomology Holovousy Ltd. Kloutvorova, Jana; Research and Breeding Institute of Pomology Holovousy Ltd. Falta, Vladan; Research and Breeding Institute of Pomology Holovousy Ltd.
Methods/Techniques:	Clean-up, Extraction, GC/MS, LC/MS
Additives/Contaminants:	Pesticide residues, Pesticides - spraying regimes
Food Types:	Baby food, Fruit, Processed foods

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

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For Peer Review Only

# 1 Safe apples for baby food production: search for pesticide preparations 2 leaving minimum residues

## 3 4 **Abstract**

5 Altogether 19 pesticide preparations were used according to agricultural practice within 6  
6 trials in apple orchards. Using gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) and liquid  
7 chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) methods, premature Golden  
8 Delicious apples collected 64, 50, 36 days before harvest and matured fruit were examined  
9 for residues of active ingredients. No residues of triflumuron, triazamate, chlorpyrifos,  
10 etofenprox, fenoxycarb, kresoxim-methyl, cyprodinyl, difenoconazole and thiram were  
11 detected in the first sampling, also the levels of chlorpyrifos-methyl, penconazole,  
12 tebuconazole and tolylfluanid dropped during the pre-harvest interval. Detectable, residues  
13 of pyridaben, thiacloprid, trifloxystrobin and tetraconazole in harvested fruits were below  
14 0.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, which is the maximum concentration of residues acceptable by baby food  
15 producer in any raw material to be processed. The only residues exceeding this  
16 concentration were captan and teflubenzuron. Based on these data, farmers may choose the  
17 pesticides for optimal treatment plants whilst enabling production of safe crop suitable for  
18 baby food production.

19  
20 **Keywords:** apples, pesticides, baby food, fruit production, gas-chromatography-mass  
21 spectrometry, liquid-chromatography- tandem mass spectrometry

## 22 23 **Introduction**

24  
25 Various abiotic factors such as unfavourable temperature, moisture, nutrients, soil  
26 conditions and/or phytotoxic environmental chemicals as well as several infectious disease  
27 agents represented mainly by biotic pathogens such as fungi, bacteria, viruses, nematodes,  
28 mycoplasmas etc. may cause damage to food crops (Hamilton 2004). To maintain healthy,  
29 productive plants and prevent losses of stored crops, producers should recognize what pests  
30 to look for, understand pest biology, use appropriate preventive measures, and apply last  
31 but not least timely efficient pesticide preparations when needed. In general, after

1  
2  
3 1 elimination of targeted pests, modern pesticides are designed to dissipate due to various  
4 2 environmental factors and detoxication processes taking place in treated plants.  
5  
6  
7 3

8  
9 4 However, under certain circumstances, even if applied in accordance with Good  
10 5 Agriculture Practice (GAP), residues of pesticides can still be detected in treated crops  
11 6 (Hajslová 1999). Consumers' exposure to such hazardous chemicals is of growing health  
12 7 concern, specifically in the case of infants and young children that represent the most  
13 8 vulnerable population group – not only because of their high food intake per body weight  
14 9 unit but also due to yet undeveloped detoxication mechanisms. With respect to these facts,  
15 10 a uniform Maximum Residue Limit (MRL) as low as 0.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> was established by EU  
16 11 Directive for any pesticide residue in processed cereal-based foods and baby foods for  
17 12 infants and young children (Commission Directive 1999/39/EC).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 13

26 14 It should be noted that EU Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) applying to common  
27 15 products of plant origin are often higher than 0.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>. According to an internationally  
28 16 accepted strategy, their values are based not only on toxicologically acceptable levels, but  
29 17 also on evaluation of residue data from supervised field trials carried out according to the  
30 18 principles of Good Agricultural Practice (GAP). Experience shows that GAP-based MRLs  
31 19 are generally lower than MRLs derived from toxicological end-points (Hamilton 2004).  
32 20 The overview of EU legislation concerned with pesticides and their MRLs is shown at  
33 21 [http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/plant/protection/pesticides/legislation\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/plant/protection/pesticides/legislation_en.htm) and  
34 22 [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/pesticides/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/pesticides/index_en.htm), respectively.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 23

44 24 A significant decrease in pesticide residues typically occurs during technological  
45 25 operations such washing, steam boiling, thermal sterilisation etc. employed for  
46 26 industrial/household fruits and/or vegetable processing (Cano et al. 1987; Cabras et al.  
47 27 1990; Mahajan et al. 1992; Cabras et al. 1993; Holland et al. 1994; Ong et al. 1996; Cabras  
48 28 et al. 1997; Burchat et al. 1998; Cabras et al. 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Will et al. 1999; Cabras  
49 29 et al. 2000; Panagiotis EA et al. 2000; Rassmussen et al. 2003; Yirong-Su et al. 2003).  
50 30 Despite this fact, in view of the large number of registered pesticides representing various  
51 31 chemical classes and (consequently) a wide range of physico-chemical properties, the  
52 32 possible transfer of some (more persistent) residues into the final product cannot be  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 avoided. To prevent such a risk and to ensure the quality of fruit/vegetable baby food, baby  
2 food producers are nowadays reluctant to process any raw materials containing residues  
3 exceeding  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  limit (even though the “common” MRL for particular crop is not  
4 exceeded). To our knowledge, the current practice of major baby food producer is to check  
5 all batches of components prior to processing; thus the risk of marketing a product (baby  
6 food) containing violative residues is minimized. Thus, strategies relying on “dilution” of  
7 contaminated batch by residues free raw material and/or degradation of occurring  
8 pesticides during processing chain are not represent common approach.

9  
10 Under these conditions, close collaboration between industry and farmers was established  
11 to facilitate a supply of crops containing low residue or residue free requirements.  
12 Although the use of organic crops might represent a conceivable option, this may not be a  
13 realistic solution in view of the global demands for raw materials. Therefore, a careful  
14 choice of agricultural practices namely selection of low input, non-persistent pesticide  
15 preparations is a critical issue in this context. It should be noted that in addition to  
16 documentation submitted by producers within the pesticides registration process, there are  
17 a large number of papers documenting a decline of various pesticide residues following  
18 respective food plant/crop treatment, however, due to a largely variable climatic conditions  
19 as well as with respect to differences in application practices, such information is only  
20 tentative and cannot be considered as fully generic (Holland et al. 1994, Rasmussen et al.  
21 2003, Gambacorta et al. 2005, Cengiz et al. 2006).

22  
23 In our study, extensive field experiments concerned with optimisation of apples production  
24 are presented. The aim of this work was to identify the optimal strategy for apple tree  
25 protection providing efficient control of pests (plant diseases) and, at the same time leaving  
26 undetectable or very low pesticide residues not exceeding  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ .

