OH H_3 OH

FAST ARSENIC SPECIATION ANALYSIS OF WINES AND RICE WITH LC-ICP-QQQ

Courtney Tanabe UC Davis THE INTEREST Shoul

- Public interest
- UCD Arsenic Workshop
- Sources of Arsenic ir wine
- Regulations around tworld





REGULATIONS

Wine

No US regulations

VQA Ontario: 100 ppb total As

Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV) 200 ppb total As

No regulations for individual As species





International Organisation of Vine and Wine Intergovernmental Organisation

Rice

FDA proposed action level for iAs in infant rice ceral: 100 ppb

China: 200 ppb rice grains

wafers, waffles

EU:

- 100 ppb iAs maximum level in rice for infants/childre
- 200 ppb iAs maximum level in non-parboiled rice
 250 ppb iAs maximum level in parboiled rice
 300 ppb iAs maximum level in rice cakes, crackers,

http://www.oiv.int/oiv/cms/index?lang=en; http://www.vqaontario.ca/Resources/Library

ORIGIN OF ARSENIC IN WINE?



STORAGE



UCDAVIS **VITICULTURE & ENOLOGY**

Agilent Technologies



Jenny Nelson



Susan Ebeler

FDA U.S. FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION



Patrick Gray



TECHNICAL NOTE



A fast and fit-for-purpose arsenic speciation method for wine and rice†

Cite this: J. Anal. At. Spectrom., 2017, 32 1031

Received 27th January 2017

Accepted 1st March 2017

DOI: 10.1039/c7ja00041c

rsc.li/jaas

Patrick J. Gray,*a Courtney K. Tanabe,^{bc} Susan E. Ebeler^{bc} and Jenny Nelson^{bcd}

This fit-for-purpose method was designed in response to recent and proposed food standards, both international and national, that limit inorganic arsenic rather than total, organic, or individual arsenic species such as arsenite (As^{III}) and arsenate (As^V). In this method, As^{III} is intentionally oxidized to As^V with H_2O_2 during sample preparation, converting all inorganic arsenic (the sum of As^{III} and As^V) to the As^V form. Arsenic species were separated in less than 2 minutes using a short, narrow bore, 5 µm chromatography column. This analysis time is 10× faster than the current FDA regulatory method. The use of O2 reaction gas with inductively coupled plasma triple quadrupole mass spectrometry (ICP-QQQ with MS/MS capability) avoided spectral interferences and dramatically increased sensitivity, allowing for low volume injections. The small injection volume and modified mobile phase composition mitigate non-spectral interferences such as carbon enhanced ionization. Furthermore, the shortened analysis time significantly increases sample throughput. Validation data from two laboratories demonstrate the method's accuracy and reproducibility of both wine and rice matrices in a single analytical batch.

OYAL SOCIETY

View Article Online

METHOD PARAMETERS



3 species analyzed: MMA, DMA, and iAs • H2O2 addition

Column: PRP-X100 50x2.1 mm 5µm Hamilton

Mobile Phase: 40 mM ammonium carbonate, 3% methanol, pH 9.0

Detection of AsO+ at m/z 91

- Agilent 8800 ICP-QQQ
- Agilent 1260 HPLC

WINE SAMPLES

- Small problem...
- Alcohol content in wine ranges from 7-24% in US
- Plasma interference
- Added 3% EtOH to all calibration standards, CCVs, CRMs
- 2 lab validation study
 - 5 samples for validation study
 - 5 additional samples for market basket study
- Commercial wines purchased in Davis, CA



RICE SAMPLES

- Reference samples
- NIST 1568b
- NMIJ 7503a
- NMIJ 7532a
- ERM BC-211
- Rice samples only analyzed at FDA





SHORT COLUMN STUDY

RESULTS

Separation of 3 arsenic species

• Overlay: 0.5 ppb, 1 ppb, and 5 ppb





RESULTS — FORTIFICATION RECOVERY

UCD Average Fortification Recovery for duplicates at 5, 10, and 30 ppb Five samples for a total of n=30

| Matrix | | DMA | MMA | iAs |
|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Wine | Average | 102% | 97% | 99% |
| | Range | 97-107% | 91-102% | 95-103% |

