



**HAL**  
open science

## Estimate of intake of sulfites in the Belgian adult population

Stefanie Marie Vandevijvere, Liesbeth Temme, Mirjana Andjelkovic, Marc de Wil, Christine Vinkx, Leo Goeyens, Joris van Loco

► **To cite this version:**

Stefanie Marie Vandevijvere, Liesbeth Temme, Mirjana Andjelkovic, Marc de Wil, Christine Vinkx, et al.. Estimate of intake of sulfites in the Belgian adult population. Food Additives and Contaminants, 2010, 27 (08), pp.1072-1083. 10.1080/19440041003754506 . hal-00604045

**HAL Id: hal-00604045**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00604045v1>**

Submitted on 28 Jun 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.



**Estimate of intake of sulphites in the Belgian adult population**

Journal:	<i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2009-432.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Mar-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Vandevijvere, Stefanie; Scientific Institute of Public Health, Epidemiology Temme, Liesbeth; RIKILT Andjelkovic, Mirjana; Scientific Institute of Public Health De Wil, Marc; Scientific Institute of Public Health Vinkx, Christine; Federal Public Service of Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment Goeyens, Leo; Scientific Institute of Public Health Van Loco, Joris; Scientific Institute of Public Health
Methods/Techniques:	Chromatographic analysis, Exposure assessment, Statistical analysis
Additives/Contaminants:	Sulfite
Food Types:	

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Estimate of intake of sulfites in the Belgian adult population

Vandevijvere, S.<sup>1</sup>, Temme, E.<sup>1</sup>, Andjelkovic, M.<sup>1</sup>, De Wil M.<sup>1</sup>, Vinkx, C.<sup>2</sup>, Goeyens, L.<sup>1</sup>, Van Loco, J.<sup>1</sup>

1 Scientific Institute of Public Health, Unit of Epidemiology, Brussels, Belgium

2 Federal Public Service of Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment, Brussels, Belgium

Author for correspondence and to who requests for reprints should be addressed:

Stefanie Vandevijvere, Scientific Institute of Public Health, Unit of Epidemiology, Brussels, J.

Wytzmanstraat 14, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium. Phone: +32 2 642 5029. Fax: +32 2 642 5410. Email:

[stefanie.vandevijvere@iph.fgov.be](mailto:stefanie.vandevijvere@iph.fgov.be)

**Running title:** intake of sulphite in the Belgian population

**Keywords:** food consumption survey, sulphite, Tier 2, Tier 3, adults, Belgium

1  
2  
3 36  
4  
5 37  
6 38 **Abstract**  
7  
8 39

9 40 An exposure assessment was performed to estimate the usual daily intake of sulfites in the  
10 41 Belgian adult population. Food consumption data were retrieved from the national food  
11 42 consumption survey. In a first step, individual food consumption data were multiplied with  
12 43 the maximum permitted use levels for sulfites, expressed as sulphur dioxide, per food group  
13 44 (Tier 2). In a second step, on the basis of a literature review of the occurrence of sulfites in  
14 45 different foods, the results of the Tier 2 exposure assessment and available occurrence data  
15 46 from the control programme of the competent authority, a refined list of foods was drafted for  
16 47 the quantification of sulphite. Quantification of sulphite was performed by a high  
17 48 performance ion chromatography method with eluent conductivity detector in beers and  
18 49 potato products. Individual food consumption data were then multiplied with the actual  
19 50 average concentrations of sulfite per food group, or the maximum permitted levels in case  
20 51 actual levels were not available (partial Tier 3). Usual intakes were calculated using the  
21 52 Nusser method. The mean intake of sulfites was 0.34 mg/kg bw/day (Tier 2), corresponding  
22 53 with 49 % of the acceptable daily intake (ADI) and 0.19 mg/kg bw/day, corresponding with  
23 54 27 % of the ADI (partial Tier 3). The food group contributing most to the intake of sulfites  
24 55 was the group of wines. The results showed that the intake of sulfites is likely to be below the  
25 56 ADI in Belgium. However, there are indications that high consumers of wine have an intake  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76

## 77 Introduction

78  
79 There are 3 ways of being exposed to SO<sub>2</sub>: by inhalation, by skin contact or by ingestion from  
80 the food chain (NPI, 2005). Sulfite (H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>) is formed by sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) gas which is  
81 very soluble in water. The presence of sulphur dioxide in the environment is due to  
82 combustion processes of organic compounds, such as natural combustion from forest fires or  
83 combustion in energy or transformation plants. Sulfite is also present in the exhaust fumes  
84 from cars and trucks. Depending on the pH of the environment, different forms of sulfite can  
85 exist or coexist.

86  
87 Sulfite has raised concerns because of its toxicity for the lungs and its ability to cause allergic  
88 reactions, especially in asthmatic persons (Valley et al., 2009). It was estimated that an  
89 exposure of 10 to 50 ppm during 5 to 15 min may have a measurable effect on humans. In the  
90 UK, 2 ppm (8 hours time weighted average TWA) or 5 ppm (10 min TWA) were set as  
91 maximum occupational exposure values (European Cooperation on School Education, 2004).  
92 In Belgium, the maximum allowed concentration of sulfite in the air is 350 µg/m<sup>3</sup> during  
93 maximum 1 hr or 125 µg/m<sup>3</sup> during maximum 24 hr (European Community 1999a). In a  
94 review of the Health Council of the Netherlands sulfite was found to be responsible of chronic  
95 urticaria, skin allergy and bronchial asthma in some humans. The NOAEL in rats was set at  
96 72 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day (Health Council of the Netherlands, 2005).

97  
98 The Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) is the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> in food that can be ingested orally  
99 over a lifetime without an appreciable health risk. The ADI is expressed per kg body weight  
100 (abbreviated "bw") per day. In the case of sulfites (expressed as SO<sub>2</sub>), the JECFA (Joint  
101 FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives) has set the group ADI value to 0.7 mg/kg  
102 bw/day (JECFA, 1999).

103  
104 Sulfite can be intentionally added to food for its antioxidant or antimicrobial properties.  
105 Sulfite inhibits the enzymatic activity of polyphenol oxidase, which is responsible for  
106 browning in fruits, vegetables and seafood products. It also prevents oxidation of food due to  
107 contact with the air and the browning effect occurring from the Maillard-type reactions. The  
108 aim of adding sulfite to wine is to prevent microbial growth and oxidation of volatile odorous  
109 compounds which may develop during the fermentation (Ough, 1986).

110

1  
2  
3 111 Sulfite is allowed as a preservative (E220-E228) in a list of different foods (excluding all  
4  
5 112 others) under the condition of respecting the maximum use levels, as specified by the  
6  
7 113 European Directive 95/2/EC as amended (European Community 1995) and for wine in annex  
8  
9 114 V of the Council regulation (EC) No. 1493/1999 (European Community 1999b).

10  
11 115 The concentration in different foods is expressed as sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) in mg/kg or mg/l,  
12  
13 116 depending on the nature of the food and relates to the total quantity from all sources. The  
14  
15 117 legislation mentions that an SO<sub>2</sub> content of not more than 10 mg/kg or 10 mg/l is not  
16  
17 118 considered to be present. Directive 2000/13/EC on labelling of pre-packaged food requires  
18  
19 119 labelling of products containing sulfite, if the SO<sub>2</sub> concentration is higher than 10 mg/kg or 10  
20  
21 120 mg/l, for the benefit of people with a food intolerance for sulfite (European Community  
22  
23 121 2000).

24 122

25  
26 123 Sulfite can be present in foods as free sulfite or react with a variety of organic compounds in  
27  
28 124 foods to form reversibly or irreversibly bound products. In our digestive tract, the free and  
29  
30 125 reversibly bound forms can be liberated (Wedizicha, 1992). García-Alonso et al., (2001)  
31  
32 126 reported that the amount of added sulfite in fresh sausage was reduced by 26 % when S—  
33  
34 127 sulphonate bounds (irreversibly bound) were formed and by 23 % when C—O—SO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> bounds  
35  
36 128 (reversibly bound) were formed. Those percentages of loss may vary sharply from 10 to 49 %  
37  
38 129 depending on the conditions when adding the sulfite to the meat (time of mixing, presence of  
39  
40 130 oxygen, degree of mincing and fat composition of the meat).