## 27 28 **Materials and methods**

### 29 *Field work*

30 Golden Delicious apples examined in this study for pesticide residues were obtained from  
31 our project partner Research and Breeding Institute of Pomology, Holovousy Ltd., Czech  
32 Republic. The field experiment was performed at the orchard Sady Rokos Petrovicky,

1  
2  
3 1 Jicín, Czech Republic. The standard agricultural practices (pruning, fertilizing, and soil  
4 management) were carried out on the plots during the season. Golden Delicious apple trees  
5 2  
6 (24 years old) were situated in spacing 5 x 3 m (approximately 650 trees per ha),  
7 3  
8 experimental area was 0.25 ha. The overview of pesticide preparations including some  
9 4  
10 relevant characteristics are summarized in Table I. A tractor mounted sprayer Tifone  
11 5  
12 Vanguard 1070 equipped with the Albus ATR nozzles was used for the pesticide  
13 6  
14 applications; the volume was 400 L per ha and the operating pressure 1.3 MPa.  
15 7  
16 8

17 9 In April 2004, pesticide treatment started on the whole experimental orchard. In June 2004,  
18 10  
19 experimental orchard was divided into six field experiments representing six differences in  
20 11  
21 pesticide preparation treatments (the frequency of applications was higher compared to  
22 12  
23 standard practice). The detailed overview of pre-harvest treatment of apple trees performed  
24 13  
25 in the year 2004 is summarized in Table II.  
26 14

27 15 Four samplings of fresh apples were carried out, 14, 28, 42 and 78 days (i.e. in August 2,  
28 16  
29 August 16, August 30 and in October 5, respectively) after the last application of pesticide  
30 17  
31 preparations. In total 24 samples were obtained. Sampling was performed by randomly  
32 18  
33 hand-picking of fruits (approximately 3 kg of apples per sample) from various places of the  
34 19  
35 experimental fields according to the standard operating procedure elaborated in compliance  
36 20  
37 with Commission Directive 2002/63/EC.  
38 21

39 22 [Insert Table I about here]  
40 23

41 24 [Insert Table II about here]  
42 25  
43 26

#### 44 27 *Weather*

45 28 Weather conditions were monitored during the whole season by automatic weather station  
46 29  
47 at 15 min intervals. Temperatures, humidity and precipitations since April 2004 till October  
48 30  
49 2004 were recorded. For an overview of average values counted during the pre-harvest  
50 31  
51 interval, see Figure 1.  
52 32

53 33 [Insert Figure I about here]  
54 34  
55 35  
56 36  
57 37  
58 38  
59 39  
60 40

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5 2 *Chemicals*  
6  
7 3 (i) Certified pesticide standards (purity in the range 94-99.5%) were obtained from Dr.  
8  
9 4 Ehrenstorfer GmbH (Germany). Pesticides stock solutions were prepared by dissolving  
10  
11 5 neat standards in toluene for analyses carried out by gas chromatography - mass  
12  
13 6 spectrometry (GC-MS) and acetonitrile for examinations employing liquid chromatography  
14  
15 7 - tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). Working standards S<sub>1G</sub> and S<sub>1L</sub> consisting of  
16  
17 8 mixtures of target pesticides were prepared from stock solutions of individual pesticides  
18  
19 9 (concentrations of individual pesticides were 1 µg ml<sup>-1</sup>). Other working standards S<sub>2G</sub>, S<sub>3G</sub>,  
20  
21 10 S<sub>4G</sub>, S<sub>5G</sub>, S<sub>6G</sub> and S<sub>2L</sub>, S<sub>3L</sub>, S<sub>4L</sub>, S<sub>5L</sub>, S<sub>6L</sub> were obtained by dilution 2x, 10x, 20x, 100x, 200x  
22  
23 11 of S<sub>1G</sub> and S<sub>1L</sub> respectively. For spiking, solutions in ethylacetate for GC-MS and in  
24  
25 12 acetonitrile for LC-MS/MS with concentration corresponding to S<sub>3G</sub>/S<sub>3L</sub> were prepared.  
26  
27 13 (ii) Organic solvents for pesticide residue analysis were purchased from Scharlau, Spain  
28  
29 14 (ethyl acetate), Merck, Germany (cyclohexane, toluene and methanol) and Sigma-Aldrich  
30  
31 15 (acetonitrile).  
32  
33 16 (iii) Anhydrous sodium sulphate obtained from Penta, Czech Republic was dried at 600°C  
34  
35 17 for 7 h and then stored in a tightly closed glass container prior to use.

### 35 18 *Apparatus*

36  
37 19 (i) Warring Blender (Warring, USA) was used to homogenize fresh apples.  
38  
39 20 (ii) Ultra-Turrax homogenizer (IKA, Werk, Germany) was used for extraction of apple  
40  
41 21 homogenate.  
42  
43 22 (iii) Automated high performance gel permeation chromatography system (HP GPC) Aspec  
44  
45 23 XL (Gilson, France) equipped with PL gel column (600 x 7.5 mm, particles size 10 µm,  
46  
47 24 50Å ; Polymer Laboratories Ltd., UK) was used for purification of crude apple extracts.  
48  
49 25 Polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) filters (5 µm; National Scientific, USA) were used for  
50  
51 26 filtration of crude extracts prior to the clean-up.  
52  
53 27 (iv) Vacuum rotary evaporator Büchi Rotavor (Büchi, Switzerland) was used for removing  
54  
55 28 of organic solvents from crude extracts and “pesticide fraction” after HP GPC clean-up.  
56  
57 29 (v) High Performance Liquid Chromatograph (HPLC) 2695 Alliance module (Waters, UK)  
58  
59 30 coupled to tandem mass spectrometric detector Quattro Premier XE (Waters, UK) was used  
60  
61 31 for determination of more polar pesticides.



(vi) Gas chromatograph (GC) 6890N (Agilent, USA) equipped with a mass-selective detector 5975 Inert XL with quadrupole analyzer (Agilent, USA) and autosampler (7683 Series) was used for determination of GC amenable pesticides.

#### *Analytical methods*

The scope of two multi-residue methods described below (LC-MS/MS and GC-MS) covered all the pesticides involved in this study with the exception of thiram compound representing the group of ethylene bisdithiocarbamates (EBDCs). These contact fungicides are according to legislation requirements determined as a carbon disulphide (CS<sub>2</sub>). Accredited method (ISO 17025) consisting of the following steps was used for examination of apples: (i) solid phase micro extraction (SPME) for absorption of CS<sub>2</sub> (degradation product of EBDCs) from headspace of sample digested by hydrochloric acid in the presence of stannous chloride and (ii) GC-MS identification/quantification of analyte thermally desorbed in GC injector port. Since in none of samples residues of thiram were detected (LOD of method was 0.5 µg kg<sup>-1</sup>), no more detailed description is provided here.

#### *LC-MS/MS method*

##### *Sample preparation*

3 kg of unwashed fresh apples (representing field sample) delivered to laboratory were homogenized using a Warring Blender homogenizer. 12.5 g of homogenate were mixed with 50 ml of acetonitrile and extracted for 2 min with Ultra-Turrax homogenizer. The suspension was filtered under vacuum; the filtrate cake was washed with 3 x 10 ml of acetonitrile and then evaporated on a vacuum rotary evaporator. 15 ml of methanol were added into the evaporation flask and the volume was quantitatively transferred into 50 ml volumetric flask and made-up with methanol. Samples were prior to injection filtered through PTFE filters. The matrix content in crude extract was 0.25 g ml<sup>-1</sup>.