RESULTS — ADDITIONAL SAMPLES

| Wine Sample | % EtOH (v/v) | DMA | мма | iAs | Sum of Species | Total As | % Mass Balance | |
|--|-----------------|--|---|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--|
| WS-6 | 13.5 | <lod< td=""><td><lod< td=""><td>32.9 ± 0.8</td><td>32.9 ± 0.8</td><td>34.4 ± 0.4</td><td>96%</td></lod<></td></lod<> | <lod< td=""><td>32.9 ± 0.8</td><td>32.9 ± 0.8</td><td>34.4 ± 0.4</td><td>96%</td></lod<> | 32.9 ± 0.8 | 32.9 ± 0.8 | 34.4 ± 0.4 | 96% | |
| WS-7 | 13.8 | <lod< td=""><td><lod< td=""><td>9.1 ± 0.4</td><td>9.1 ± 0.4</td><td>9.1 ± 0.3</td><td>100%</td></lod<></td></lod<> | <lod< td=""><td>9.1 ± 0.4</td><td>9.1 ± 0.4</td><td>9.1 ± 0.3</td><td>100%</td></lod<> | 9.1 ± 0.4 | 9.1 ± 0.4 | 9.1 ± 0.3 | 100% | |
| WS-8 | 13.5 | 1.1 ± 0.0 | <lod< td=""><td>27.6 ± 0.7</td><td>28.6 ± 0.7</td><td>28.9 ± 0.3</td><td>99%</td></lod<> | 27.6 ± 0.7 | 28.6 ± 0.7 | 28.9 ± 0.3 | 99% | |
| WS-9 | 10.5 | 1.0 ± 0.1 | <lod< td=""><td>27.5 ± 0.9</td><td>28.5 ± 0.9</td><td>27.9 ± 0.9</td><td>102%</td></lod<> | 27.5 ± 0.9 | 28.5 ± 0.9 | 27.9 ± 0.9 | 102% | |
| WS-10 | 13.5 | <lod< td=""><td><lod< td=""><td>4.5 ± 0.1</td><td>4.5 ± 0.1</td><td>4.7 ± 0.1</td><td>94%</td></lod<></td></lod<> | <lod< td=""><td>4.5 ± 0.1</td><td>4.5 ± 0.1</td><td>4.7 ± 0.1</td><td>94%</td></lod<> | 4.5 ± 0.1 | 4.5 ± 0.1 | 4.7 ± 0.1 | 94% | |
| Average $\pm 1\sigma$, n=3 for the individual species | | | | | | | | |
| Average $\pm 1\sigma$, n=3 for the Total As concentration | | | | | | | | |



Overlay of sample WS-8 triplicate chromatograms

RESULTS — LONG METHOD (EAM §4.10) VS. FAST AND FIT-FOR-PURPOSE METHOD

- Comparison of the FDA §4.10 Extension results (Long) with the Fast and Fit-for-purpose results (Fast)
- Percent difference in parentheses

| Style | Cultivar | % ethanol | DMA | | i/ | As | Total As | |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | | | Long | Fast | Long | Fast | EAM §4.7 | Sum Species |
| Rosé | Zinfandel | 9.5 | 0.81 ± 0.1 | 0.72 ± 0.04 (89%) | 14.4 ± 1.0 | 16.0 ± 0.5 (111%) | 16.5 ± 0.02 | 16.7 ± 0.5 (101%) |
| White | Sauvignon blanc | 13 | 0.74 ± 0.04 | 0.72 ± 0.06 (98%) | 10.7 ± 0.2 | 11.4 ± 0.4 (107%) | 12.6 ± 0.16 | 12.1 ± 0.3 (96%) |
| Sparkling | Sparkling white blend | 12 | 0.75 ± 0.1 | 0.83 ± 0.04 (111%) | 9.2 ± 0.4 | 9.5 ± 0.6 (103%) | 10.4 ± 0.11 | 10.3 ± 0.5 (99%) |
| Dessert | Petite Sirah | 20 | 1.7 ± 0.1 | 1.86 ± 0.06 (109%) | 2.1 ± 0.3 | 2.3 ± 0.4 (109%) | 4.5 ± 0.01 | 4.1 ± 0.4 (92%) |
| Red | Cabernet Sauvignon | 14.5 | 0.45 ± 0.01 | 0.47 ± 0.04 (105%) | 1.5 ± 0.3 | 1.7 ± 0.3 (113%) | 2.4 ± 0.03 | 2.2 ± 0.3 (90%) |

RESULTS — FAST AND FIT-FOR-PURPOSE RICE REFERENCE SAMPLES

- Analyses of rice reference materials
- Uncertainty shown as 1 standard deviation (n = 3)
- % recovery shown in parentheses

| Rice | DMA | | MMA | | iAs | | Sum | |
|------------|------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | Reference | Measured | Reference | Measured | Reference | Measured | Reference | Measured |
| NIST 1568b | 180 ± 12 | 195 ± 4 (109%) | 11.6 ± 3.5 | 14.9 ± 0.9 (128%) | 92 ± 10 | 105 ± 1 (114%) | 285 ± 14 | 315 ± 3 (110%) |
| NMIJ 7503a | 13.3 ± 0.9 | 15.4 ± 0.1 (116%) | None reported | < LOD | 84.1 ± 3* | 79 ± 4 (94%) | 98 ± 7 | 94 ± 4 (96%) |
| NMIJ 7532a | 18.6 ± 0.8 | 18.7 ± 1.3 (101%) | None reported | 2.2 ± 1.9 | 298 ± 8 | 277 ± 12 (93%) | 320 ± 10 | 297 ± 12 (93%) |
| ERM BC-211 | 119 ± 13 | 146 ± 3 (123%) | None reported | 19.9 ± 0.6 | 124 ± 11 | 124 ± 2 (100%) | 260 ± 13 | 290 ± 5 (112%) |

* NMIJ 7503a iAs uncertainty estimated as the square root of the sum of squares of the AsIII and AsV uncertainties.

CONCLUSIONS

- Validation of Fast and Fit for purpose method for wine analysis
 - Shorter run time compared to FDA 4.10 extension method for wine analysis
 - Results show separation of all analyzed arsenic species
 - Good results between the labs in validation study
 - Can analyze various wine types
- Fast and Fit for purpose method for rice analysis
 - Shorter run time compared to FDA 4.11 method for rice analysis
 - Improved sensitivity and limits of detection

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS









