

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Innovative combination of QuEChERS extraction with on-line solid-phase extract purification and pre-concentration, followed by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry for the determination of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and their metabolites in sewage sludge

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1610231> since 2016-11-07T16:01:03Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.aca.2016.06.023

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

This Accepted Author Manuscript (AAM) is copyrighted and published by Elsevier. It is posted here by agreement between Elsevier and the University of Turin. Changes resulting from the publishing process - such as editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms - may not be reflected in this version of the text. The definitive version of the text was subsequently published in *ANALYTICA CHIMICA ACTA*, 935, 2016, 10.1016/j.aca.2016.06.023.

You may download, copy and otherwise use the AAM for non-commercial purposes provided that your license is limited by the following restrictions:

- (1) You may use this AAM for non-commercial purposes only under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND license.
- (2) The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner, and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
- (3) You must attribute this AAM in the following format: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>), 10.1016/j.aca.2016.06.023

The publisher's version is available at:

<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0003267016307863>

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

<http://hdl.handle.net/>

1 **Innovative combination of QuEChERS extraction with on-line solid-phase extract purification**
2 **and pre-concentration, followed by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry for the**
3 **determination of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and their metabolites in sewage sludge**
4

5 D. Rossini^{a,b}, L. Ciofi^a, C. Ancillotti^a, L. Checchini^a, M.C. Bruzzoniti^b, L. Rivoira^b, D. Fibbi^c, S. Orlandini^a, M Del
6 Bubba^{a,*}

7 ^a Department of Chemistry “Ugo Schiff”, University of Florence, Via della Lastruccia 3, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino
8 (Florence, Italy)

9 ^b Department of Chemistry, University of Turin, Via Pietro Giuria 5, 10125 Turin (Italy)

10 ^c GIDA S.p.A., Via di Baciacavallo 36, 59100 Prato (Italy)

11

12 * Corresponding author: Massimo Del Bubba, Department of Chemistry, University of Florence, Via della Lastruccia 3,
13 50019 Sesto Fiorentino (Florence, Italy). Phone number: +39-055-4573326. E-mail: delbubba@unifi.it

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 **Abstract**

29 For the first time QuEChERS extraction of sewage sludge was combined with the automatic solid-
30 phase pre-concentration and purification of the extract (following indicated as SPE) and LC-MS/MS
31 analysis, for the determination of the non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs acetylsalicylic acid
32 (ASA), diclofenac (DIC), fenbufen (FEN), flurbiprofen (FLU), ketoprofen (KET), ibuprofen (IBU)
33 and naproxen (NAP), and their metabolites salicylic acid (SAL), 4'-hydroxydiclofenac (4'-HYDIC),
34 1-hydroxyibuprofen (1-HYIBU), 2-hydroxyibuprofen (2-HYIBU), 3-hydroxyibuprofen (3-HYIBU)
35 and o-desmethylnaproxen (O-DMNAP). Various commercial pellicular stationary phases (i.e. silica
36 gel functionalized with octadecyl, biphenyl, phenylhexyl and pentafluorophenyl groups) were
37 preliminarily investigated for the resolution of target analytes and different sorbent phases (i.e. octyl
38 or octadecyl functionalized silica gel and a polymeric phase functionalized with N-benzylpyrrolidone
39 groups) were tested for the SPE phase. The optimized method involves the QuEChERS extraction of
40 1 g of freeze-dried sludge with 15 mL of water/acetonitrile 1/2 (v/v), the SPE of the extract with the
41 N-benzylpyrrolidone polymeric phase and the water/acetonitrile gradient elution on the
42 pentafluorophenyl stationary phase at room temperature. Matrix effect was always suppressive and
43 in most cases low, being it $\leq 20\%$ for ASA, DIC, FLU, KET, IBU, 1-HYIBU, 2-HYIBU, 3-HYIBU,
44 NAP and O-DMNAP, and included in the range of 35-47% for the other analytes. Recoveries were
45 evaluated at three spiking levels, evidencing almost quantitative values for HYIBUs and O-DMNAP;
46 for ASA, SAL and KET the recoveries were included in between 50-76%, whereas for the other
47 compounds they ranged from 36% to 55%. The proposed method showed better analytical
48 performances than those so far published, being suitable for target compound determination in real
49 samples from tens of pg g^{-1} to ng g^{-1} of freeze-dried sludge, with a total analysis time of 30 minutes
50 per sample.

51 **Keywords**

52 QuEChERS; Solid-phase pre-concentration and purification; Liquid chromatography-tandem mass
53 spectrometry; Sewage sludge; Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; Drug metabolites

54 **1 Introduction**

55 Quick, Easy, Cheap, Effective, Rugged, and Safe (QuEChERS) method is an extraction and clean-up
56 technique originally developed for recovering pesticide residues from fruits and vegetables [1-3] and
57 thereafter applied to the analysis of various organic micropollutants in different environmental
58 matrices, mainly of solid nature, such as sediments and soil [4].

59 The recovery from soil of selected drugs and herbicides, characterized by low values of the octanol-
60 water partition coefficient (i.e. $\log K_{ow}=0.8-2.8$), has been demonstrated by the QuEChERS method
61 [5], thus suggesting its suitability also for a wide range of polar compounds, including
62 pharmaceuticals and their metabolites.

63 The determination of organic micropollutants in sewage sludge is surely a topic of great interest from
64 an environmental point of view. In fact, biological sludge may represent the final sink of organic
65 micropollutants in wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), the determination of which can give useful
66 information concerning the overall efficiency of the wastewater treatment process, as well as the
67 potential soil contamination, when these bio solids are used for land applications [6, 7].

68 Organic micropollutants in sewage sludge have been analysed using different recovery techniques
69 such as pressurized liquid extraction and microwave assisted extraction, usually followed by SPE
70 clean-up procedures [8]. Instrumental determination of organic analytes in sludge has been performed
71 by using both gas chromatography (GC) and liquid chromatography (LC), depending on the
72 physicochemical characteristics of investigated compounds, mainly coupled with mass spectrometry
73 (MS) [8]. However, in this regard, it should be emphasized that, when thermally labile and/or polar
74 analytes like pharmaceuticals have to be analysed, a proper derivatization step is necessary for GC
75 analysis [9, 10], whereas their direct determination can be performed in LC.