##### *LC-MS/MS identification/quantification*

LC separations were carried out on a reversed phase column Discovery C<sub>18</sub> (150 x 3 mm, 5 µm). The sample temperatures as well as column temperature were maintained at 25°C. The mobile phase contained water (A) and methanol (B) and the flow rate was 0.3 ml min<sup>-1</sup>. Gradient was employed, starting composition of 50% B, rising linearly 100% B over 6

1 min then held for 11 min at 100% B followed by 10 min re-equilibration to initial mobile phase composition. Injection volume 20  $\mu\text{l}$  was used in all separations.

Identification/quantification of target analytes was performed using a Quattro Premier tandem quadrupole mass spectrometer. The detector was operated in a positive electrospray (ES+) ionisation mode. Multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) conditions (collision energy and cone voltage) were optimised for each pesticide during infusion (5  $\mu\text{l min}^{-1}$ ) of individual pesticide solution (1-5  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ ) into the mobile phase flow (A:B 50:50, (v/v), 0.3  $\text{ml ml}^{-1}$ ). All experiments were realised employing the following parameters: capillary voltage 3.5 kV, extractor voltage 4 V, source temperature 120°C, desolvation temperature 250°C, cone gas flow 100  $\text{L h}^{-1}$  and desolvation gas flow 700  $\text{L h}^{-1}$  (both gasses were nitrogen). Argon was used as a collision gas (3.3 x 10<sup>-3</sup> mbar). Tuned and optimised MS/MS transitions as well as specific cone voltages and collision energies are summarized in Table III. Analytes were divided into time segments based on their elution characteristics. The MS/MS transitions were monitored in the multiple reaction-monitoring (MRM) mode at the same dwell time 0.005 s, inter-channel delays, and inter-scan delays of 10 ms for all transitions.

Generated experimental data were processed using MassLynx software version 4.0 Service Pack 4, Software Change Note #462.

[Insert Table III about here]

#### *GC-MS method*

##### *Sample preparation*

3 kg of unwashed fresh apples (representing field sample) delivered to laboratory were homogenized using a Warring Blender homogenizer. A 25 g of homogenized apples were weighed in a glass beaker, after addition of 100 ml ethyl acetate and 75 g of anhydrous sodium sulphate the sample was extracted for 2 minutes with the Ultra-Turrax homogenizer at 10 000 rpm. The suspension was filtered under vacuum through the layer of anhydrous sodium sulphate, the beaker and filtrate cake were rinsed with 3 x 25 ml of ethyl acetate. Combined filtrates were evaporated using vacuum rotary evaporator (temperature max.

1  
2  
3 1 40°C, pressure 220 mbar) to volume circa 25 ml. Concentrated crude extract was  
4  
5 2 transferred into volumetric flask and the final volume was made up with cyclohexane to 50  
6  
7 3 ml (matrix concentration 0.5 g ml<sup>-1</sup>).

#### 8 9 4 *HP- GPC purification*

10 5 Samples were filtered through PTFE filters prior to purification. Crude extracts were  
11  
12 6 purified employing automated high performance gel permeation chromatography system.  
13  
14 7 The following conditions were used for sample clean-up: mobile phase ethyl acetate-  
15  
16 8 cyclohexane (1:1), flow rate 1 ml min<sup>-1</sup>, injection volume 2 ml, collected “pesticide”  
17  
18 9 fraction 14.5-31 ml. Purified pesticide fraction was evaporated using vacuum rotary  
19  
20 10 evaporator (temperature max. 40°C, pressure 220 mbar) almost to dryness, the residual  
21  
22 11 solvent was removed with a gentle stream of nitrogen. After addition of 1 ml of toluene,  
23  
24 12 sample was ready to GC-MS analysis. The content of original matrix was 1 g ml<sup>-1</sup>.

#### 25 13 *GC-MS identification/quantification*

26 14 All separations of GC amenable pesticides were carried out on capillary column DB-5MS  
27  
28 15 (60 m x 0.25 mm x 0.25 µm). Pulsed splitless injection was used (pressure pulse 60 psi,  
29  
30 16 pulse period 2 min, inlet temperature 250°C, injection volume 1 µl). Oven temperature  
31  
32 17 program started at initial temperature 90°C (hold 2 min), 5°C min<sup>-1</sup> to 180°C then 2°C min<sup>-1</sup>  
33  
34 18 to 280°C (hold 5 min). Helium was used as a carrier gas at a constant rate 19 cm s<sup>-1</sup>. MSD  
35  
36 19 detector was working in electron ionization mode (EI), ion source temperature 230°C, MS  
37  
38 20 Quad temperature 150°C. Identification/quantification was performed in the Selected Ion  
39  
40 21 Monitoring mode (SIM), see Table IV. All GC-MS chromatographic data were processed  
41  
42 22 using ChemStation® Software (D.02.00 SP1, Agilent, USA)

#### 43 23 *Matrix - matched standards*

44 24 Matrix-matched standards used for calibration were prepared from untreated apples. Blank  
45  
46 25 extracts were prepared according to the above described LC-MS/MS and GC-MS  
47  
48 26 procedures. For LC-MS/MS, 100µl of working standard solution S<sub>1L</sub>-S<sub>6L</sub> were added to  
49  
50 27 900µl of blank apple extract prior to analysis. As for GC-MS, residue after evaporation of  
51  
52 28 solvent from purified blank apple extract was re-dissolved in 1ml of appropriate standard  
53  
54 29 working solution S<sub>1G</sub>-S<sub>6G</sub> for following analysis.

#### 55 30 56 57 31 *Quality Assurance*

1  
2  
3 1 For recovery tests, apple homogenates were spiked by pesticide mixture (spikes  
4 concentration corresponded to 0.1 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and then processed as described for LC-MS/MS  
5 and GC-MS analyses. Quality control procedures for pesticide residues analysis (Document  
6 N° SANCO/10232/2006) were applied in setting LOD and LOQ values. The latter one was  
7 the lowest calibration level (LCL) and corresponded for particular analyte to 3 x LOD.  
8 Under these conditions, LOQs were the minimum concentrations of analytes that was  
9 possible to quantify with acceptable accuracy and precision.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 9 The methods described above are accredited according to ISO/IEC 17025. As a part of  
19 external Quality Assurance, laboratory has been successfully participating in proficiency  
20 tests - Food Analysis Performance Assessment Scheme (FAPAS<sup>®</sup>) and European  
21 proficiency testing within the pesticide monitoring programme. Performance characteristics  
22 of applied analytical methods are summarized in Table IV.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 15 [Insert Table IV about here]  
29  
30  
31

## 32 17 **Results and discussion**

33 18  
34 19 As mentioned in the introduction, where fruit is intended for baby food production, careful  
35 attention has to be paid to selection of pesticide preparations matching specific  
36 requirements for obtaining low or residue-free crop. Since baby food producers tolerate  
37 only residues not exceeding 0.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in the raw material, fundamental changes of  
38 treatment strategy might have to be adopted in this aspect to produce acceptable raw  
39 material. To identify “high residue” pesticides that should be in particular case eliminated  
40 from the further use, monitoring of apples grown by several farmers under common  
41 conventional practices was carried out in the first phase of our experiments.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 28 *Monitoring study of fresh apples*