41 131

42  
43 132 Cooking was shown to reduce the level of sulfite in beef and chicken burgers (Pena-Egido et  
44  
45 133 al; 2005; Garcia-Alonso et al., 2001) the distribution of the 3 different forms of sulfite (free,  
46  
47 134 reversibly bound and S-sulphonate) remained approximately the same after as before the  
48  
49 135 cooking process. The losses reported for meat burgers were 31 % for the S-sulphonates, 29 %  
50  
51 136 for the free sulfite and 28% for the total sulfite. This study also showed that the frying process  
52  
53 137 reduced the amount of total sulfite on average by 41 % (± 13%). A study in shrimps  
54  
55 138 (Armentia-Alvarez et al., 1994) showed that during cooking the loss of free and reversibly  
56  
57 139 bound sulfite varied between 45 and 55 %. The level of total sulfite was about 5 times higher  
58  
59 140 in the non edible parts compared to the edible parts. The authors concluded that the boiling  
60  
141 step did not change the distribution of free and total sulfite in shrimps, but a reduction of  
142 about 40 % was observed for the total sulfite in the edible parts. From the boiled water it was

1  
2  
3 143 shown that the loss of SO<sub>2</sub> in shrimps during the boiling process was not totally recovered in  
4  
5 144 the water due to oxidation of sulfite and reaction of sulfite with food components.  
6  
7 145

8  
9 146 Another study on shrimps (Armentia-Alvarez et al., 1997) showed that during bad freezing  
10 147 storage (> -18°C), the free sulfite combined with the disulfide bounds of proteins denatured  
11 148 by the freezing process. The longer the storage time, the higher the amount of combined  
12 149 sulfite produced. Reduction of sulfite concentration after a storage period of 1 month was  
13  
14 150 reported to be between 25 and 50 % for fish products, potatoes and dried fruits (Leclercq et  
15  
16 151 al., 2000)

17  
18  
19 152 Finne et al., (1986) studied the residual sulfite content in shrimps after different days of  
20 153 conservation in ice. They demonstrated that, starting with a concentration of about 80 ppm,  
21 154 the residual content was reduced to less than 10 ppm after 6 days of storage on ice.  
22  
23 155

24  
25  
26 156 Directive 95/2/EC (European Community, 1995) requires that Member States of the EU  
27 157 monitor the intake and use of food additives in order to allow evaluation of intake trends.  
28 158 Measures can be taken to amend the legislation if intake concerns are identified in one or  
29 159 more Member States. The Report from the European Commission on Dietary Food Additive  
30 160 Intake in the European Union (European Commission, 2001) describes a harmonized, tiered  
31 161 method to estimate additive intakes. In the first step (Tier 1), theoretical food-consumption  
32 162 data (Hansen, 1979) are combined with the maximum permitted usage levels for the additive.  
33 163 This conservative estimate was performed at European level. For the additives exceeding the  
34 164 ADI in Tier 1, in a further step (Tier 2), national food consumption data are combined with  
35 165 maximum permitted usage levels. Such intake estimate will still overestimate the real intake,  
36 166 but can exclude additives, which do not pose a major risk from the most difficult estimate in  
37 167 Tier 3: a combination of actual national food consumption data with actual levels of the  
38 168 additive. The report from the Scientific Committee on Food (SCF) about Dietary Food  
39 169 Additive Intake in the European Union (1998) showed that, based on Tier 1, there were 10  
40 170 additives in the European Union for which a more refined intake estimate was needed.  
41 171 Among those additives also sulfite was mentioned (Scientific Committee on Food). A Tier 2  
42 172 exposure assessment in 7 countries (Belgium not included) showed that the range of estimated  
43 173 intakes was 20-266% of the ADI for adults (European Commission).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58  
59 174 The objective of this study was to perform a refined exposure assessment for sulfite intake in  
60 175 the Belgian adult population, using the data from the national food consumption survey of

1  
2  
3 176 2004. Another objective was to identify the food groups contributing most to the total intake  
4  
5 177 of sulfites in Belgium.  
6  
7

8 178  
9 **Materials and Methods**  
10 179

11 180  
12 **Study design**

13 182 A semi-probabilistic approach was used to perform the exposure assessment. For the Tier 2  
14  
15 183 exposure assessment, maximum levels of sulphur dioxide in different foods were linked to the  
16  
17 184 food consumption data of these specific foods, derived from the Belgian food consumption  
18  
19 185 survey (2004). For some foods in the EU legislation, it is unlikely that they are consumed in  
20  
21 186 significant quantities or they were too difficult to link with the data from the food  
22  
23 187 consumption survey: burger meat with a vegetable or cereal content of minimum 4 %;  
24  
25 188 breakfast sausages; *Longaniza fresca* and *Butifarra fresca*; dried salted *Gadidae* fish; *sago*;  
26  
27 189 pearl barley; dried ginger; pulp of horseradish; pulp of onions, shallots and garlic; yellow  
28  
29 190 paprika in brine; flavourings on the basis of lemon fruit juice; concentrated grape juice for the  
30  
31 191 making of house wine; *mostrarda di frutti*; gelatinized fruit extracts or fluid pectin; glass  
32  
33 192 preserves of cut lemon; white syrup and molasses; orange-, grapefruit-, apple- and pineapple  
34  
35 193 juice for unpackaged sell in catering enterprises; concentrates on the basis of fruit juice with  
36  
37 194 at least 2.5 % pearl barley; *capilhé groselha*; unfermented grape juice for religious use; wine  
38  
39 195 without alcohol; fermented vinegar; marinated nuts; vacuum packaged sugar maize and  
40  
41 196 distilled alcoholic beverages with whole pears. Consequently these products were not taken  
42  
43 197 into account in the intake assessment. This could lead to an underestimation of the intake, but  
44  
45 198 this was supposed to be limited. As stated in the introduction, cooking and freezing can  
46  
47 199 decrease the sulfite concentration of foods. This was not taken into account either due to the  
48  
49 200 lack of reliable processing factors. Consequently this could lead to an overestimation of the  
50  
51 201 intake.  
52

53 202  
54 203 In order to perform a more refined estimate of the sulfite intake (partial Tier 3 exposure  
55  
56 204 assessment), on the basis of literature, available concentration values for products analyzed by  
57  
58 205 The Belgian Federal Agency for Safety of the Food Chain (FASFC) and the results from the  
59  
60 206 Tier 2 exposure assessment, it was decided to analyze concentrations of sulphur dioxide in  
207  
208 207 beers and potato products. In these samples concentrations were determined using a high  
209  
209 208 performance ion chromatography method with eluent conductivity detector, optimized and  
209  
209 209 validated for this purpose. In the partial Tier 3 exposure assessment, analyzed actual levels of



1  
2  
3 210 sulphur dioxide in different foods were linked to the food consumption data of these specific  
4  
5 211 foods, derived from the Belgian food consumption survey (2004). For foods for which no  
6  
7 212 analyzed levels were available, maximum concentrations were used, as in the Tier 2 exposure  
8  
9 213 assessment. No illegal uses of sulfites in food groups in which no use of sulfites is authorised,  
10  
11 214 were taken into account in this study.

12 215  
13  
14 216 Although the regulation specifies maximum levels for specific groups, in this paper, the  
15  
16 217 results of the analyses were grouped to ensure a clear data presentation. The grouping was  
17  
18 218 performed according to the EU directive 95/2/EC (European Community, 1995) as follows:  
19  
20 219 beers; wines; sugars and glucose-based products; condiments and dessert sauces; gelatine and  
21  
22 220 meat substitutes; shellfish; cereal-based products (starches and biscuits); processed potatoes,  
23  
24 221 processed fruits (including dried fruits, candied fruits, jams, jellies and marmalades, lemon  
25  
26 222 and lime juice, fruit fillings and fruits in vinegar, brine, oil) and processed vegetables  
27  
28 223 (including dried tomatoes, mushrooms, vegetables in vinegar, brine and oil and white  
29  
30 224 vegetables).