76 Among the various extraction techniques applied to the extraction of organic micropollutants from
77 biological sludge, the QuEChERS approach was seldom adopted. To date, these studies focus on the
78 determination of selected benzotriazole, benzothiazole and benzenesulfonamide derivatives [11], and
79 a number of hormones, pharmaceuticals and personal care products [12-14]. In these works the
80 traditional QuEChERS extraction and dispersive solid-phase (d-SPE) purification of the extract,
81 based on the use of “primary secondary amine” (PSA) as sorbent, was coupled with liquid
82 chromatographic (LC) analysis and tandem mass spectrometric (MS/MS) [11, 12, 14] or single time
83 of flight mass detection [13].

84 Even though the QuEChERS technique can be considered as a high-throughput analytical approach,
85 the d-SPE step significantly increases the analysis time and involves an extra sample manipulation,
86 compared to the extraction alone. Moreover, large matrix effects (ME) have been often observed,
87 especially when ESI-MS detection is employed, notwithstanding various d-SPE sorbents, besides
88 PSA, were investigated to lower the matrix influence [13]. A remarkable decrease in total analysis
89 time, together with a significant increase of the overall pre-concentration factor, would be achieved
90 by treating the QuEChERS extract like a water sample, by the on-line solid-phase pre-concentration
91 and purification technique, automatically coupled with LC-MS/MS (on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS), which
92 has been extensively applied to the determination of various classes of organic micropollutants in
93 environmental waters [15-17].

94 Accordingly, the aim of this research was to investigate the combination of QuEChERS extraction
95 with on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS for the determination of selected pharmaceutical compounds in sewage
96 sludge. More in detail, various commercially available sorbent phases (i.e. silica gel functionalized
97 with octyl or octadecyl groups and a polymeric phase functionalized with N-benzylpyrrolidone
98 groups) were evaluated for replacing the d-SPE step of the QuEChERS method. Furthermore, some
99 analytical stationary phases (i.e. silica gel functionalized with octadecyl, biphenyl, phenylhexyl and
100 pentafluorophenyl groups), characterized by different physicochemical properties, were tested.

101 Target compounds of this study (i.e. acetylsalicylic acid, diclofenac, fenbufen, flurbiprofen,

102 ibuprofen, ketoprofen and naproxen) were chosen within the group of non-steroidal anti-
103 inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), which represent one of the most worldwide consumed class of
104 pharmaceutical compounds [18-20]. Furthermore, some NSAIDs (e.g. diclofenac and ibuprofen) are
105 characterized by endocrine disruption properties [21, 22] and have been previously found in
106 biological sludge [10, 13, 23]. It should also be noted that some NSAID metabolites (i.e. salicylic
107 acid, 4'-hydroxydiclofenac, 1-hydroxyibuprofen, 2-hydroxyibuprofen, 3-hydroxyibuprofen and O-
108 desmethylnaproxen), never investigated before in sewage sludge, were included in this study. Target
109 analytes were characterized by a very wide range of polarity (log K_{OW} included in the range 1.4-4.5),
110 thus representing a group of chemicals very interesting to be studied from an analytical viewpoint
111 during the various partition steps involved in both the QuEChERS and the SPE phases.

112 **2 Experimental**

113 *2.1 Chemicals and materials*

114 LC-MS grade methanol, acetonitrile, water, formic acid, HPLC grade methanol and acetonitrile were
115 purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Ultrapure water was obtained from a Milli-Q
116 system (Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA). Sodium chloride and magnesium sulphate heptahydrate used
117 for QuEChERS extraction were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich.

118 Acetylsalicylic acid (ASA, CAS: 50-78-2), acetylsalicylic acid D3 (ASA D3, CAS: 921943-73-9),
119 salicylic acid (SAL, CAS: 69-72-7), diclofenac (DIC, CAS: 15307-79-6), diclofenac D4 (DIC D4,
120 CAS: 153466-65-0), 4'-hydroxydiclofenac (4'-HYDIC, CAS: 64118-84-9), fenbufen (FEN, CAS:
121 36330-85-5), flurbiprofen (FLU, CAS: 5104-49-4), ketoprofen (KET, CAS: 22071-15-4), ketoprofen
122 D3 (KET D3, CAS: 159490-55-8), ibuprofen (IBU, CAS: 15687-27-1), ibuprofen D3 (IBU D3, CAS:
123 121662-14-4), 1-hydroxyibuprofen (1-HYIBU, CAS: 53949-53-4), 2-hydroxyibuprofen (2-HYIBU,
124 CAS: 51146-55-5), 3-hydroxyibuprofen (3-HYIBU, CAS: 53949-54-5), naproxen (NAP, CAS:
125 22204-53-1), o-desmethylnaproxen (O-DMNAP, CAS: 52079-10-4) were supplied by Sigma-
126 Aldrich. 2-hydroxyibuprofen D6 (2-HYIBU D6, CAS: 50474-67-4) was obtained by Green-Pharma

127 (Orléans, France).

128 The solid-phase cartridges employed in this study for the extraction of target analytes (see Table 1)

129 were all from Phenomenex (Torrance, CA, USA): octadecyl-bonded silica (Strata C18-E), octyl-

130 bonded silica (Strata C8) and surface-modified N-benzylpyrrolidone polymeric phase (Strata-X).

131 The following LC pellicular columns (100 mm×3 mm, 2.6 μm particle size), purchased from

132 Phenomenex, were used: (i) octadecylsilane Kinetex XB-C18 (C18), (ii) biphenylsilane Kinetex

133 Biphenyl (BP), (iii) phenyl-hexylsilane (PhH) Kinetex Phenyl-Hexyl and (iv)

134 pentafluorophenylsilane Kinetex PFP (PFP).

