

PFAS – PT Study

Results of the first interlaboratory comparison based on real world samples

Michael Wilken



Why this study?

- PFAS are emerging contaminant
- The methods are still developing
- Decreasing detection limits are required, and new components are frequently added
- Currently a discrepancy in requirements between North America, Europe, Australia
- We want to understand the potential variability of data between the labs
- We want to find and identify preferred laboratories
- 13 laboratories invited, 12 participated



What does real world sample mean?

- The concept is based on providing blends of samples from various locations
- These blends have the "backbones" (matrices) from the sources which may pose analytical challenges (interferences)
- The blends are in general <u>not spiked</u>
- The blends are provided camouflaged and typically as a concentrated and a diluted blend. One of them may be provided as a duplicate
- It allows us to evaluate the quality at different concentration levels and to determine the RPD.
- Dow has implemented this concept for numerous parameters (VOC, SVOC, metals, dioxin).
- This concept helps to identify, qualify and re-qualify the preferred contract laboratories.



Details for this study

- Material is blend of left-overs from various non-Dow projects, mixed with additional non-PFAS containing water to add a "backbone"
- Neat sample of the blend (A) plus diluted sample as duplicate (B,C) provided to labs. For sample C extra bottles provided for lab-duplicate
- Sample D is lab water in which Teflon laboratory material was soaked for a week. Finally spiked with a mix of 12 standards to achieve 5 ng/l per component (carboxylic acids and sulfonates)
- No requirements for any specific method (US and Europe would be totally different anyway)
- Isotope dilution required
- Indication if only linear or linear + branched were analyzed
- Selection of 15 PFAS (see next table)



Requested Analytes and Reporting Limits

Analytes	Requested Reporting limit
	ng/l
Perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA)	2
Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	2
Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	2
Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)	2
Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	2
Perfluorononaoic acid (PFNA)	2
Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)	2
Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnA)	2
Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoA)	2
Perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS)	2
Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)	2
Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	1
Perfluorooctanesulfonamide (PFOSA)	2
6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2-FTS)	10
8:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (8:2-FTS)	10



Achieved Reporting Limits



all data points reported as < RL or ND are set to 0

Y-axis is LOGARITHMIC scale!!!



Results



EH&S Remediation







EH&S Remediation





Samples B/C/C-DUP (sulfonates, telomers, PFOSA)

Perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS)
Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)
Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)
Perfluorooctanesulfonamide (PFOSA)
6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2-FTS)
8:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (8:2-FTS)

EH&S Remediation







Dow

--- Spike level



Analyzed components

Analytes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13
Perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	S	S	L
Perfluorononaoic acid (PFNA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)	S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	S	S	L
Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	S	S	L
Perfluorooctanesulfonamide (PFOSA)	S	L	S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S	S	L
6:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2-FTS)	S		S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S		L
8:2 Fluorotelomer sulfonate (8:2-FTS)	S		S	S	S	L	L	L	L	S		L

L = linear components only

S = linear + branched components



Distribution of linear and branched PFAS





More results

- Recovery rates of surrogate standards vary strongly from component to component and from laboratory to laboratory
- Some standard recovery rates are typically in the range of 50% (¹³C₄-PFBA), while others (¹³C₂-6:2 FTS) are way above 100% (up to 292 %)
- This indicates the need of the isotope dilution method to correct for the apparent inconsistencies



Summary

- Variability between the laboratories is (surprisingly) small
- Biggest problem is sensitivity: varies more than factor 1000 !!!
- European (0.65 ng/l) and Australian (0.23 ng/l) surface water requirements can be achieved only by the European lab
- 6 North American labs can achieve 2 ng/l or below
- Laboratories do not analyze the same things (linear w or w/o branched)
- Sample D highlights the importance of an absolutely clean lab
- Variability of surrogate recoveries requires the use of isotope dilution



I like to thank all laboratories for their participation

and I like to thank

YOU

for your attention