31 225  
32 226 **Food consumption data**  
33 227  
34  
35 228 Consumption data from the national food consumption survey 2004 were used to perform the  
36  
37 229 exposure assessment. Aims, design and methods of this survey are described elsewhere (De  
38  
39 230 Vriese et al. 2005). The target population comprised all Belgian inhabitants of 15 years or  
40  
41 231 older. The sample included 3245 participants randomly selected from the National Register,  
42  
43 232 using a multi-stage stratified procedure.

44 233  
45  
46 234 Information on dietary intake was collected by two non-consecutive 24-hour recalls in  
47  
48 235 combination with a food frequency questionnaire. During the 24-hour recall interviews the  
49  
50 236 respondent reported the quantity of all foods and beverages consumed during the preceding  
51  
52 237 day. The 24-hour recall was carried out using EPIC-SOFT software (Slimani & Valsta, 2002).  
53  
54 238 This program allows obtaining very detailed information about the foods consumed and the  
55  
56 239 recipes used in a standardized way.

57 240  
58 241 3083 participants, of which 1537 women and 1546 men, completed two 24-hour recalls.  
59  
60 242 Participants were categorized into four age groups: 15-18 years (n=760), 19-59 years (n=830),  
243 60-74 years (n=789) and 75 years or older (n=704).

244

**245 Sulphur dioxide concentration of selected foods**

246 The selection of the matrix types to be analyzed was based on the results of the Tier 2  
247 calculation, literature and on the available sulfite concentrations obtained from the FASFC in  
248 different kinds of foods (Table 1). Both beers and pre-cut fresh potatoes or French fries and  
249 frozen prepared potato (precooked or not) products were sampled.

250

251 The Belgian law (Belgian Monitor) specifies 4 categories of beer (S and I to III) depending on  
252 the Plato degree. Beers are characterized according to the fermentation type, the bitterness,  
253 the colour, the wort density and the alcohol concentration. Those characteristics were  
254 important in the present study, for example in case of ale beers undergoing a second  
255 fermentation in the bottle where sulfite can be released by the fermentation process. The  
256 presence of fruits can also be a source of sulfite. Therefore, in this study, beers were  
257 categorized as follows: beer table blond, beer table brown, beer table triple blond, beer table  
258 non specified colour, beer pilsner, beer pilsner light, beer without alcohol, beer special blond,  
259 beer special amber, beer special brown, beer special with fruits, beer special unknown colour,  
260 beer gueuze, beer gueuze with fruits, beer white, beer white with fruits and beer unknown  
261 type and colour.

262

263 From the Belgian food consumption survey 2004 the frequencies and amounts of beer  
264 consumption for all beers were retrieved. Each brand was assigned to a group of beer, as  
265 defined earlier; and some simple calculations were made to determine the percentage of  
266 consumption for each beer category and each brand within each category. The number of  
267 samples was taken proportional to the brand distribution in the respective categories.

268 Samples were only taken for the brands with a percentage of consumption higher than 0.5 %,  
269 except for 1 brand of gueuze with fruits and 2 other brands of gueuze because they are  
270 representative in their specific categories and they were observed in different stores.

271

272 Collection of samples was performed in 2007 in 5 major supermarket chains with a good  
273 market share, which are visited by approximately 77.5 % of the Belgian population in search  
274 for their food provisioning (CRIOC - OIVO). In total for both categories 67 samples (21 for  
275 potato products and 46 for beers) were collected and analysed.

276

1  
2  
3 277 The only existing ISO method including sulfite analysis is the method ISO 10304-3:1997. The  
4  
5 278 HPIC/conductivity detector with eluent conductivity suppressor was used in this study to  
6  
7 279 perform the analyses. Ion chromatography is an appropriate technique for the separation of  
8  
9 280 sulfite from other anions like phosphate and sulphate, and it has also been recognised for the  
10  
11 281 quantification of sulfite (Armentia-Alvarez A. et al., 1997; Kim 1989; Kim et al. 1987; Kim et al.  
12  
13 282 2000; Paino-Campa et al. 1991; Pena-Egido et al., 2005; Pizzoferrato et al. 1990) Pulsed  
14  
15 283 amperometric detection necessitates very specific material and is not so easy to use because of  
16  
17 284 possible fouling of the electrode by matrix compounds (McFeeters and Barish, 2003). The  
18  
19 285 most used detection method in ion chromatography is eluent suppressed conductivity. With  
20  
21 286 the carbonate/bicarbonate eluent, the produced species in the suppressor is  $\text{H}_2\text{CO}_3$  (which  
22  
23 287 decomposes in  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ).  
24

288

### 289 ***Material***

290 For sample preparation, a Robocoup mixer 3000, a T25 Ultra-Turrax (IKA) and a centrifuge  
291 Beckman Avanti J-25 operated at 7500rpm were used. All extracts were filtered through  
292 0.2 $\mu\text{m}$  PVDF syringe filters. The analytical system was composed of a Waters 717+ auto  
293 injector, an HP 1050 pump, an Alltech Suppressor model 640 and an Alltech conductivity  
294 detector model 650. The acquisition of the signal and data treatment (calibration curve and  
295 extract concentration) were made by a computer equipped with an analogue/digital converter  
296 and ChromQuest software version 4.1. The separation column was composed of a Dionex  
297 RFIC analytical column type IonPac AS14A-5 $\mu\text{m}$  3x150mm (particle size of 5 $\mu\text{m}$ ) and  
298 precolumn RFIC IonPac AG14A-5 $\mu\text{m}$  3x30mm.

### 299 ***Reagents and solutions***

300

301 All reagents were at least from analytical grade. Sodium carbonate and sodium bicarbonate  
302 were purchased from VWR International. D-Mannitol, disodium salt of ethylenediamine  
303 tetra acetic acid (EDTA) and formaldehyde were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and  
304 anhydrous sulfite was purchased from Fluka.

305 The aqueous solutions were prepared with a MilliQ Reagent Grade System's water with  
306 conductivity lower than  $18.2 \text{ M}\Omega\text{cm}^{-1}$  (from Millipore coupled after a Millipore Elix 100  
307 deionised water production system). Stock solutions  $\text{NaHCO}_3$  0.3 M,  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  0.2M and D-  
308 Mannitol 0.5 M were prepared. Those solutions were kept in the fridge. The eluent used for  
309 the anion separation was the buffer  $\text{NaHCO}_3/\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  3mM/2mM. The sulfite extraction

1  
2  
3 310 buffer was a mixture of NaHCO<sub>3</sub>/Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>/D-Mannitol 9mM/16mM/10mM. This resulted in a  
4  
5 311 final extraction pH between 8 and 10, as proposed in literature for free sulfite and reversible  
6  
7 312 bound sulfite extraction (Armentia-Alvarez A. et al. 1993; Wedzicha, 1992). The 1000 mg/l  
8  
9 313 sulphur dioxide standard stock solution was prepared by weighting 0.1968g anhydrous sulfite  
10  
11 314 and making a 100.0 ml solution with extraction buffer.  
12

13 315

### 15 316 *Sample collection, storage and pre-treatment*

17 317 After collection of the samples, they were identified by a unique identification number and  
18  
19 318 registered in a Microsoft Excel sheet. Following characteristics were added: brand name,  
20  
21 319 product description, lot number, temperature of conservation in the store and any relevant  
22  
23 320 information for the project (presence or absence of sulfite mentioned on the label or usage of  
24  
25 321 ingredients containing sulfite). The liquid samples where stored in a fridge and the solid  
26  
27 322 samples where stored in the freezer (-18°C or less) until pre-treatment or analysis.  
28