135 The following syringe filters were used: Phenex-RC (cellulose membrane, pore size 0.2 μm,

136 Phenomenex) and Minisart SPR-PTFE (polytetrafluoroethylene membrane, pore size 0.45 μm)

137 (Sartorius-Stedim, Goettingen, Germany).

138 Acidic water employed for the preparation of standard solutions, the QuEChERS extraction, the on-

139 line SPE of the extract and LC-MS/MS analysis was a 0.2% (v/v) solution of formic acid in Milli-Q

140 or LC-MS grade water (pH=2.50±0.05).

141 2.2 *Sampling sites and sludge samples*

142 The samples were collected (i) in two different activated sludge WWTPs (i.e. Baciacavallo and Calice

143 facilities) devoted to the treatment of wastewater from the industrial textile district and the city of

144 Prato (Tuscany, Italy), and (ii) in three activated sludge WWTPs (i.e. Vernio, Vaiano and Cantagallo

145 facilities) treating the domestic and industrial wastewater from the civil and textile areas of Bisenzio

146 Valley (Tuscany, Italy). The sludge lines of WWTPs consisted in a gravity thickening and a filter

147 press and/or centrifugal dewatering.

148 Sewage sludge used for method development and application on real samples were collected in July

149 2015 and September 2015, respectively. After collection, the samples were immediately treated with

150 liquid nitrogen and transported to the laboratory, where they were freeze-dried and finally stored in

151 the dark at -20°C, until analysis.

152 For method development, an average representative sample of the different sludge collected in the
153 five WWTPs was prepared by mixing equal amounts of each freeze-dried sample (following
154 identified as “sludge mix”).

155 2.3 *QuEChERS extraction*

156 One gram of freeze-dried sludge was weighed into a 50 mL centrifuge tube and 5 mL of acidic water
157 were added. The mixture was hand-shaken for 15 sec and vortex-mixed for 1 min, and 10 mL of
158 CH₃CN were added. After a further step of hand-shaking (15 sec) and vortex mixing (1 min), 2 g of
159 NaCl and 2 g of MgSO₄ were added, and the obtained mixture underwent to additional hand-shaking
160 and vortex-mixing processes. The tube was centrifuged at 1200 x g for 4 min and 1 mL of the CH₃CN
161 supernatant phase was made up to 10 mL with acidic water. The diluted extract was finally filtered
162 with a 0.2 µm RC membrane and analysed by on-line SPPCP-LC-MS/MS. Accordingly, the
163 QuEChERS extraction lasted about 9 min.

164 2.4 *On-line SPE-LC analysis*

165 The system used for the on-line SPE-LC analysis was home-made assembled as schematically
166 illustrated in Fig. S1 of the “Supplementary Material”. The single modular devices were purchased
167 from Shimadzu (Kyoto, Japan) and consisted of two isocratic pumps LC-20AD XR (pumps 1 and 2),
168 an autoinjector SIL-30AC equipped with a 2 mL loop, a low-pressure gradient quaternary pump
169 Nexera X2 LC-30AD (pump 3), a thermostatted column compartment CTO/20AC, a degassing unit
170 DGU-20A 5R, and a module controller CBM-20A. The Shimadzu LC system was coupled with a
171 Vici (Schenk, Switzerland) two-position six-port switching valve model HT. A sorbent cartridge
172 and an analytical column were installed on the six-port valve, as illustrated in Fig. S1.

173 The automatic pre-concentration and purification of the extract consisted in a first step (“loading
174 phase”) in which 2 mL of the QuEChERS extract are loaded into the cartridge, using an appropriate
175 carrier eluent, supplied by pump 1 (see Fig. S1-A of the “Supplementary Material”). Afterwards, the

176 valve is switched so as to allow the mobile phase supplied by pump 3 to back-flush the cartridge and
177 target analyte to be desorbed and transferred into the analytical column (“desorption and injection
178 phase”, see Fig. S1-B of the “Supplementary Material”), where they undergo the chromatographic
179 separation. After the analyte injection in the analytical column, the valve switches in the previous
180 position and the cartridge is fed by pump 2 in order to remove matrix constituents from the sorbent
181 phase; finally the cartridge is re-equilibrated with the loading solvent supplied by pump 1. The entire
182 chromatographic procedure is programmed and automatically controlled by the Analyst[®] software,
183 version 1.6.2 (ABSciex, Ontario, Canada).

184 In the optimized conditions, the QuEChERS extract was diluted ten times with water and then loaded
185 on a Strata-X cartridge at a flow of 11 $\mu\text{L s}^{-1}$, with a mixture of acidic water/CH₃OH 80/20 (v/v),
186 supplied by pump 1 at a flow rate of 1.50 mL min⁻¹ for 3.5 minutes (“loading phase”). Afterwards,
187 the six-port valve switched to the “desorption and injection phase” and target compounds were
188 transferred to the analytical column by the below-reported LC gradient, supplied by pump 3. After 2
189 min, the valve was switched again in the “loading phase” and the cartridge flushed with 100% CH₃CN
190 (pump 2) for 10 min and for further 6 min with acidic water/CH₃OH 80/20 (v/v) (pump 1) (“cartridge
191 washing and re-equilibration phase”).

192 LC analysis was carried out at 25°C, on the PFP column, using acidic LC-MS grade water (A) and
193 CH₃CN (B), as eluents, at a flow rate of 0.450 mL min⁻¹. Gradient elution: 25% B for 1.5 min, from
194 25% to 95% in 5.6 min and a final isocratic for 4 min. Final re-equilibration at 25% B for 7 min.
195 Accordingly, total analysis time per sample, including loop filling, was about 25 min.

196 2.5 Tandem mass spectrometry

197 The LC system was coupled with a 5500 QTrap[™] mass spectrometer (ABSciex), by a Turbo V[™]
198 interface equipped with an ESI probe. Tandem mass analysis was carried out using the Multiple
199 Reaction Monitoring (MRM) mode by negative ESI.