52 29 As shown in our previous study conducted in years 2001-2003 (Stepán et al. 2005), almost  
53 no violation of MRLs occurred. Nevertheless, 60 % from 220 batches of apples delivered  
54 by farmers contained detectable pesticide residues, 48% of them exceeded baby food MRL  
55 0.010 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and therefore had to be used for other purposes than baby food production.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5 2 The most troublesome pesticides in this respect were phosalone, chlorpyrifos-methyl,  
6  
7 3 captan, tolylfluanid and fenitrothion. Following the analysis of a data set generated within  
8  
9 4 this 3-year pilot study, farmers were advised to search for replacing preparations containing  
10  
11 5 these with other ones. As a consequence of modified treatment practices, significant  
12  
13 6 decrease of organophosphorus insecticide residues (phosalone, and fenitrothion) were  
14  
15 7 observed, while no changes in captan and tolylfluanid incidence were found. The search for  
16  
17 8 “new” preparation resulted in increased occurrence of trifloxystrobin residues. Overall, the  
18  
19 9 farmers` effort to improve treatment plans was documented by decrease of positive samples  
20  
21 10 number to 54% (i.e. only 15% exceeded baby food MRL of 0.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2004). It  
22  
23 11 should be noted that climatic conditions did not differ significantly in this crop year from  
24  
25 12 previous ones.

26  
27 14 Considering large variation (both qualitative and quantitative) in contamination patterns  
28  
29 15 among apples supplied by individual farmers, the need to harmonize treatment plans with  
30  
31 16 the aim to further improve crops quality become evident.

#### 32 17 33 18 *Degradation of pesticide residues in pre-harvest interval*

35 19 To get more knowledge on the fate of individual pesticides, extensive experiments were  
36  
37 20 carried out in 2004, see Table II. All 19 pesticides studied covered the range of  
38  
39 21 preparations most commonly applied within apple trees treatment during the pre-harvest  
40  
41 22 interval. However, there are also other registered pesticide preparations which are  
42  
43 23 conceivably used for apple trees protection.

44 24  
45  
46 25 It should be noted that only very few studies are available in the scientific literature, none  
47  
48 26 of them covering the spectrum of pesticides involved in our study. Actually, the only  
49  
50 27 available data relevant to our experiment are those summarized in reports  
51  
52 28 (<http://www.who.int/ipcs/publications/jmpr/en/>) of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of  
53  
54 29 Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and Environment and the WHO Core Assessment  
55  
56 30 Group of Pesticide Residues, JMPR (similar data have to be submitted by applicants for  
57  
58 31 active ingredients review process currently dealt by European Food Safety Authority,  
59  
60 32 EFSA).

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5 2 Figures 2-10 document the dynamics of pesticides involved in our study. In the sampling  
6  
7 3 carried out 14 days after the last pesticide application, residues of fungicides (captan,  
8  
9 4 tetraconazole, trifloxystrobin, penconazole, tebuconazole and tolylfluanid) and insecticides  
10  
11 5 (pyridaben, chlorpyrifos-methyl, thiacloprid and teflubenzuron) were detected. In following  
12  
13 6 pre-harvest interval successive decline of residues was observed, although the rate of  
14  
15 7 dissipation varied largely. Since it is impossible to generalize the fate of the whole set of  
16  
17 8 pesticides investigated, behavior of individual compounds is discussed in separated  
18  
19 9 paragraphs below (Figures 2-9). Figure 10 summarizes concentration levels of pesticides  
20  
21 10 found in harvested apples within all 6 field experiments (FE 1 , FE 2, FE3, FE 4, FE 5 and  
22  
23 11 FE 6).

### 24 25 13 *Captan*

26  
27 14 As shown in Figure 2, the residues of captan, the main fungicide widely used for control of  
28  
29 15 apple scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), were either not detected (FE 5 and FE 6) or already fairly  
30  
31 16 well below the MRL (3 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at the first sampling, even in an experiment with two  
32  
33 17 treatments (FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4). Successive decrease of captan occurred and at the time  
34  
35 18 of harvest its residues at 0.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> level were detected in only two samples (FE 2 and  
36  
37 19 FE 4).

38  
39 21 It is worth noting that the relative decrease rate was higher in FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4  
40  
41 22 compared to FE 5 and FE 6 in which longer time elapsed since the last treatment with  
42  
43 23 Merpan 80 WG preparation. No significant differences in residue levels were found in the  
44  
45 24 third sampling regardless the application rate and date of application, residues were  
46  
47 25 between 0.01 – 0.02 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>.

48  
49 27 Considering the data obtained from the Canadian study for JMPR (Captan residues in food:  
50  
51 28 1984 evaluation), we obtained significantly lower content of captan residues. Whereas  
52  
53 29 content of captan in Canadian apples was in the range 0.6 - 2.9 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> some 30 days after  
54  
55 30 its application, in apples carried out within our experiments its concentration did not  
56  
57 31 exceed 0.1 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 33 days after captan treatment.

58  
59 32



1  
2  
3 1 [Insert Figure 2 about here]  
4

5 2 *Pyridaben*  
6

7 3 Although applied at the same rate and the same date, pyridaben residues in apples from  
8  
9 4 individual experiments differed largely at the time of the first sampling. While relatively  
10  
11 5 rapid decrease of residues occurred in FE 1 with no detectable residues at the harvest time,  
12  
13 6 in FE 2 despite the lower concentration in the first sampling, traces of pyridaben were  
14  
15 7 detectable even in harvested apples (see Figure 3).  
16  
17 8

17 9 [Insert Figure 3 about here]  
18  
19 10

21 11 *Chlorpyrifos-methyl*  
22

23 12 Residues of insecticide chlorpyrifos-methyl used for crop protection against codling moths  
24  
25 13 (*Cydia pomonella*) and sawfly insects (*Hymenoptera*, *Haplocampa testudinea*) dropped in  
26  
27 14 both FE 3 and FE 5 below the MRL (0.50 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in all experiments even before the end  
28  
29 15 of the safety period. As can be seen from Figure 4, further degradation of residues occurred  
30  
31 16 and residues were close to or below the baby food MRL. Harvested apples collected 78  
32  
33 17 days after the last Reldan 40 EC application in FE 3 and FE 5 did not contain any  
34  
35 18 chlorpyrifos-methyl residues. In apples from experiment FE 1, residues were not detected  
36  
37 19 even during the pre-harvest interval (61 days).  
38  
39 20

39 21 [Insert Figure 4 about here]  
40  
41 22

42 23 *Teflubenzuron*  
43

44 24 Teflubenzuron is an insecticide recommended against tortricid (*Tortricidae*) that can cause  
45  
46 25 mechanical damage to ripe fruits, which can consequently be a “gate” for secondary  
47  
48 26 putrefactive diseases (*Alternaria*, *Nectria*, *Phytophthora*) during apple storage. As shown in  
49  
50 27 Figure 5, repeated application of Nomolt 15 SC resulted in a fairly high content of  
51  
52 28 teflubenzuron in FE 2 contrary to single application in case of FE 3 and FE 4 in the first  
53  
54 29 and second samplings. In none of the experiments was the MRL (0.5 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) exceeded  
55  
56 30 even in the first sampling. Among the first and second samplings only a slight decrease of  
57  
58 31 teflubenzuron content was observed, probably due to lack of precipitation that might  
59  
60 32 remove some surface residues (see Figure 1). In the following pre-harvest time the content