29 323

30  
31 324 The pre-treatment of the solid samples consisted of grinding at least 200 g collected sample  
32  
33 325 with a kitchen robot (Robot Coupe model R 301 Ultra) in order to get piece cuts less than 3~5  
34  
35 326 mm. Afterwards the prepared samples were stored deep frozen. All analyses where conducted  
36  
37 327 within 3 weeks after collection of the samples.  
38

### 39 328 *Sample preparation*

40  
41 329 For the preparation of the liquid samples 100 µl of D-Mannitol 0.5 M was added to about 100  
42  
43 330 ml of the sample before degassing in an ultrasound bath for 5 minutes; 5.0 ml of sample was  
44  
45 331 then diluted in the extraction buffer by a factor of 5 (final volume = 25.0 ml) and the extract  
46  
47 332 was filtered through a PVDF syringe filter with 0.2 µm pore size before injection on the HPIC  
48  
49 333 system. For the preparation of the solid samples, after a short period of unfreezing, about 5 g  
50  
51 334 of sample (weighted with at least 3 digits after the point) was weighted in a P.E. tube of 50 ml  
52  
53 335 to be centrifuged; 25.0 ml of extraction buffer (measured with a graduate cylinder of 25 ml)  
54  
55 336 was added to the sample; the sample was then homogenated in an Ultra-Turrax for a  
56  
57 337 minimum of time, so that the mixture looked like creamy (10 to 15 seconds suffice).  
58

58 338 The tube was closed and set in a centrifuge at 7500 rpm for 10 minutes; the surnatant extract  
59  
60 339 was filtered through a PVDF syringe filter with 0.2 µm pore size before injection on the HPIC  
340  
340 system.

1  
2  
3 341  
4  
5 342 ***Calibration curve - linearity***  
6  
7 343 Due to the range of maximum permitted levels in the different kinds of foods it was chosen to  
8  
9 344 use a calibration curve ranging from 0.1 to 200 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l.

10  
11 345 By diluting 1000 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l extraction buffer a series of eight dilutions was prepared (0.1, 0.5,  
12  
13 346 1. 5, 10, 50, 100, and 200 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l). Blank was used as 0 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l. The best fit was used in  
14  
15 347 order to maximize the coefficient of determination (> 98 %) and to minimise the residues at  
16  
17 348 each level.

18  
19 349 ***Validation***

20  
21 350 The method was validated for linearity, precision (repeatability, reproducibility), accuracy and  
22  
23 351 limit of detection according to the procedure described by Van Loco et al (Van Loco and  
24  
25 352 Beernaert 91-94). After multiple tests for concentration ratios of the NaHCO<sub>3</sub>/Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> buffer  
26  
27 353 it was decided to use the composition 3 mM/2 mM. This composition permits the separation  
28  
29 354 of phosphate, sulfite, and sulphate with a total runtime period of 25 minutes (stabilization  
30  
31 355 included). Different stabilization compounds (EDTA, D-Mannitol and formaldehyde) were  
32  
33 356 tested according to previous reports. D-Mannitol was chosen due to its best effect on the  
34  
35 357 sample extract. Some stability tests were made with a standard solution 10 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l. The  
36  
37 358 responses of a standard solution prepared in water and the same amount of standard solution  
38  
39 359 prepared in a pH~ 9.3 buffer with 10 mM D-mannitol were compared.

40  
41 360  
42 361 The final sulfite extraction buffer chosen after pH test in mixture with the sample matrix was  
43  
44 362 NaHCO<sub>3</sub>/Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>/D-Mannitol at concentration levels of 9 mM/16 mM/10 mM respectively.  
45  
46 363 The pH of this buffer was between 9 and 10. The extracts prepared with beer resulted in a pH  
47  
48 364 of 9.3 and of 8.7 when prepared with frozen French fries. NaOH/formol was tested for the  
49  
50 365 extraction of sulfite from beer. But the chromatographic separation gave very high  
51  
52 366 background noise after a few injections. The material was not able to work with an organic  
53  
54 367 modifier like acetone in high proportion like described in Metrohm application note S-95.

55  
56 368  
57 369 To test linearity it was opted for the weighted quadratic regression of the heights in function  
58  
59 370 of the extract concentration. This type of regression resulted in a determination coefficient  
60  
371 greater than 0.99 and residues lower than 15 % for the lowest concentration point.

372

1  
2  
3 373 The range for the calibration was 0.1 to 100 mg/l extract (The injection of the point 200 mg/l  
4  
5 374 was kept in order to be able to quantify higher amounts from a new regression). The range in  
6  
7 375 the extract corresponded to a range in the sample going from 0.5 to 500 mg/kg (or mg/l,  
8  
9 376 depending of the nature of sample) if the dilution factor was taken into account.

10  
11 377  
12 378 In order to test the repeatability and reproducibility a sample (table beer) was fortified at 4  
13  
14 379 levels of concentration corresponding to 0, 5, 10 and 15 mg/l of the sample (which  
15  
16 380 corresponds to 0, 1, 2 and 3mg/l in the extract). The test was conducted in triplicate for each  
17  
18 381 level and repeated for each level at 3 different days. The non fortified sample did not result in  
19  
20 382 a detectable response and the obtained result of reproducibility was lower than 12.6 %.

21 383  
22  
23 384 The apparent recovery was, on average, for the 3 levels of concentration,  $73 \pm 6$  at 3  
24  
25 385 concentration levels. A lower recovery may be explained by a possible reaction of SO<sub>2</sub> to  
26  
27 386 some compounds present in the matrix and/or by oxidation after the dissolution of ambient  
28  
29 387 oxygen into the extracts. Therefore, it was decided to correct the results for the recovery of  
30  
31 388 the control standard included in the series of analysis.

32 389  
33 390 In beer sample, the sulfite peak was poorly separated from matrix interferences. The  
34  
35 391 minimum detectable concentration in the extract was about 0.5 mg/l. This corresponds to a  
36  
37 392 quantification limit (LOQ) of 1 mg/l extract which corresponds to 5 mg/l (or mg/kg) in the  
38  
39 393 sample. This is also the lowest tested concentration.

40 394

#### 41 395 **Exposure assessment**

42 396 Only respondents with two completed 24-hour recall interviews were included in the analyses  
43  
44 397 (n= 3083; 1546 men and 1537 women).

45 398

46 399 The individual intake of sulphur dioxide from a certain food product was estimated using the  
47  
48 400 following equation:

49  
50  
51  
52  
53 401 
$$y_i (mg / kgbw / day ) = \frac{c \times x_i}{bw_i}$$

54  
55  
56 402 where  $y_i$  is the intake of sulphur dioxide by individual  $i$  from a particular food (in mg per kg  
57  
58 403 bodyweight per interview day),  $c$  is the concentration of sulphur dioxide in that food (mg per  
59  
60 404 kg),  $x_i$  is the consumption of a certain food by individual  $i$  (kg) and  $bw_i$  is the self-reported  
405 body weight of individual  $i$  (kg). To estimate the total intake of sulphur dioxide per food



1  
2  
3 406 group or per day, individual daily intakes of sulphur dioxide from different foods were added  
4  
5 407 up.

6  
7 408 As mentioned before, two approaches were used for the calculation of sulphur dioxide intake.  
8  
9 409 In the Tier 2 approach,  $c_i$  represents the maximum allowed concentration in each food. The  
10  
11 410 maximum permitted levels of sulphur dioxide used in different foods are listed in the  
12  
13 411 European Directive 95/2/EC (European Community, 1995). In the Tier 3 approach,  $c_i$   
14  
15 412 represents the actual average concentration of sulphur dioxide that is observed in a particular  
16  
17 413 food.