200 Source dependent parameters were optimized in flow injection analysis at optimal LC flow and
201 mobile phase composition and were as follows: Curtain Gas (CUR) 40, Collision-Activated
202 Dissociation Gas (CAD) medium, Temperature (TEM) 550°C, Gas 1 (GS1) 50, Gas 2 (GS2) 50, and
203 Ion Spray Voltage (IS) -4500 V.

204 Compound dependent parameters were optimized by direct infusion of properly diluted standard
205 solution of each analyte (see Table 2).

206 *2.6 Identification and quantification of target analytes*

207 For each investigated compound, the most intense transition was used for quantification and the
208 second most intense, when present, for confirming identification (Table 2). Criteria proposed by the
209 Commission Decision 2002/657/CE were adopted for identity confirmation [24]. The positive
210 identification is achieved when: (i) LC retention time agrees within $\pm 2\%$; (ii) relative abundance of
211 the two transitions, selected as precursor ion and product ion, falls within the permitted tolerances for
212 relative ion intensities using the LC-MS technique.

213 For quantification of target analytes in real samples, the standard addition method was adopted.
214 Accordingly, sludge samples were fortified with four different concentration levels, each one
215 replicated three times, and subjected to the whole analytical process, together with unfortified
216 samples. The spiking procedure was performed by adding 500 μL of CH_3CN standard solution to 1
217 g of dried sludge, the sample was then vigorously vortex stirred and the solvent evaporated at room
218 temperature. Finally, the sludge was incubated for 24 h at 4°C prior analysis.

219 Peak attribution and quantitative determination were performed using MultiQuant software version
220 3.0.2 (ABSciex). All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS[®] software, version 22 (SPSS
221 Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

222 **3 Results and discussion**

223 Structure formula, log K_{OW} and pKa values of the investigated analytes are shown in Fig. S2 of the
224 “Supplementary Material”.

225 *3.1 On-line SPE-LC-MS/MS approach*

226 *3.1.1 Chromatographic behaviour*

227 In this paper the four different commercially available pellicular analytical columns listed in Section
228 2.1 were tested. The use of pellicular analytical columns allows to achieve the same peak capacity of
229 fully porous stationary phases, with larger particle diameters, thus leading to lower backpressures,
230 which are more compatible with the use of on-line SPE cartridges [15].

231 The four stationary phases selected for this study (i.e. C18, BP, PhH and PFP) were characterized by
232 very different functionalization of silica particles, thus covering a wide and interesting range of
233 interactions between target analytes and stationary phases themselves. More in detail, C18 stationary
234 phase, which has been extensively used for LC analysis of pharmaceutical compounds, including
235 NSAIDs [25, 26] is characterized by hydrophobic interactions. PFP, which was employed for NSAID
236 determination only in few cases [27, 28], is conversely distinguished by a much wider set of
237 interactions, including π - π , hydrogen bonding, dipole-dipole and steric ones. A similar broad variety
238 of interactions is also shown by BP and PhH columns, which have been herein investigated for LC
239 analysis of NSAIDs for the first time.

240 As illustrated in Table 2, among target compounds of this study, FEN and KET have the same
241 quantifier MRM transition. Moreover, HYIBUs have common quantifier and/or qualifier transitions,
242 being them positional isomers (see Fig. S2 of the “Supplementary Material”). Hence, the
243 chromatographic separation of these compounds is mandatory for their LC-MS/MS analysis.

244 The chromatographic behaviour of target analytes on the four different stationary phases included in
245 this study was first investigated using mixtures of 0.2% (v/v) aqueous solution of formic acid and

246 methanol or 0.2% (v/v) aqueous solution of formic acid and acetonitrile, as eluents, according to a
247 gradient elution from 10% to 90% of the organic solvent at a column temperature of 25°C. Separation
248 of isobaric compounds was achieved with all stationary phases using CH₃CN as organic solvent,
249 whereas when CH₃OH was adopted, 2-HYIBU and 3-HYIBU were not resolved on the C18 stationary
250 phase, and 3-HYIBU and 1-HYIBU co-eluted on the PFP column. As expected, a general much
251 higher retention was highlighted using CH₃OH instead of CH₃CN, irrespective of the stationary phase
252 employed. More in detail, with the former eluent, PFP and BP columns were the most retentive. PFP
253 stationary phase showed the highest retention with CH₃CN, as well, especially for the more polar
254 analytes (i.e. SAL, ASA and HYIBUs, see log K_{ow} values reported in Fig. S2 of the “Supplementary
255 Material”). In this regard, it should be remarked that a higher analyte retention is more advisable
256 when a reversed-phase SPE step is combined with the analytical chromatography. In fact, in order to
257 achieve a narrow band during the analyte desorption from the cartridge and a satisfactory peak
258 focusing in the analytical column, an aqueous-organic mixture with proper eluting power must be
259 used, so as to minimize the loss of resolution of the chromatographic system, especially for early
260 eluting compounds. Thus, the higher the analyte retention on the analytical column was, the lower
261 was the influence of the initial organic percentage in the eluent employed for desorption from the
262 cartridge on the chromatographic separation.

263 Based on the above-reported findings, BP and PFP columns were used with acidic water/CH₃OH and
264 acidic water/CH₃CN eluent mixtures, respectively.

265 *3.1.2 Optimization of the analyte desorption within the on-line SPE step*

266 Among the few sorbents commercially available as on-line cartridges, those selected for this study
267 were: (i) an octadecyl-bonded silica; (ii) an octyl silica and (iii) a styrene-N-benzylpyrrolidone co-
268 polymeric phase, which provide different retention characteristics. Even though octyl- and octadecyl-
269 bonded silica sorbents are more suitable for the recovery of hydrophobic species from aqueous
270 solutions, they have been also successfully employed for SPE of medium- to high-polarity

271 compounds, such as estrogens [15] and pharmaceuticals [29, 30]. Accordingly, they can be adopted
272 for NSAIDs recovery under proper experimental conditions that essentially concern the use of low
273 loading volumes [31], the use of solvent mixtures with low eluting strength during the SPE step and
274 the pH correction of loaded sample and eluents, in order to prevent ionization of target analytes.