1  
2  
3 1 of teflubenzuron declined during apple maturation. No residues were detected in FE 3  
4 harvested apples. However, in FE 2 and FE 4 ripe apples, teflubenzuron at concentration  
5 2 levels exceeding the baby food MRL was found. This can be attributed to the relatively  
6 3 high stability of this compound (The Pesticide Manual 2002).  
7 4  
8 5

9  
10  
11  
12 6 [Insert Figure 5 about here]  
13  
14 7

### 15 8 *Thiacloprid*

16 9 Thiacloprid belongs to the very limited group of in-season insecticides allowed to be  
17 10 applied at the early pink stage of trees development to control beetles (*e.g. Anthonomus*  
18 11 *pomorum*), codling moths (*Cydia pomonella*), rosy apple aphids, green aphids and to help  
19 12 mite suppression (IPM Commercial Apples, Insect, Disease and Weed Control  
20 13 Recommendations for 2006). Thiacloprid was applied in all FE 1, FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4  
21 14 once, three times in FE 5 and twice in FE 6. Since the treatment was carried out in early  
22 15 May, in line with expectation low concentrations correlating with application rate were  
23 16 obtained in FE 1, FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4. Interesting is that these were detected even 111  
24 17 days after Calypso 480 SC application (*i.e.* 97 days after safe period elapsed). Nevertheless,  
25 18 in time of harvest, no residues were detected. Significant differences in thiacloprid contents  
26 19 in the first sampling date was found in the case of repeated applications carried out in FE 5  
27 20 and FE 6 (see Figure 6). However, its content rapidly declined during pre-harvest interval  
28 21 and only trace amounts ( $0.003 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ) were found in ripe apples.  
29 22

30 23 [Insert Figure 6 about here]  
31 24  
32 25

### 33 26 *Tebuconazole and tolylfluanid*

34 27 Tebuconazole and tolylfluanid were applied together as Hattrick pesticide preparation (see  
35 28 Table I) against apple scab (*Venturia inaequalis*) in FE 5 and FE 6. Relatively high  
36 29 persistency was recognized for tebuconazole. Residues of this fungicide exceeded the baby  
37 30 food limit even in the third sampling (55 days beyond safety period). Nevertheless, these  
38 31 were not detected in the harvested fruits (see Figure 7a). As compared to tolylfluanid, this  
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 1 Figure 7b) and dissipated during the pre-harvest time; in harvested apples no tolylfluanid  
4 2 residues were detected.

5 3  
6 4 [Insert Figures 7a and 7b about here]  
7 5  
8 6

#### 9 *Tetraconazole*

10 7 As shown in Figure 8, residues of tetraconazole used as a protection against apple scab and  
11 8 powdery mildew were well below the MRL (0.5 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in the first sampling in  
12 9 experiments with three (FE 2 and FE 3) and four (FE 4) treatments; in FE 6 tetraconazole  
13 10 was not detected. A decline of tetraconazole residues occurred in following pre-harvest  
14 11 time; in harvested apples only low concentrations levels (0.005 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) were observed at  
15 12 field experiments repeatedly treated (FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4).  
16 13

17 14 [Insert Figure 8 about here]  
18 15  
19 16

#### 20 *Trifloxystrobin*

21 17 As shown in Figure 9, the residues of trifloxystrobin were detected in all samples FE 1, FE  
22 18 2, FE 3, FE 4, FE 5 and FE 6 in the first sampling. Since applied at the same date and same  
23 19 application rate in FE 2, FE 3, FE 4 and FE 5, similar concentrations were found contrary  
24 20 to repeated applications in FE 1 and FE 6 resulting in higher contents of trifloxystrobin in  
25 21 the first sampling. While relatively continuous decline of residues was identified in FE 1  
26 22 and FE 6 with no (FE 6) or trace (FE 1) residues in harvested apples, in samples with lower  
27 23 treatment (FE 2, FE 3, FE 4 and FE 5), the reduction in residue levels was not so distinct,  
28 24 although the baby food limit was not exceeded.  
29 25

30 26 [Insert Figure 9 about here]  
31 27  
32 28

#### 33 *Penconazole*

34 29 The fungicide penconazole applied only in FE 5, was detected in the first sampling (33  
35 30 days after the last Topas 100 EC application) at trace concentration levels (0.005 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>).  
36 31 In harvested apples no penconazole residues were found.  
37 32

38 33 *Overview of pesticide degradation in field experiments FE 1 – FE 6*

1  
2  
3 1 Field experiments were carried out aimed at identifying pesticide preparations that ensure  
4 effective crop protection and yet at the same time leave very low residues. Based on 6 field  
5 2 experiments described in this study, a set of data enabling evaluation of both the  
6 3 degradation rate and levels of terminal residues in matured apples was obtained. The main  
7 4 observations resulting from this study are summarized below.  
8 5

9 6 • In the *first sampling*, carried out before or immediately after the pesticides safety  
10 7 period has elapsed, only 10 pesticides (46% of 22 active ingredients applied) were  
11 8 detected; 8 of them exceeded or were at  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ . Those were fungicides captan in FE  
12 9 1, FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4, tetraconazole in FE 2, FE 3, FE 4 and FE 5, trifloxystrobin in FE 1  
13 10 and FE 6, tebuconazole in FE 5 and FE 6; insecticides pyridaben in FE 1 and FE 2,  
14 11 teflubenzuron in FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4, chlorpyrifos-methyl in FE 1, FE 3 and FE 5 and  
15 12 thiachloprid in FE 5 and FE 6. On the other hand, the levels of penconazole in FE 5 and  
16 13 tolylfluanid in FE 6 were found below baby food MRL; similarly low were thiachloprid,  
17 14 tetraconazole and trifloxystrobin in some experiments. Residues of triflumuron, triazamate,  
18 15 chlorpyrifos, etofenprox, fenoxycarb, kresoxim-methyl, cyprodinyl, difenoconazole and  
19 16 thiram were not detected at all.  
20 17

21 18 • In the *second sampling*, 9 pesticides were found (penconazole in FE 5 was not  
22 19 detected anymore); 8 residues of active ingredients still exceeded  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  in some  
23 20 experiments (captan, pyridaben, teflubenzuron, thiachloprid, tebuconazole, trifloxystrobin,  
24 21 tetraconazole and chlorpyrifos-methyl). Since the previous sampling, contents of  
25 22 chlorpyrifos-methyl in FE 1 and tetraconazole in FE 3 and FE 5 declined fairly below baby  
26 23 food MRL.  
27 24

28 25 • Also in the *third sampling*, 9 pesticides were detected, nevertheless only 5 of them  
29 26 exceeded  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  (captan, pyridaben, teflubenzuron, thiachloprid and tebuconazole).  
30 27 Residues of chlorpyrifos-methyl in FE 3 and FE 5, tebuconazole in FE 5, trifloxystrobin in  
31 28 FE 1, FE 5 and FE 6 and tetraconazole in FE 2 and FE 4 dropped below this value since  
32 29 second sampling.  
33 30