18 414  
19 415 The usual intake distribution for sulphur dioxide was estimated with the Nusser method  
20  
21 416 (Nusser et al. 1996) using the C-side software (Iowa State University, 1996). Several  
22  
23 417 statistical methods are available to estimate usual intake distributions with the correct mean,  
24  
25 418 variance and skewness. These statistical procedures adjust for within-person or day-to-day  
26  
27 419 variability. Of all different statistical procedures, the Nusser method (Nusser et al., 1996) is  
28  
29 420 highly recommended because it eliminates the intra-individual variance and additionally  
30  
31 421 transforms the data to obtain approximately normally distributed data. The method is suitable  
32  
33 422 to estimate usual intake distributions in a population both for normally and non-normally  
34  
35 423 distributed foods and nutrients. The usual intake distribution was weighted and adjusted for  
36  
37 424 the age and sex distribution of the Belgian population and adjusted for day of the week and  
38  
39 425 season.

40 426

## 41 427 **Results and discussion**

42 428  
43 429 As an adult inhales about 15 m<sup>3</sup> of air per day, this means that in the worst case the amount of  
44  
45 430 SO<sub>2</sub> intake from the environment is 215 µg/m<sup>3</sup> x 15 m<sup>3</sup>= 3225 µg/ day = 3.2 mg/day. 215  
46  
47 431 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is the highest concentration of SO<sub>2</sub> measured in Belgium in 2005. Since the average  
48  
49 432 body weight of a Belgian adult is around 70 kg, the final SO<sub>2</sub> intake from the environment is  
50  
51 433 estimated to be 0.045 mg/kg bw/day. From those results it was decided to neglect the  
52  
53 434 environmental contribution to SO<sub>2</sub> intake in Belgium.

54 435

55  
56 436 The usual sulfite intake of the Belgian adult population estimated by the Tier 2 approach was  
57  
58 437 0.34 mg/kg bw/day (49 % of the ADI) at the mean level of consumption (Table 2). At the  
59  
60 438 97.5<sup>th</sup> percentile of the population, the sulfite intake was estimated to be 1.1 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg  
439 bw/day (157 % of the ADI). It was observed that the ADI was exceeded beyond the 90<sup>th</sup>

1  
2  
3 440 percentile of the population. At this percentile the contribution of wine consumption to the  
4  
5 441 total intake was estimated to be 71 %. Including only wine consumers (55.1%), the ADI was  
6  
7 442 reached at the 57.5<sup>th</sup> percentile of population (data not shown).  
8  
9 443

10 444 Wine contributed for more than 50 % to the total intake of sulfite. Sugar and glucose-based  
11 445 products, beers, processed fruits and processed potatoes contributed each between 7-13 % to  
12 446 the total intake, while shellfish and processed vegetables contributed each about 4 % to the  
13 447 total intake. Condiments and cereal products contributed to less than 1 % to the total average  
14 448 sulfite intake (Table 2).  
15  
16 449

17 450 Concentrations of sulfite in beer samples (n=46) were all under the detection limit (LOD) of 5  
18 451 mg/l; these results were different from the concentrations found in other countries. For  
19 452 example, in France (Mareschi et al. 1992) and Italy (Leclercq et al., 2000) the average sulfite  
20 453 concentrations found in beer were respectively 7.5 and 15 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l. In these studies the  
21 454 Monier-Williams method was used to perform the analyses. It is known that this method has  
22 455 possible interferences with volatile compounds. The method used in the present study does  
23 456 not have this disadvantage. With the limit of quantification of 5 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l it was not possible  
24 457 to determine any residual SO<sub>2</sub> levels in the beers analyzed. Provided this and the results  
25 458 reported by other countries obtained by more sensitive electrochemical methods of analysis  
26 459 (Dvorak et al. 2006) it was decided not to perform an intake estimation of sulfite from beer  
27 460 using a null concentration of sulfite in beers. It is known that sulfite could be produced during  
28 461 the natural fermentation process in the bottle. Therefore half of the LOQ concentration was  
29 462 used (medium bound approach) instead of the null concentration to perform the intake  
30 463 estimation.  
31  
32 464

33 465 For potato products 6 samples out of 21 analyzed samples resulted in SO<sub>2</sub> levels above the  
34 466 quantification limit (LOQ) of 5 mg/l and only one sample with no sulfite declared on the label  
35 467 resulted in a concentration higher than the LOQ. This positive sample was a fresh pre-cut  
36 468 product in which the concentration was 9.9 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg. For the samples with a concentration  
37 469 above LOQ, an average concentration value of 11.6 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg was found and the results  
38 470 were spread between 9.0 and 13.5 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg. In total there were 83 samples checked for  
39 471 sulfite on the label, while only 21 samples were analyzed. If all samples checked on the label  
40 472 for sulfite would be considered (n=83) instead of only the analyzed ones, and if it is assumed  
41 473 there are no frauds on sulfite usage, only 6 of 83 products were found to have a sulfite



1  
2  
3 474 concentration above LOQ. For the evaluation of the sulfite intake from potato products it was  
4  
5 475 decided to use the average concentration of the samples having a concentration above LOQ.  
6  
7 476 This might result in an overestimation of the intake since only 7 % of selected and analyzed  
8  
9 477 potato products had a SO<sub>2</sub> concentration above the LOQ. However, some consumers might be  
10  
11 478 loyal to these particular kinds of brands. In addition this actual level used (11.6 mg/kg) is still  
12  
13 479 far below the maximum permitted levels (50-100 mg/kg SO<sub>2</sub>).  
14

15  
16 481 From the Belgian Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain (FASFC), sulfite analysis  
17  
18 482 results for different kinds of foods sampled between 2003 and 2006 were obtained (Table 1).  
19  
20 483 These results show that average actual levels found are often much lower than maximum  
21  
22 484 levels.

23 485 After considering the data from different years, it was decided to take the average results from  
24  
25 486 the last year only or from different previous years. For each food group, the average  
26  
27 487 concentration of the samples having a concentration above LOQ (5 mg/l) was used, in order  
28  
29 488 to account for consumers being loyal to certain brands of products. There was a drastic  
30  
31 489 decrease (about factor 10) in SO<sub>2</sub> concentration in dried tomatoes from 2004 to 2005 due to  
32  
33 490 the fact that in 2004 there were found levels above the maximum while no levels above the  
34  
35 491 maximum were found in 2005; therefore only the 2 last year's results were taken into account  
36  
37 492 (2005 and 2006). The available number of data for each kind of dried fruits, except dried  
38  
39 493 apricots, is low; therefore it was decided to use the average concentration of sulfite in dried  
40  
41 494 fruits (excluding dried apricots) (data from 2006) for dried fruits other than apricots. The  
42  
43 495 concentration assigned to dried apricots was the average of the 2005 and 2006 measurements  
44  
45 496 in dried apricots. For wines, the average concentration found by the FASFC in white and red  
46  
47 497 wines for the years 2004 and 2006 was assigned.  
48

49 499 Measurements made in France (Mareschi et al., 1992) during the period 1989-1992, showed  
50  
51 500 that the highest average SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were found in salted fish fillets and dried fruits  
52  
53 501 (more than 625 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg), followed by mustard (225 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg) and peeled potatoes (100  
54  
55 502 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg). Wines resulted in an average concentration of 75 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/l (no differences were  
56  
57 503 made between red and white wines). Other measurements made during the same period in the  
58  
59 504 United States (Daniels et al. 1992) showed higher concentrations in dried fruits, mashed  
60  
505 potatoes and wines. More recent (2000-2005) studies made in Italy (Leclercq et al., 2000) and

1  
2  
3 506 Australia (Food Standards Australia New Zealand, 2005), showed that the sulfite level content  
4  
5 507 in food tends to diminish in some kinds of foods like cider, beer, dried fruits and wines.  
6  
7 508

8  
9 509 The results of the partial Tier 3 based on the analyzed products and on the maximum levels  
10  
11 510 for the other food groups, are given in Table 3. The mean intake of sulfites in the Belgian  
12  
13 511 adult population was estimated to be 0.19 mg/kg bw/day, corresponding to 27 % of the ADI.  
14  
15 512 At the 97.5<sup>th</sup> percentile of the population the usual intake was 0.61 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day (87 %  
16  
17 513 of the ADI). It was found that for the average consumer wine contributed up to 14 % of the  
18  
19 514 ADI). The sugar group still had a relative significant contribution to the intake, but actual  
20  
21 515 concentrations were not available. It is known, however, that food producers try to avoid the  
22  
23 516 need for allergen labelling of sulfite, by reducing the levels below 10 mg/kg.  
24