275 The Strata-X cartridge belongs to the group of stationary phases that allows for establishing
276 hydrophilic, π - π bonding, hydrogen bonding and dipole-dipole interactions, which are particularly
277 important for the retention of molecules like drugs, which have multiple functional groups.

278 The three cartridges (i.e. Strata C18-E, Strata C8 and Strata-X) were preliminarily tested to evaluate
279 the desorption profile of target compounds from the SPE sorbents, so as to define the optimal eluent
280 composition to be used for analyte transfer to the analytical column. This latter aspect is very
281 important in order to obtain a narrow chromatographic band during the desorption phase and,
282 consequently, a satisfactory peak focusing in the analytical column.

283 Initially, standard water solutions of target compounds were loaded at room temperature into the SPE
284 sorbents using an acidic water/CH₃OH 90/10 (v/v) mixture as loading carrier and acidic water/CH₃OH
285 or acidic water/CH₃CN as cartridge backflush mixture, with organic solvent percentages included in
286 the range of 20-50%. The use of aqueous methanol mixtures for the desorption of target compounds
287 was not able to provide a good mass transfer from Strata-X, not even by eluting with acidic
288 water/CH₃OH 50/50 (v/v). The strong retention of the N-benzylpyrrolidone polymeric phase was
289 mainly due to the π - π interactions between sorbent and target analytes. Conversely, when C8 and
290 C18-E sorbents were used, a narrow detachment band (i.e. about 30 and 60 sec, respectively) was
291 achieved with methanol percentages of 50% (see Fig. S3 of the “Supplementary Material”). The
292 higher eluting strength of CH₃CN allowed to obtain the desorption of investigated compounds from
293 all the sorbents in a short time window (i.e. 1 min) using percentages of organic solvent of 25% (see
294 Fig. S4 of the “Supplementary Material”).

295 Based on the aforementioned considerations, the subsequent optimization steps have been performed
296 on the following on-line sorbents/analytical column configurations: (a) Strata C8/PFP; (b) Strata C18-

297 E/PFP; (c) Strata-X/PFP; (d) Strata C8/BP and (e) Strata C18-E/BP. According to the
298 chromatographic behaviour observed for the PFP and BP analytical columns (see section 3.1.1), for
299 configurations (a-c) and (d-e), acidic water/CH₃CN and acidic water/CH₃OH mixtures must
300 respectively be used.

301 3.1.3 *On-line SPE-LC-MS/MS chromatographic method*

302 The chromatographic behaviour of target analytes was investigated for the five sorbents/analytical
303 column configurations reported above and common elution gradients were respectively optimized for
304 configurations (a-c) and (d-e), with the aim of identifying the best compromise between
305 chromatographic resolution and analysis time. For this optimization the injection volume was 2000
306 μL (sample drawing speed equal to $11 \mu\text{L s}^{-1}$) and loading solution was acidic water/CH₃OH 90/10
307 (v/v) at the flow rate of 1.50 mL min^{-1} for 3.5 min.

308 For the instrumental configurations (a-c) the separation was carried out at 25°C , with a flow rate of
309 $450 \mu\text{L min}^{-1}$, using acidic water (A) and CH₃CN (B) according to the following gradient elution:
310 25% B for 4.5 min, from 25% to 95% in 5.6 min and final isocratic for 4 min. The “two position six-
311 port” switching valve (see Fig. S1A-B of the “Supplementary Material”) was scheduled as follows:
312 0-3.5 min “loading phase”, 3.5-5.5 min “desorption and injection phase”, 5.5-21.6 min “cartridge
313 washing and re-equilibration phase”. The duration of the whole chromatographic method, including
314 loop filling, sample loading and system re-equilibration, was 24.6 min. Representative
315 chromatograms obtained under the above-mentioned experimental conditions with the Strata-X and
316 Strata C8 coupled with the PFP analytical column are shown in Fig. 1A-B, as examples of the
317 chromatographic behaviour with a-c configurations.

318 Analogously, for configurations (d-e) the column temperature was set at 20°C and the
319 chromatographic analysis was performed at $300 \mu\text{L min}^{-1}$ using acidic water (A) and CH₃OH (B),
320 eluting as follows: 50% B for 8 min, from 50% to 95% in 4.5 min and final isocratic for 4 min. The
321 two position six-port switching valve was scheduled as follows: 0-3.5 min “loading phase”, 3.5-4.5

322 min “desorption and injection phase”, 4.5-22 min “cartridge washing and re-equilibration phase”.
323 Total analysis time per sample, including loop filling, sample loading and system re-equilibration,
324 was 25 min. A representative chromatogram obtained under the above-mentioned experimental
325 conditions with the Strata C18-E/BP configuration is shown in Fig. 1-C, as an example of the
326 chromatographic behaviour with d-e configurations.

327 The chromatographic resolution of the MS/MS isobaric compounds (see Table 2) was achieved on
328 each investigated configuration, even though different elution orders and chromatographic profiles
329 were observed, depending on sorbents and analytical columns used. In any case, a very good peak
330 shape was obtained for O-DMNAP, 4'-HYDIC, KET, FEN, NAP, FLU, IBU and DIC. Conversely,
331 the peak shape of ASA, SAL and HYIBUs resulted to be affected by the different nature of the SPE
332 cartridge; more in details, broader peaks were observed for these compounds when the Strata-X
333 sorbent was used (see Fig. 1-A), due to the multiple interactions, typical of this phase. On the contrary,
334 a better peak focusing was achieved by the C8 and C18 sorbent phases (Fig. 1-BC).

335 Since baseline separation of MS/MS isobaric compounds was obtained in all cases, each proposed
336 configuration was further investigated for the following optimization steps.