34 31 • When assessing the residues situation at the harvest time (the *fourth sampling*), each  
35 32 of the treatment regimes resulted in detectable residues (see Figure 10). In total, 6  
36 33 pesticides i.e. 27% of active ingredients applied for the treatment of apple trees were  
37 34 detected.  
38 35  
39 36  
40 37  
41 38  
42 39  
43 40  
44 41  
45 42  
46 43  
47 44  
48 45  
49 46  
50 47  
51 48  
52 49  
53 50  
54 51  
55 52  
56 53  
57 54  
58 55  
59 56  
60 57

1  
2  
3 1 The lowest contamination was observed in FE 1, FE 3 and FE 6, where residues of only  
4 one pesticide, well below  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  was found (trifloxystrobin in FE 1; tetraconazole in  
5 FE 3 and thiacloprid in FE 6). Field treatment FE 5 resulted in the occurrence of two  
6 detectable pesticides (trifloxystrobin and thiacloprid) in matured apples. Similarly to FE 1  
7 and FE 6, the concentration levels of residues found in these samples were well below the  
8 baby food MRL. On the other hand, baby food producers' requirements were not fulfilled  
9 in FE 2 and FE 4, where "the worst" contamination situation was found. In both these field  
10 experiments tefubenzuron exceeded  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  and residues of captan were also present  
11 close to this critical concentration level. Besides, additional pesticide residues were found;  
12 these were pyridaben, tetraconazole, trifloxystrobin in FE 2 and tetraconazole and  
13 trifloxystrobin in FE 4 - all of them below  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 13 Regarding the effectiveness of crop protection against pests, all six treatment regimes were  
26 also evaluated for the occurrence of apple scab (*Venturia inaequalis*). No significant  
27 differences among the quality of apples obtained from individual field experiments were  
28 recognized. The extent of apple scab was only about 5% higher in our experiments  
29 compared to "conventionally" treated apples (regimes conducted in accordance with GAP  
30 leaving residues complying with MRL which may be, however, in some cases higher than  
31  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ).

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 21 [Insert Figure 10 about here]

## 40 41 42 23 **Conclusion**

43  
44  
45  
46 25 Considering the requirements of baby food producers for safe raw material with pesticide  
47 residues not exceeding  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ , treatment regimes FE 1, FE 3, FE 5 and FE 6 might  
48 be considered as an appropriate apple protection strategy, since only traces of active  
49 ingredients (tetraconazole, thiacloprid and trifloxystrobin) were contained in crops at the  
50 time of harvest. Residues of captan and teflubenzuron, active ingredients of pesticide  
51 preparations used for treatment in experiments FE 2 and FE 4, exceeded  $0.01 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  and  
52 their use in farms supplying apples for baby food production should be carefully  
53 considered. On the other hand, the use of cyprodinyl, chlorpyrifos, chlorpyrifos-methyl,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 difenoconazole, etofenprox, fenoxycarb, kresoxim-methyl, penconazole, pyridaben,  
4 2 tebuconazole, thiram, triazamate, triflumuron, and tolylfluanid in apple orchards seems – in  
5 3 terms of contamination - free of problems, no residues were detected in harvested fruit. It  
6 4 should be noted that employing treatment regimes aimed at minimization of residues in  
7 5 harvested crops did not result in its lower quality in terms of damage caused by pests.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 7 In any case, follow-up validation of these recommendations has to be carried out under  
15 8 conditions specific for particular locality. It is believed that at the end of long-term  
16 9 experiments specific guidelines for farmers supplying apples to baby food producers will  
17 10 be developed.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 12 **References**