25 517  
26 518 Some groups of the population could be more exposed than others to sulfite intake, in  
27  
28 519 particular wine consumers. The probability of approaching the ADI by wine consumers will  
29  
30 520 depend on the particular choice of wine (sulfite concentration) and the consumption level.  
31  
32 521 This is hard to estimate. An exceeding of the ADI can not be excluded for a limited  
33  
34 522 percentage of the population of wine consumers, who might consume wine with a higher  
35  
36 523 average concentration than the average concentration used here in the tier 3 calculations, as  
37  
38 524 can be shown from the tier 2 estimates (where the consumption of wine alone can reach the  
39  
40 525 ADI).  
41

42 526  
43 527 The fact that some food groups were not taken into account, could have led to a certain  
44  
45 528 underestimation of the intake. However, the reduction that takes place during further  
46  
47 529 preparation of foods was not taken in to account but is a factor of overestimation of the intake  
48  
49 530 of sulfites. Further, the fact that no illegal uses of sulfites in certain food groups were taken  
50  
51 531 into account, could also have led to an underestimation. In 2005 1002 tests with malachite  
52  
53 532 green were performed in chopped meat by the FASCA of which 54 were positive. 43 of these  
54  
55 533 were confirmed in the laboratory. The average sulfite content in the samples exceeding the  
56  
57 534 LOQ was on average 474.1 +/-487.1 mg/kg and 1782.6 mg/kg at the 97.5 percentile.  
58  
59 535

60 536 In 1999, JECFA reviewed the intake estimation of sulfite from different countries (JECFA,  
537  
538 1999): Aus-NZ, China, Finland, France, India, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom and United  
539  
and 1400 % of ADI. It should be noted that data modelling differed between countries. The

1  
2  
3 540 different used models are the budget method, the poundage data method, the FBS/HES/sales  
4 data method, model diets method and individual dietary records method. A summary of the  
5 541  
6 data method, model diets method and individual dietary records method. A summary of the  
7 542 mean intake results *per capita* for those countries is given in Table 4. All of these results are  
8 based on a Tier 2 like approach. Comparatively to those results, in the present study lower  
9 543  
10 544 intakes were found, except when compared to Finland, India and USA.

11 545  
12  
13 546 A more recent study in France (1998) performed a Tier 2 intake estimation (Verger et al. 1998).  
14 547 The average sulfite intake was estimated to be 1.34 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day (191 % of the ADI)  
15 548 and the intake at the 95th percentile of the population to be 3.13 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day (447 % of  
16 549 the ADI). All of these estimates exceeded the ADI of 0.7 mg/kg bw/day and were comparable  
17 550 to the earlier calculated data. The estimation of the intake of sulfite in France (Verger et al.  
18 551 1998) on basis of actual concentrations for the global population was 20 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/day *per*  
19 552 *capita* in 1992 (48 % of the ADI). The authors concluded that the major contributors to the  
20 553 intake of sulfite were alcoholic beverages (wine, cider and beer). They performed an intake  
21 554 calculation for alcoholic beverage consumers only and for non alcoholic beverage consumers.  
22 555 They found an intake of sulfite respectively of 31.5 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/day (75.0 % of the ADI) and 1.96  
23 556 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/day (4.67 % of the ADI).

24 557  
25  
26 558 In Italy during 2000, exposure to sulfite was estimated for adults and children (Leclercq et al.,  
27 559 2000). A first Tier 2 calculation resulted in an exposure of 0.82 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day or 117 %  
28 560 of the ADI, of which 32 mg was due to wine consumption (65 % of total intake), 8 mg from  
29 561 dried fruits (16 %) and 2 mg from fish (4 %).

30 562  
31  
32 563 Since the ADI is exceeded by the Tier 2 in Italy, calculation with actual data was performed  
33 564 by the same authors. Leclercq *et al.* (2000) made 2 different modelled diets rich in sulfited  
34 565 foods in order to calculate estimation of the intake on bases of actual concentrations in food.  
35 566 The models differed for children and adults, where it was assumed that the body weight is 30  
36 567 kg for a child and 60 kg for an adult. The ADI was not exceeded using the example diets  
37 568 proposed for calculation, although nearly (more then 95 % of the ADI) for adults in the worst  
38 569 case scenario. Real food consumption data would have increased the amount of information  
39 570 and improved the intake estimates.

40 571  
41  
42 572 A study conducted in Slovakia (Sinko & Janekova, 2006) demonstrated that the intake of  
43 573 sulfite in a group of children aged between 7 and 10 years old (lowest body weight 21 kg;

1  
2  
3 574 average weight 26 kg) was between 27 and 93 % of the ADI for a child of 21 kg. The study  
4  
5 575 was based on the actual food consumption during 4 months and maximum allowed sulfite  
6  
7 576 content in food.

8  
9 577  
10 578 A recent survey in Australia (Food Standards Australia New Zealand, 2005) showed an  
11  
12 579 average intake of sulfite in the population of 0.2 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day (lower bound estimation;  
13  
14 580 concentrations not detected set to zero). With the upper bound estimate, the intake obtained  
15  
16 581 was the same (30 % of the ADI). The same calculation for the 95th percentile of the  
17  
18 582 population showed an intake estimate of 0.9 mg SO<sub>2</sub>/kg bw/day (lower bound or upper  
19  
20 583 bound), that corresponded to 130 % of the ADI. It was shown that in Tier 2 approach the  
21  
22 584 intake estimated for high consumers was 1400 % of the ADI (JECFA) while with actual data,  
23  
24 585 the intake for the high consumers became 130 %, which is more than 10-fold difference (yet  
25  
26 586 still above the ADI).

27  
28 588 In this study, actual typical levels of sulfites were much lower than the maximum levels set in  
29  
30 589 the legislation for several food groups. This resulted in average intake estimates going from  
31  
32 590 0.34 mg/kg bw/day in Tier 2 to 0.19 mg/kg bw/day in the partial Tier 3. Wine showed a  
33  
34 591 decrease in the sulfite intake estimate from 24 % (Tier 2) to 14 % (partial Tier 3) of the ADI  
35  
36 592 for the mean consumer and from 116% (Tier 2) to 69% (partial Tier 3) for the 97.5 percentile.  
37  
38 593 However, the choice of wine of a consumer might be different than average.

39 594

## 40 41 595 **Conclusion**

42  
43 596 In conclusion, it was shown that the intake of sulfites in the Belgian adult population is likely  
44  
45 597 to be below the ADI with the possible exception for some high consumers of wines with high  
46  
47 598 sulfite levels. As a consequence, the intake of sulfites by wine consumers remains a point of  
48  
49 599 attention. Further it was shown that for several food groups actual typical levels of sulfites are  
50  
51 600 much lower than the maximum levels set in the legislation.

52 601

53 602

## 54 55 603 **Acknowledgements**

56  
57 604 The authors declare not having any conflicts of interest. The authors acknowledge the funding  
58  
59 605 of the study by the Federal Ministry of Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment and the  
60  
606 occurrence data provided by the Federal Agency of the Safety of the Food Chain (FASFC).

607 .

**References**

609

610 Armentia-Alvarez A., Garcia-Moreno C, Peña-Egido J. 1994. Residual levels of sulfite in raw  
611 and boiled frozen shrimps: variability, distribution and losses. *Journal of Food Protection* 57:  
612 66-69.

613 Armentia-Alvarez A., Peña-Egido J., Garcia-Moreno C. 1993. Improved method for the  
614 determination of sulfites in shrimp. *Journal of AOAC International* 76: 565-569.

615 Armentia-Alvarez A., Peña-Egido J., Garcia-Moreno C. 1997. S-sulfonate determination in  
616 shrimp. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 45: 791-796.