337 *3.1.4 Optimization of the dilution factor of QuEChERS extract*

338 The raw QuEChERS extract is typically a CH₃CN solution that cannot be directly loaded into the
339 commonly available sorbent cartridges, the retention mode of which is based on the reversed-phase
340 mechanism. Thus, the raw organic extract must be diluted with water before the SPE procedure, and
341 the dilution factor to be applied is a key-parameter in method development, since it affects the overall
342 method performance. In order to assess the minimum dilution factor to be applied to the raw
343 QuEChERS extract, acidic water/CH₃CN mixtures at the relative percentages of 95/5, 90/10 and
344 80/20 (v/v) (corresponding to dilution factors of 20, 10 and 5, respectively) were properly spiked to
345 final concentrations of 25 ng L⁻¹ for SAL, DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN, KET and NAP, 100 ng L⁻¹ for FLU,
346 IBU and O-DMNAP and 250 ng L⁻¹ for ASA and HYIBUs. The standard solutions were subjected to

347 the on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis using Strata C8, Strata C18-E and Strata-X cartridges coupled
348 to the PFP analytical column. The spiked acidic water/CH₃CN solutions were loaded into the
349 cartridges using an aqueous-methanolic solution containing the minimum organic solvent percentage
350 (i.e. 5%), so as to enhance the influence on the sorbent retention of CH₃CN present in the diluted
351 extract. For each compound, the mean peak areas (n=5) were compared to those obtained from five
352 replicated analysis of a reference standard solution in acidic water (representing the “infinite dilution”
353 of the raw organic extract), containing the aforementioned concentrations of target analytes. Fig. 2-
354 AB illustrates the results obtained for Strata-X and Strata C18-E, the latter as an example of the
355 retention observed for alkyl bonded silica sorbents, which behaved very similarly.

356 For the most lipophilic compounds the retention of alkyl bonded silica and Strata-X sorbents was
357 high for all the acidic water/CH₃CN relative percentages, compared to acidic water 100%, whereas
358 for compounds characterized by the lowest log K_{ow} values (i.e. ASA, SAL, HYIBUs and O-DMNAP,
359 see Fig. S2 of the “Supplementary Material”) a strong analyte loss was observed during the loading
360 step, when the highest CH₃CN percentage (20%) was employed. Furthermore, for SAL and above all
361 ASA, the drop of normalized peak area was evident also for CH₃CN percentages of 10% and 5%,
362 evidencing that even very low percentages of organic solvent in the loading solution significantly
363 hinder the retention of these molecules under the reversed-phase mode. More in detail, irrespective
364 of the cartridge considered, the percent decrease of the chromatographic response with increasing
365 CH₃CN content in the loading solution from 5% to 10% was in the worst case (e.g. SAL with Strata
366 C18-E) less than 40%. Conversely, when CH₃CN percentage increased from 10% to 20% the signal
367 drop was much more relevant, being it about 50%; moreover, using the Strata C18-E, a 50% decrease
368 of the chromatographic area was also observed for HYIBUs (Fig. 2B). In this regard, it should be
369 underlined that signal losses $\geq 50\%$ observed with the doubling of CH₃CN percentage, make
370 negligible the signal increase due to the halving of the dilution factor and the corresponding doubling
371 of the pre-concentration one.

372 Accordingly, an acidic water/CH₃CN 90/10 (v/v) ratio, equivalent to a 1:10 dilution factor of the raw
373 QuEChERS extract, can be considered the best compromise that allows to obtain a high pre-
374 concentration factor, together with satisfactory recoveries.

375 *3.1.5 Influence of the methanol percentage in the loading solution on the recovery profile within*
376 *the on-line SPE step*

377 The recoveries of target analytes during the SPE phase were evaluated for the three investigated
378 sorbents as a function of the eluting strength of the loading solution dispensed by Pump 1. An acidic
379 water/CH₃CN mixture 90/10 (v/v), which simulates the composition of a raw QuEChERS extract
380 after its 1:10 dilution with acidic water, was properly spiked to final concentrations of 25 ng L⁻¹ for
381 DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN, KET and NAP, 100 ng L⁻¹ for FLU, IBU, O-DMNAP and SAL and 250 ng
382 L⁻¹ for HYIBUs. For ASA a spiking concentration of 250 or 1000 ng L⁻¹ was adopted, depending on
383 the sorbent used for the SPE phase.

384 The spiked solution was subjected to the on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis using acidic water/CH₃OH
385 mixtures with relative percentages of organic solvent in the range of 5-30%, as loading solution. The
386 lowest CH₃OH percentage corresponded to the lowest organic solvent concentration necessary to
387 avoid alkyl bonded phase collapse and subsequent retention loss of analytes.

388 This evaluation was performed using the PFP column, according to the elution gradient described in
389 Section 3.1.3. For each eluent composition, five replicated on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis were
390 performed and the corresponding chromatographic areas were compared with those obtained by direct
391 injections (n=5) of equivalent amounts of target analytes. Accordingly, recovery values for a given
392 compound were calculated as the percent ratio of the mean peak area obtained in the on-line SPE
393 configuration and the corresponding mean value obtained by direct injection.

394 Fig. 3 illustrates the mean recovery percentages and corresponding standard deviations obtained for
395 each investigated compound, using Strata-X (Fig. 3A), Strata C18-E (Fig. 3B) and Strata C8 (Fig.
396 3C) cartridges coupled to the PFP column.

397 The Strata-X sorbent (Fig. 3A) exhibited satisfactory recoveries, ranging from 70% to 107%, for all
398 the target analytes and under all the loading conditions tested, with the only exception of ASA (41%)
399 using 30% CH₃OH in the loading solution. The use of CH₃OH percentages as high as 30% was not
400 investigated on octadecyl (Fig. 3B) and octyl (Fig. 3C) silica sorbents since with a percentage of the
401 organic solvent as high as 20% CH₃OH, ASA and SAL were washed out of the sorbents.

402 The acidic water/CH₃OH ratios 90/10 and 80/20 (v/v) showed similar recoveries for all target
403 compounds. Accordingly, the latter relative percentage was chosen for the loading solution, being it
404 the best compromise between satisfactory recovery and efficient clean-up of the matrix in the analysis
405 of real samples.