24 13  
25 14 Burchat CS, Ripley BD, Leishman PD, Ritcey GM, Kakuda Y, Stephenson GR. 1998. The  
26 15 distribution of nine pesticides between the juice and pulp of carrots and tomatoes after  
27 16 home processing. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 15:61-71.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 18 Cabras P, Angioni A, Garau VL, Pirisi FP, Brandolini V, Cabitza F, Cubeddu M. 1998c.  
34 19 Pesticide residues in prune processing. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*  
35 20 46:3772-3774.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 22 Cabras P, Angioni A, Garau VL, Mellis M, Pirisi FP, Cabitza F, Cubeddu M. 1998b.  
41 23 Pesticide residues on field-sprayed apricots and in apricot drying process. *Journal of*  
42 24 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 46:2306-2308.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 26 Cabras P, Angioni A, Garau VL, Melis M, Pirisi FP, Cabitza F, Pala M. 1998a. Pesticide  
48 27 residues in raisin processing. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 46:2309-2311.  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 29 Cabras P, Angioni A, Garau VL, Pirisi FP, Cabitza F, Pala M, Farris GF. 2000. Fate of  
54 30 quinoxifen residues in grapes, wine and their processing products. *Journal of Agricultural*  
55 31 *and Food Chemistry* 48:6128-6131.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 Cabras P, Angioni A, Garau VL, Melis M, Pirisi FM, Farris GA, Sotgiu C, Minelli EV.  
4 1997. Persistence and metabolism of folpet in grapes and wine. *Journal of Agricultural and*  
5 2  
6 3 *Food Chemistry* 45:476-479.  
7 4  
8  
9  
10 5 Cabras P, Garau VL, Melis M, Pirisi FM, Spannedda L. 1993. Persistence and fate of  
11 6 fenthion in olives and olive products. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 41:2431-  
12 7 2433.  
13 8  
14  
15  
16 8  
17 9 Cabras P, Spanedda L, Cabitza F, Cubeddu M, Martini MG, Brandolini V. 1990.  
18 10 Pirimicarb and its metabolite residues in lettuce. Influence of cultural environment, *Journal*  
19 11 *of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 38:879-882.  
20 12  
21  
22  
23 12  
24 13 Cano P, De LaPlaza JL. 1987. Determination and persistence of several fungicides in  
25 14 postharvest-treated apples during their cold storage. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*  
26 15 *Chemistry* 144-147.  
27 16  
28  
29  
30 16  
31 17 Cengiz MF, Certel M, Karakaş B, Göçmen H. 2006. Residue contents of captan and  
32 18 procymidone applied on tomatoes grown in greenhouses and their reduction by duration of  
33 19 a pre-harvest interval and post-harvest culinary treatments. *Food Chemistry. In Press.*  
34 20  
35  
36  
37 20  
38  
39 21 European Commission. Commission Directive 1999/39/EC of 6 May 1999 amending  
40 22 Directive 96/5/EC on processed cereal-based foods and baby foods for infants and young  
41 23 children. *Official Journal of European Communities* L124 (1999) 8-10.  
42 24  
43  
44 24  
45  
46 25 European Commission. Commission Directive 2002/63/EC of 11 July 2002 establishing  
47 26 Community methods of sampling for the official control of pesticide residues in and on  
48 27 products of plant and animal origin and repealing Directive 79/700/EEC. *Official Journal*  
49 28 *of European Communities* L187 (2002) 30- 43.  
50 29  
51  
52  
53 29  
54  
55 30 European Commission. *Information on EU legislation concerned with pesticides* [internet]  
56 31 Available from: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/pesticides/legislation\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/pesticides/legislation_en.htm);  
57 32  
58 32 Accessed: April 18, 2006  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5 2 European Commission. *Information on pesticide EU MRLs* [internet]  
6  
7 3 Available from: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/pesticides/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/pesticides/index_en.htm);  
8  
9 4 Accessed: August 16, 2006  
10 5  
11  
12 6 Gambacorta G, Faccia M, Lamacchia C, Di Luccia A, La Notte E. 2005. Pesticide residues  
13 7 in tomato grown in open field. *Food Control* 16: 629-632.  
14 8  
15  
16 9 Hajslová J. 1999. Pesticides. In: *Environmental Contaminants in Food*, editors Moffat CF,  
17 10 Whittle KJ. Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, p. 219-243, ISBN: 1-85075-921-9  
18 11  
19  
20 12 Hamilton D, Crossley S. 2004. *Pesticides Residues in Food and Drinking Water. Human*  
21 13 *Exposure and Risks*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., p. 2. ISBN: 0-471-48991-3  
22 14  
23  
24 15 Holland PT, Hamilton D, Ohlin B, Skidmore MW. 1994. Effects of storage and processing  
25 16 on pesticide residues in plant matrices. *Pure and Applied Chemistry* 66:335-356.  
26 17  
27  
28 18 IPM Commercial Apples, Insect, Disease and Weed Control Recommendations for 2006  
29 19 [internet]. Available from: [http://www.aces.edu/pubs/docs/A/ANR-0500-A/VOL1-](http://www.aces.edu/pubs/docs/A/ANR-0500-A/VOL1-2006/apple.pdf)  
30 20 [2006/apple.pdf](http://www.aces.edu/pubs/docs/A/ANR-0500-A/VOL1-2006/apple.pdf) . Accessed 2006 March 25  
31 21  
32  
33 22 Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and Environment  
34 23 and the WHO Core Assessment Group of Pesticide Residues, JMPR [internet].  
35 24 Available from: <http://www.who.int/ipcs/publications/jmpr/en/>.  
36 25 Accessed: August 17, 2006  
37 26  
38  
39 27 Mahajan BVC, Chopra SK. 1992. Effect of post-harvest application of fungicides and wax  
40 28 coating on the quality of and storage of apple. *New Agriculturist*, 3:137-146  
41 29  
42  
43 30 Ong KC, Cash JN, Zabik MJ, Siddiq M, Jones AL. 1996. Chlorine and ozone washes for  
44 31 pesticide removal from apples and processed apple sauce. *Food Chemistry*, 55:153-160  
45 32  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 Panagiotis EA, Pappas Ch. 2000. Effect of fruit and storage conditions on the rate of  
4 2 degradation of azinphos methyl on apples and lemons. Food Chemistry, 69-72.  
5 3  
6 4 Pesticide residues in food. Evaluations 1984. [internet]. Captan. Available from:  
7 5 <http://www.inchem.org/documents/jmpr/jmpmono/v84pr08.htm>; Accessed 2006, March 6.  
8 6  
9 7 Quality Control Procedures For Pesticide Residue Analysis. Document  
10 8 N°SANCO/10232/206 from March/24/2006 [internet]  
11 9 Available from:  
12 10 [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/resources/qualcontrol\\_en.pdf#search=%22Docum](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/resources/qualcontrol_en.pdf#search=%22Document%20N%C2%B0%20SANCO%2F10232%2F2006%22)  
13 11 [ent%20N%C2%B0%20SANCO%2F10232%2F2006%22](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/resources/qualcontrol_en.pdf#search=%22Document%20N%C2%B0%20SANCO%2F10232%2F2006%22)  
14 12 Assessed: August 16, 2006  
15 13  
16 14 Rasmussen RR, Poulsen ME, Hansen HCB. 2003. Distribution of multiple pesticide  
17 15 residues in apple segments after home processing. Food Additives and Contaminants 20:  
18 16 1044-1063.  
19 17  
20 18 Stepán R, Tichá J, Hajslová J, Kovalczuk T and Kocourek V. 2005. Baby food production  
21 19 chain: Pesticide residues in fresh apples and products. Food Additives and Contaminants  
22 20 22:1231-1242.  
23 21  
24 22 The Pesticide Manual. C.D.S. Tomlin. The British Crop Protection Council. 2002. ISBN:  
25 23 1-901396-31-2  
26 24  
27 25 Will F., Krüger E. 2000. Fungicide residues in Strawberry Processing. Journal of  
28 26 Agricultural and Food Chemistry 47:858-861  
29 27  
30 28 Yirong-Su, Mitchell SH, AntSaoir SM. 2003. Carbendazim and metalaxyl residues in post-  
31 29 harvest treated apples. Food Additives and Contaminants 20:720-727.  
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



**Table I:** Overview of pesticide preparations used in field experiments and physico-chemical properties of their active ingredients

Mode of action	Commercial product	Active ingredient (content)	Content in preparation	MRL (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Safety period (days)	Physico-chemical properties of active ingredient		
						Molecular weight	log K <sub>ow</sub>	Water solubility (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )
insecticides	Alsystin	triflumuron	480 g/l	1	28	358.7	4.91 (20 °C)	0.025 (20°C)
	Aztec 140 EW	triazamate	140 g/l	0.1	7	314.4	2.15 (pH 7, 25 °C)	399 (pH 7, 25°C)
	Calypso 480 SC	thiacloprid	480 g/l	0.3	14	252.7	-	185 (20 °C)
	Nomolt 15 SC	teflubenzuron	150 g/l	0.5	28	381.1	4.30 (20°C)	0.019 (23°C)
	Oleoekol	chlorpyrifos	30 g/l	0.5	-	350.6	4.7	1.4 (25°C)
		coleseed oil	75%	-	-	-	-	-
	Trebon 10 F	etofenprox	100 g/l	1	28	376.5	7.05 (25°C)	<1 (25°C)
	Insegar 25	fenoxycarb	25%	0.05	60	301.3	4.07 (25°C)	7.9 (pH 7.55-7.84, 25°C)
	Reldan 40 EC	chlorpyrifos-methyl	400 g/l	0.5	28	322.5	4.24	2.6 (20°C)
Sanmite 20 WP	pyridaben	20%	0.1	42	364.9	6.37 (25°C)	0.012 (24°C)	
fungicides	Discus	kresoxim-methyl	50%	0.2	35	313.4	3.40 (pH 7, 25°C)	2 (20°C)
	Domark 10 EC	tetraconazole	100 g/l	0.5	14	372.1	3.56 (20°C)	156 (pH 7, 20°C)
	Euparen Multi	tolyfluanid	50%	1	7	347.3	3.90 (20°C)	0.9 (20°C)
	Foligreen	agricultural micronutrient (N, P, K, B, Fe, Mn, Zn, Mg, Co, Cu, Mo)						
	Hatrick	tebuconazole	10%	0.5	28	307.8	3.70 (20°C)	36 (pH 5-9, 20°C)
		tolyfluanid	40%	1	28			
	Champion 50W	Cu(OH) <sub>2</sub>	77%	10	-	97.6	-	2.9 mg/l (pH 7, 25°C)
	Chorus 75 WG	cyprodinil	750g/kg	1	28	225.3	4.0 (pH 9.0, 25°C)	20 (pH 5.0, 25°C)
	Merpan 80 WG	captan	80%	3	35	300.6	2.80 (25°C)	3.3 (25°C)
	Score 250 EC	difenoconazole	250 g/l	0.02	49	406.3	4.20 (25°C)	15 (25°C)
	Solubor	Na <sub>2</sub> B <sub>8</sub> O <sub>13</sub> ·4H <sub>2</sub> O	> 98 %	-	-	412.52		9.7% (20°C)
Thiram Granuflo (F)	thiram	80%		14	240.4	1.73	18 (room temperature)	
Topas 100 EC (F)	penconazole	100 g/l	0.2	35	284.2	3.72 (25°C)	73 (20°C)	
Zato 50 WG	trifloxystrobin	500 g/kg	0.5	14	408.4	4.50 (25°C)	610 (25 °C)	