617 Armentia-Alvarez A, Fernandez-Casero A, Garcia-Moreno C, Pena-Egido MJ. 1993. Residual  
618 levels of free and total sulphite in fresh and cooked burgers. *Food additives and contaminants*  
619 10: 157-165.

620 Belgian Monitor. 1993. Royal Decree of 31th of March 1993 concerning beer, published on  
621 4th of June 1993 and updated on 18th of July 2007. *Belgian Monitor*, Brussels.

622 CRIOC - OIVO. 2007. Canaux de distribution des produits alimentaires. Centre de Recherche  
623 et d'Information des organisations de consommateurs (CRIOC)

624 Daniels DH, Joe FL, Jr., Warner CR, Longfellow SD, Fazio T, Diachenko GW. 1992. Survey  
625 of sulphites determined in a variety of foods by the optimized Monier-Williams method. *Food*  
626 *additives and contaminants* 9: 283-289.

627 De Vriese S, Debacker G, de Henauw S, Huybrechts I, Kornitzer M, Leveque A, Moreau M,  
628 Van Oyen H. 2005. The Belgian food consumption survey: aims, design and methods.  
629 *Archives of Public Health* 63: 1-16.

630 Dvorak J, Dostalek P, Sterbal K, Cejka P, Kellner V, Culik J, Beinrohr E. 2006.  
631 Determination of total sulphur dioxide in beer samples by flow-through chronopotentiometry.  
632 *Journal of the Institute of Brewing* 112: 308-313.

633 European Commission. 2001. Report from the Commission on dietary food additive intake in  
634 the European Union. European Commission, Brussels.

635 European Community. 1995. DIRECTIVE 95/2/EC of the European Parliament and Council  
636 of the 20th February 1995 concerning the additives other than colours and sweeteners.

637 European Community. 1999a. Council Directive 1999/30/EC of 22 April 1999 relating to  
638 limit values for sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter  
639 and lead in ambient air.

640 European Community. 1999b. Council Regulation (EC) No 1493/1999 of 17 May 1999 on the  
641 common organisation of the market in wine.

642 European Community. 2000. Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the  
643 Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to  
644 the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs.



- 1  
2  
3 645 European Cooperation on School Education. 2004. Material Safety Data Sheet: Hands-on  
4 646 Science (H-Sci) Project Comenius.
- 5  
6  
7 647 Finne G, Wagner T, DeWitt B, Martin R. 1986. Effect of treatment, ice storage and freezing  
8 648 on residual sulfite in shrimp. *Journal of Food Science* 51: 231-232.
- 9  
10 649 Food Standards Australia New Zealand. 2005. The 21st Australian Total Diet Study. A total  
11 650 diet study of sulphites, benzoates and sorbates. Food Standards Australia New Zealand
- 12  
13 651 Garcia-Alonso B, Pena-Egido MJ, Garcia-Moreno C. 2001. S-sulfonate determination and  
14 652 formation in meat products. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 49: 423-429.
- 15  
16  
17 653 Hansen S. 1979. Conditions for use of food additives based on a budget for an acceptable  
18 654 daily intake. *Journal of Food Protection* 42: 429-434.
- 19  
20 655 Health Council of the Netherlands. 2005. Committee on Updating of Occupational Exposure  
21 656 Limits. Sodium hydrogen sulphite. Health-based reassessment of administrative occupational  
22 657 exposure limits. Den Haag.
- 23  
24  
25 658 Iowa State University. 1996. A user's guide to C-SIDE. Software for Intake Distribution  
26 659 Estimation. Department of Statistics and Center for Agricultural and Rural Development;  
27 660 Iowa State University
- 28  
29 661 JECFA. 1999. WHO Food Additive Series: 42. Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives  
30 662 (JECFA), Geneva.
- 31  
32  
33 663 Kim H. 1989. Comparison of the ion exclusion chromatographic method with the Monier-  
34 664 Williams method for determination of total sulfite in foods. *Journal of AOAC International*  
35 665 72: 266-272.
- 36  
37 666 Kim HJ, Park GY, Kim YK. 1987. Analysis of sulfites in foods by ion exclusion  
38 667 chromatography with electrochemical detection. *Food Technology* 41: 85-91.
- 39  
40  
41 668 Kim YK, Koh EM, Park SY, Chang SY, Park SJ, Na WI, Kim HJ. 2000. Determination of  
42 669 sulfite in oriental herbal medicines. *Journal of AOAC International* 83: 1149-1154.
- 43  
44 670 Leclercq C, Molinaro MG, Piccinelli R, Baldini M, Arcella D, Stacchini P. 2000. Dietary  
45 671 intake exposure to sulphites in Italy--analytical determination of sulphite-containing foods  
46 672 and their combination into standard meals for adults and children. *Food additives and*  
47 673 *contaminants* 17: 979-989.
- 48  
49  
50 674 Mareschi JP, François-Collange M, Suschetet M. 1992. Estimation of consumption of sulfite  
51 675 in France. *Food additives and contaminants* 9: 541-549.
- 52  
53 676 McFeeters RF, Barish AO. 2003. Sulfite analysis of fruits and vegetables by high-  
54 677 performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) with ultraviolet spectrophotometric detection.  
55 678 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 51: 1513-1517.
- 56  
57  
58 679 NPI. 2005. Sulphur dioxide fact sheet.
- 59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 680 Nusser SM, Carriquiry AL, Dodd KW, Fuller WA. 1996. A semiparametric transformation  
4 681 approach to estimating usual daily intake distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical*  
5 682 *Association* 91: 1440-1449.
- 6  
7  
8 683 Ough CS. 1986. Determination of sulfur dioxide in grapes and wines. *Association of Official*  
9 684 *Analytical Chemists Journal* 69: 5-7.
- 10  
11 685 Paino-Campa G, Peña-Egido J., Garcia-Moreno C. 1991. Liquid chromatographic  
12 686 determination of free and total sulphites in fresh sausages. *Journal of the Science of Food and*  
13 687 *Agriculture* 56: 85-93.
- 14  
15  
16 688 Pena-Egido MJ, Garcia-Alonso B, Garcia-Moreno C. 2005. S-sulfonate contents in raw and  
17 689 cooked meat products. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 53: 4198-4201.
- 18  
19 690 Pizzoferrato L, Quattrucci E, Di Lullo G. 1990. Evaluation of an HPLC method for the  
20 691 determination of sulphiting agents in foods. *Food additives and contaminants* 7: 189-195.
- 21  
22 692 Scientific Committee on Food. 1998. Dietary additive intake in the European Union.  
23 693 Scientific Committee on Food, Luxembourg.
- 24  
25  
26 694 Sinkova T, Janekova K. 2006. Dietary intake of sulphites by children in the Slovak Republic.  
27 695 *Central European Journal of Public Health* 14: 18-21.
- 28  
29 696 Slimani N, Valsta L. 2002. Perspectives of using the EPIC-SOFT programme in the context  
30 697 of pan- European nutritional monitoring surveys: methodological and practical implications.  
31 698 *European Journal of clinical Nutrition* 56 Suppl 2: S63-S74.
- 32  
33  
34 699 Vally H, Misso NL, Madan V. 2009. Clinical effects of sulphite additives. *Clinical and*  
35 700 *Experimental Allergy* 39: 1643-1651.
- 36  
37 701 Van Loco J, Beernaert E. 2003. An alternative method validation strategy for european  
38 702 decision 2002/657/EC. *Proceedings of European Food Chemistry XII: strategies for safe food*  
39 703 *1*: 91-94.
- 40  
41  
42 704 Verger P, Chambolle M, Babayou P, Le Breton S, Volatier JL. 1998. Estimation of the  
43 705 distribution of the maximum theoretical intake for ten additives in France. *Food additives and*  
44 706 *contaminants* 15: 759-766.
- 45  
46 707 Wedzicha BL. 1992. Chemistry of sulphiting agents in food. *Food additives and contaminants*  
47 708 *9*: 449-459.
- 48  
49 709  
50 710  
51 711  
52 712  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1. Average sulfite concentrations \* in different foods (data from the control program of the Federal Agency for Safety of the Food Chain, Belgium)