406 Data reported in Fig. 3, together with those discussed in the previous sections, indicated the feasibility
407 of using Strata-X sorbent for the on-line SPE analysis of QuEChERS extracts, after their 1:10
408 dilution, employing an acidic water/CH₃OH 80/20 (v/v) loading solution and performing the LC-
409 MS/MS analysis on the PFP column under the optimized elution conditions reported in the Section
410 3.1.3.

411 3.1.6 Instrumental figure of merits of the SPE configuration

412 Before investigating real QuEChERS extracts, this instrumental configuration was preliminarily
413 evaluated for limits of detection (LODs), limits of quantification (LOQs), linearity and precision by
414 replicated injections of standard solutions in acidic water/CH₃CN 90/10 (see Table S1 of the
415 “Supplementary Materials”). LODs and LOQs were taken as the minimum concentrations of target
416 analytes that give rise to a signal to noise ratio (s/n) equal to 3 and 10, respectively. LODs were
417 included in the range 0.33-36 ng L⁻¹, which represents sensitivities higher or comparable with those
418 recently obtained for target analytes on environmental waters using on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS [32-34].
419 The linearity was investigated by replicated analyses (n=5) of standard solutions from four to ten
420 calibration levels. Concentration ranges from LOQs to 5000-10000 ng L⁻¹ were chosen, depending
421 on the analyte, in order to cover a concentration linearity range of about three magnitude orders (Table

422 S1). Determination coefficients (R^2) ≥ 0.992 were obtained in all cases. Intra-day ($RSD\%_{\text{intra}}$) and
423 inter-day ($RSD\%_{\text{inter}}$) precision were evaluated by ten replicated injections of standard solutions, at
424 concentration levels twice higher than LOQs. $RSD\%_{\text{intra}}$ and $RSD\%_{\text{inter}}$ values were found in the
425 ranges of 1.7-8.2% and 4.1-9.9%, respectively.

426 3.2 *QuEChERS extraction*

427 The QuEChERS approach mainly involves two steps: (i) a water/ CH_3CN salting-out liquid/liquid
428 partition of target analytes desorbed from the solid matrix and (ii) a d-SPE for the clean-up of the
429 CH_3CN extract. For the first time, in this paper, d-SPE clean-up is replaced with the on-line SPE
430 approach that allows the automated pre-concentration and purification of the raw QuEChERS extract
431 (see Section 3.1), together with LC-MS/MS analysis.

432 The QuEChERS method is usually applied to solid matrixes with a high water content (e.g. fruit and
433 vegetables) and, if dried samples are extracted, their rehydration before QuEChERS procedure is
434 recommended for increasing analyte recovery; moreover, an excess of solvent compared with the
435 sample is suggested for improving the extraction efficiency [4] and the use of solvent/sample ratios
436 up to ten has been proposed for the analysis of organic micropollutants in sludge [11].

437 In our study a QuEChERS procedure, employing CH_3CN as extractant, 2 g of NaCl and MgSO_4 as
438 salting-out agents and a sample/ $\text{H}_2\text{O}/\text{CH}_3\text{CN}$ ratio of 1/5/10 ($w/v/v$), was adopted (see Section 2.3).

439 3.2.1 *Extraction efficiency of the QuEChERS procedure*

440 In order to evaluate the QuEChERS extraction efficiency, three 1 g-aliquots of the “sludge mix” (see
441 Section 2.2 for further details) were fortified with mass labelled compounds (5 ng g^{-1} for DIC D4 and
442 KET D3, 10 ng g^{-1} for ASA D3 and NAP D3, 25 ng g^{-1} for IBU D3 and 2-HYIBU D6). It should be
443 noted that these compounds cover the entire range of physicochemical properties of the investigated
444 molecules (e.g. log K_{OW} and acid-base properties, see Fig. S2 of the “Supplementary Material”) and
445 are therefore representative of the whole set of target analytes.

446 The spiking procedure was performed by adding 500 μL of the CH_3CN standard solution
447 (concentration range from 10 to 50 ng mL^{-1} , depending on the compound investigated) to 1 g of dried
448 sludge, the sample was then vigorously vortex stirred and the solvent was evaporated at room
449 temperature. Finally, the sludge was incubated for 24 h at 4°C. The spiked samples were subjected to
450 the QuEChERS extraction, followed by the on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis; the resulting mean
451 areas (n=3) were compared to the mean areas (n=3) obtained by spiking the QuEChERS extract of a
452 non-fortified representative sample with equivalent amounts of mass labelled compounds (i.e. 0.5 ng
453 mL^{-1} for DIC D4 and KET D3, 1 ng mL^{-1} for ASA D3 and NAP D3, 2.5 ng mL^{-1} for IBU D3 and 2-
454 HYIBU D6).

455 Filtration of QuEChERS extracts before on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis was carried out on RC
456 membranes, which guaranteed the absence of adsorption phenomena towards target analytes (see Fig.
457 S5 of the “Supplementary Material”).

458 The QuEChERS extraction efficiency of mass labelled analytes was found in the range of 80-94%.
459 and resulted therefore suitable for the extraction of selected NSAIDs and their metabolites from
460 sewage sludge.

461 3.3 *Method recovery evaluation*

462 3.3.1 *Overall analytical process efficiency*

463 The overall method performance for the analysis of real samples are expected to be affected by the
464 presence of the co-extracted matrix components, which may: (i) interfere with the partitioning
465 processes within the on-line SPE step, thus decreasing the overall analytical recovery (RE%) [35]
466 and (ii) alter the efficiency of the ionization process in the MS source. The latter phenomenon, which
467 affects method sensitivity and accuracy is commonly referred as “matrix effect” (ME%) [36].

468 The evaluation of these effects is of paramount importance for a reliable quantification of target
469 compounds in real samples. Accordingly, in this study the combination of RE% and ME% has been
470 initially evaluated in terms of overall analytical process efficiency (PE%) [35]. To this aim, three

471 aliquots (1 g each) of the “sludge mix” were fortified to three different concentration levels (spike
472 level 1: 5 ng g⁻¹ for SAL, DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN and KET; 10 ng g⁻¹ for ASA, NAP and O-DMNAP;
473 25 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU and HYIBUs; spike level 2: 25 ng g⁻¹ for SAL, DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN and
474 KET; 50 ng g⁻¹ for ASA, NAP and O-DMNAP; 125 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU and HYIBUs; spike level
475 3: 250 ng g⁻¹ for SAL, DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN and KET; 500 ng g⁻¹ for ASA, NAP and O-DMNAP;
476 1250 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU and HYIBUs).