**Table II:** Field experiments: time-schedule of pesticide preparations use and treatment rates

Application date 2004	Codes of experiments (Field Experiment FE 1 - 6)					
	FE 1	FE 2	FE 3	FE 4	FE 5	FE 6
April 7	Champion 50 WP (4.0 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )* Chorus 75 WG (0.2 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Domark 10 EC (0.25 l ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Oleoekol (10.0 l ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Zato 50 WG (0.15 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Thiram (3.0 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Domark 10 EC (0.25 l ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Solubor (1.5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Discus (0.2 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Calypso 480 SC (0.2 l ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Zato 50 WG (0.15 l ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Foligreen (1.0 l ha <sup>-1</sup> ) Merpan 80 WG (2.0 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ), Foligreen (1.0 l ha <sup>-1</sup> )					
April 19						
April 26						
May 5						
May 11						
May 20						
May 28						
June 9	Score 250 EC (0.2 l) Insegar 25 (0.6 l kg)	Score 250 EC (0.2 l) Nomolt (1.0 kg)	Merpan 80 WG (2.0 kg) Trebun 10 F (0.5 l)	Domark 10 EC (0.4 l) Alsystin (0.25 kg)	Thiram (3.0 kg) Calypso 480 (0.2 l)	Hatrick (1.125 kg) Reldan 40 (1.25 l)
June 21	Score 250 EC (0.2 l)	Domark 10 EC (0.4 l)	Score 250 (0.2 l)	Domark 10 EC (0.4 l)	Hatrick (1.125 kg)	Zato 50 WG (0.15 kg)
July 1	Zato 50 WG (0.15 kg) Reldan 40 EC (1.25 l)	Merpan 80 WG (2.0 kg) Insegar 25 WG (0.6 kg)	Domark 10 EC (0.4 l) Nomolt 15 SC (1.0 kg)	Merpan 80 (2.0 kg) Nomolt 15 (1.0 kg)	Topas 100 (0.45 l) Calypso (0.2 l)	Hatrick (1.125 kg) Reldan 40 (1.25 l)
July 20	Sanmite 20 WP (0.75 kg) Insegar 25 WP (0.3 kg)	Sanmite 20 WP (0.75 kg) Nomolt 15 SC (1.0 kg)	Reldan 40 EC (1.25 l)	Aztec 140 EW (0.5 l)	Reldan 40 (1.25 l)	Calypso 480 (0.2 l)

\* Per hectare dosage of applied pesticide preparation

**Table III:** Optimised MS/MS transitions parameters


Analyte	Transition (m/z)	Cone ( V )	Colision ( V )
diflubenzuron	311 > 158	25	10
	311 > 141	25	29
etofenprox	394 > 177	20	14
	394 > 135	20	26
pyrimethanil	200 > 107	54	24
	200 > 82	54	24
teflubenzuron	381 > 158	23	13
	381 > 141	23	13
thiacloprid	253 > 126	35	25
	253 > 186	35	13
triflumuron	359 > 156	29	16
	359 > 139	29	30

**Table IV:** Performance characteristics and monitored ions (m/z) of the analytical methods employed for apples analysis


Deleted: ¥

Analyte	Method	Quantitation ion (m/z)	Confirmation ions (m/z)	LOD (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Repeatability (RSD, %) at 0.100 mg kg <sup>-1</sup>	Recovery (%)
captan	GC-MS	149	79, 264	0.003	9	92
cyprodinil	GC-MS	224	210, 225	0.002	17	87
difenoconazole	GC-MS	323	207, 267, 281	0.002	4	95
etofenprox	LC-MS/MS	394 > 177	394 > 135	0.004	8	94
fenoxy carb	GC-MS	255	116, 186	0.003	10	97
chlorpyrifos	GC-MS	314	199, 258	0.003	8	94
chlorpyrifos-methyl	GC-MS	286	125, 288	0.003	7	93
kresoxim-methyl	GC-MS	206	116, 131	0.001	9	94
penconazole	GC-MS	248	159, 161	0.002	10	110
pyridaben	GC-MS	147	117, 309	0.003	5	72
pyrimethanil	LC-MS/MS	200 > 107	200 > 82	0.004	9	87
tebuconazole	GC-MS	250	125, 163, 252	0.002	8	89
teflubenzuron	LC-MS/MS	381 > 158	381 > 141.05	0.004	7	86
tetraconazole	GC-MS	336	159, 338	0.001	5	90
thiacloprid	LC-MS/MS	253 > 126	253 > 186	0.004	6	94
tolyfluanid	GC-MS	137	181, 238	0.003	5	100
triazamate	GC-MS	314	227, 242, 262	0.002	8	103
trifloxystrobin	GC-MS	131	116, 222	0.001	8	98
triflumuron	LC-MS/MS	359 > 156	359 > 139	0.004	6	89

Figure 1: Weather conditions in the pre-harvest period




**Figure 2:** The dynamics of captan decrease between samplings in FE 1, FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



\* Safety period (35 days) has not elapsed yet


**Figure 3:** The dynamics of pyridaben decrease between samplings in FE 1 and FE 2 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



\* Safety period (42 days) has not elapsed yet


Review Only

**Figure 4:** The dynamics of chlorpyrifos-methyl decrease between samplings in FE 1, FE 3 and FE 5 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



\* Safety period (28 days) has not elapsed yet


**Figure 5:** The dynamics of teflubenzuron decrease between samplings in FE 2, FE 3 and FE 4 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



\* Safety period (28 days) has not elapsed yet




**Figure 6:** The dynamics of thiacloprid decrease between samplings in FE 1, FE 2, FE 3, FE 4, FE 5 and FE 6 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).




Review Only


**Figure 7a:** The dynamics of tebuconazole decrease between samplings in FE 5 and FE 6 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



**Figure 7b:** The dynamics of tolylfluand decrease between samplings in FE 6 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).




**Figure 8:** The dynamics of tetraconazole decrease between samplings in FE 1, FE 2, FE 3, FE 4 and FE 5 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



Review Only

**Figure 9:** The dynamics of trifloxystrobin decrease between samplings in FE 1, FE 2, FE 3, FE 4, FE 5 and FE 6 (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).



Review Only

**Figure 10:** Differences in the contents of pesticide residues in FE 1, FE 2, FE 3, FE 4, FE5 and FE 6 at the day of harvest (error bars express the expanded uncertainty of respective results).