Matrix	Year	Number of samples	Number of samples exceeding the LOQ	Average sulphite concentration* (mg/kg) <sup>1</sup>	Standard deviation (mg/kg)	Minimum value (mg/kg)	Maximum value (mg/kg)	Median (mg/kg)	Percentile 95 (mg/kg)	Percentile 97.5 (mg/kg)
Dried tomatoes	2005-2006	65	9	7.3	3.7	2.0	13.0	7	12.6	12.8
All dried fruits (defined or undefined; Apricots included)	2006	40	27	384	320	9.0	917	267	876	903
All dried fruits (defined or undefined; Apricots excluded)	2006	25	14	179	238	9.0	781			
Dried apricots	2005-2006	181	176	533	308	0.0	1448	478	1083	1182
Wines (Red, White or undefined)	2004-2006	83	82	114	45.4	30.0	240	113	180	184
of which Red	2004 & 2006	28	28	78.6	33.2	30.0	160	74.5	142	149
White	2004 & 2006	39	39	139	28.1	91.0	198	136	180	181
Raw Shrimps	2006	10	1	10.0	/	10.0	10.0	10	10.0	10.0
Mustard	2006	4	1	18.0	/	18.0	18.0	18	18.0	18.0
Mushrooms	2006	5	2	11.5	3.5	9.0	14.0	11.5	13.8	13.9
Jams	2006	10	10	16.0	11.6	1.0	33.0	14	32.6	32.8
Potato products	2006	16	9	3.8	3.4	0.3	10.0	3	9.6	9.8
Beers	2006	9	3	1.3	0.6	1.0	2.0	1	1.9	2.0

\* Including only samples exceeding the LOQ of 5 mg/L to calculate the average



**Table 2**

Usual intake of sulfites (mg/kg bw/day); results from the Tier 2 exposure assessment (national food consumption survey, 2004)

	Sulphite (mg/kg body weight/day)									% of ADI at average intake
	Mean (% of total)	SD	P25	P50	P75	P95	P97.5	P99		
Wines	0.17 (53%)	0.240	0.000	0.050	0.270	0.660	0.810	1.020		24
Sugars and glucose syrup based products	0.042 (13%)	0.063	0.000	0.014	0.064	0.168	0.216	0.283		6.0
Beers	0.033 (10%)	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.045	0.148	0.204	0.286		4.7
Processed fruits*	0.025 (7.6%)	0.061	0.000	0.063	0.022	0.107	0.166	0.283		3.5
Processed potatoes	0.024 (7.3%)	0.022	0.007	0.018	0.034	0.068	0.082	0.101		3.4
Processed vegetables**	0.014 (4.4%)	0.013	0.005	0.010	0.019	0.039	0.049	0.062		2.0
Shellfish	0.013 (4.2%)	0.019	0.000	0.006	0.002	0.052	0.065	0.083		1.9
Gelatine and meat substitutes	Error reporting in CSIDE (no result produced)									
Condiments and dessert sauces	0.0011 (0.35%)	0.0018	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.006	0.008		0.16
Cereal based products (starches and biscuits)	0.00045 (0.14%)	0.00087	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.004		0.064
<b>Total intake</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>		<b>49</b>

ADI acceptable daily intake

SD standard deviation

bw body weight

The usual dietary intakes were weighted and adjusted for the age and sex distribution of the Belgian population 2004 and adjusted for interview day and season.

Total number of consumption days is 6166; total number of consumers is 3083

The acceptable daily intake (ADI) for sulphite is 0.7 mg/kg bw/day

\* including dried fruits (including dried apricots), candied fruits, jams, jellies and marmalades, lemon and lime juice, fruit fillings, fruits in vinegar, brine, oil.

\*\* including dried tomatoes, mushrooms, vegetables in vinegar, brine and oil, and white vegetables

**Table 3** Usual intake of sulfites (mg/kg bw/day); results from the partial Tier 3 exposure assessment (national food consumption survey, 2004)

	Sulphite (mg/kg bodyweight/day)									% of ADI at average intake
	Mean (% of total)	SD	P25	P50	P75	P95	P97,5	P99		
Wines	0.097 (51.1%)	0.141	0.000	0.028	0.151	0.383	0.483	0.620	13.9	
Sugars and glucose syrup based products <sup>°</sup>	0.042 (22.1%)	0.063	0.000	0.014	0.064	0.168	0.216	0.283	6.0	
Beers	0.008 (4.2%)	0.015	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.037	0.051	0.071	1.1	
Processed fruits* <sup>°°</sup>	0.012 (6.3%)	0.035	0.000	0.002	0.008	0.058	0.092	0.161	1.7	
Processed potatoes	0.0024 (1.3%)	0.0020	0.00092	0.0021	0.0035	0.0062	0.0072	0.0086	0.3	
Processed vegetables** <sup>°°</sup>	0.014 (7.4%)	0.013	0.005	0.010	0.019	0.039	0.049	0.062	2.0	
Shellfish <sup>°°</sup>	0.0097 (5.1%)	0.0148	0.000	0.0035	0.0138	0.0392	0.0513	0.0685	1.4	
Gelatine and meat substitutes <sup>°</sup>	Error reporting in CSIDE (no result produced)									
Condiments and dessert sauces <sup>°°</sup>	0.00017 (0.09%)	0.00019	0.000	0.000121	0.000275	0.000547	0.000658	0.000805	0.02	
Cereal based products (starches and biscuits) <sup>°</sup>	0.00045 (0.24%)	0.00087	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.06	
<b>Total intake</b>	<b>0.190</b>	<b>0.159</b>	<b>0.074</b>	<b>0.146</b>	<b>0.260</b>	<b>0.505</b>	<b>0.611</b>	<b>0.753</b>	<b>27.1</b>	

ADI acceptable daily intake

SD standard deviation

bw body weight

The usual dietary intakes were weighted and adjusted for the age and sex distribution of the Belgian population 2004 and adjusted for interview day and season.

Total number of consumption days is 6166; total number of consumers is 3083

The acceptable daily intake (ADI) for sulphite is 0.7 mg/kg bw/day

\* including dried fruits (including dried apricots), candied fruits, jams, jellies and marmalades, lemon and lime juice, fruit fillings, fruits in vinegar, brine, oil.

\*\* including dried tomatoes, mushrooms, vegetables in vinegar, brine and oil, and white vegetables

<sup>°</sup> Maximum concentrations used instead of analyzed concentrations

<sup>°°</sup> Combination of maximum concentrations and analyzed concentrations used depending on the availability of analyzed concentrations for the food items in the considered food groups

**Table 4.** JECFA summary of sulphite intake (Tier 2 exposure assessment) in 9 countries (JECFA, 1999)

Country	Date	Survey	Intake of sulphites estimate (mg/kg bw per day)	% of ADI
Aus-NZ	1983	National, 24-h recall; adults, 25-64 years; sample, 6254	Aus-NZ permissions: 10	1400
China	1992	National household survey, 24-h recall; 30 provinces; sample, 91 818	Average consumer: 0.63 High consumer: 3.2	90 460
Finland	1994	poundage data	0.067	10
France	1993-94	Sales data	0.70 (mean, corrected) 1.0 (mean, uncorrected) 2.2 (90th percentile, uncorrected) 3.2 (95th percentile, uncorrected)	100 140 310 460
India	1995-96	Food balance sheet	0.35	50
Japan	1994	National nutrition intake survey	Average consumer: 0.033	
Spain	1993	Household survey	0.88	130
United Kingdom	1986-87	National; 7-day weighed record; adults, 16-64 years National; 7-day weighed record; children, 1.5-4.5 years	UK permissions/adult: 17 UK permissions/child: 77	2400 11000
United States	1982-88	14-day MRCA food frequency data (1982-87) combined with portion sizes from USDA/NFCS (1987-88); population $\geq$ 2 years	US permissions/mean: 0.30 US permissions/90 <sup>th</sup> : 0.73	40 100