477 For each compound and spike level, PE% was defined as follows:

478
$$PE\% = \frac{A_{\text{spiked}} - A_{\text{unspiked}}}{A_{\text{standard}}} \cdot 100$$

479 where A_{spiked} is the mean chromatographic area of three replicated QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-
480 MS/MS analysis of the fortified “sludge mix”; A_{unspiked} is the mean peak area of three replicated
481 QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis of the unspiked “sludge mix”; A_{standard} is the mean
482 chromatographic area (n=3) obtained by direct injection of an equivalent amount of the analyte in
483 CH₃CN. The results, illustrated in Table 3, indicate different trends of PE% values as a function of
484 the spike levels, depending on the analyte considered. For most analytes, no statistically significant
485 differences were observed at the three fortification levels investigated. Conversely, for ASA, DIC,
486 4'-HYDIC and KET, PE% values found at the fortification level 1 were significantly higher than
487 those determined at higher spiking concentrations. Finally, for FLU and NAP a slight increasing PE%
488 trend was evidenced. Very good overall method performances were observed for HYIBUs and O-
489 DMNAP, which showed PE% values in the range of 71-94%. Very low PE% values ($\leq 30\%$) were
490 conversely found for 4'-HYDIC and FEN, whereas intermediate performances (PE% = 31-67%) were
491 found for the remaining compounds.

492 These results strongly differed from those previously obtained during the performance evaluation of
493 the on-line SPE procedure (see Section 3.1.5), indicating that the sample matrix actually affects the
494 SPE step and/or the analyte detection via tandem mass spectrometry.

495 3.3.2 *Matrix effect and recovery evaluations of the QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS method*

496 The evaluation of the “matrix effect” occurring in MS source is performed by comparing the signal
497 in solvent of a certain amount of a given analyte, with the one obtained from the injection of a sample
498 or an extract containing the same amount of the analyte [36]. Accordingly, in our case, the sample
499 fraction that should be injected into the analytical column after the SPE step (purified matrix) was
500 collected and fortified with target analytes, as followed specified: 2 mL-aliquots of the QuEChERS
501 diluted extract (obtained from the extraction of the “sludge mix”) were loaded onto the cartridge
502 (“loading phase”, see Fig. S1-A of the “Supplementary Material”), treated according to the SPE
503 procedure (see Fig. S1-B of the “Supplementary Material”) and finally collected without being
504 introduced in the analytical column. More in detail, in accordance with the SPE procedure described
505 in Section 3.1.3, about 900 μ L-aliquots of the purified matrix were collected.

506 The matrix effect was evaluated through the standard addition method, by spiking the purified matrix
507 with the following different equally-spaced amounts of target analytes: 10-20-30-40 pg for SAL, DIC,
508 4'-HYDIC, and KET; 50-100-150-200 pg for ASA, FEN and NAP; 150-300-450-600 pg for FLU,
509 IBU and O-DMNAP; 250-500-750-1000 pg for HYIBUs. The same amounts of target compounds
510 were added to a reference solution with a solvent composition equal to the purified matrix (i.e. acidic
511 water/CH₃CN 75/25). In both cases a final volume of 900 μ L was obtained. Direct injections (n=3)
512 of the whole 900 μ L-aliquots of spiked purified matrix aliquots and reference solutions were
513 performed, and the mean peak areas obtained were plotted as a function of the amount of added
514 compound.

515 Matrix effect percentage (ME%) was defined as:

516
$$\text{ME}\% = \frac{S_{\text{purified matrix}}}{S_{\text{solvent}}} \cdot 100 - 100$$

517 where $S_{\text{purified matrix}}$ and S_{solvent} are the slopes of the calibration lines in matrix and in solvent (i.e. acidic
518 water/CH₃CN 75/25), respectively. ME% values higher or lower than 0 indicate the presence of signal
519 enhancement or suppression in comparison with the instrumental response observed in solvent.

520 However, $|\text{ME}\%| \leq 20\%$, is considered by several authors to have a negligible influence on the
521 analytical performance [37-39]. In our study, ME% was always found to be suppressive, being it
522 included between -21% and -47% for SAL, 4'-HYDIC, FEN and FLU and $\leq 20\%$ for the others
523 compounds (Fig. 4). These results are very satisfactory and indicate the high clean-up efficiency of
524 the proposed SPE procedure, especially considering that biological sludge is an extremely complex
525 matrix. Peysson et al. [13], who performed a multiresidual study on 136 pharmaceuticals and
526 hormones in aerobic biological sludge using an optimized QuEChERS extraction followed by d-SPE
527 with PSA and LC-ESI-TOF-MS analysis, reported strong matrix effects for the determination of IBU,
528 KET, DIC and SAL (i.e. from -80% to +251%); moreover, ME found for NAP was so high to prevent
529 its determination. High suppressive matrix effects were also observed by Jelic et al. (i.e. from -14%
530 to -79%) and above all Radjenovic et al. (i.e. from -52% to -85%) for the LC-ESI-MS/MS analysis
531 of DIC, NAP, IBU and KET in aerobic biological sludge from two Spanish WWTPs, after pressurized
532 liquid extraction (PLE) and extract clean-up on a styrene-N-vinylpyrrolidone co-polymeric phase [23,
533 40], which is very similar to the Strata-X sorbent herein selected for the SPE analytical step (see
534 Section 3.1.5).

535 Matuszewski et al. (2003) [35] highlighted the dependency existing among PE%, ME% and RE% by
536 the equation 2:

$$537 \quad \text{RE}\% = \frac{\text{PE}\%}{\text{ME}\% + 100}$$

538 that allows for estimating the overall method recovery when PE% and ME% are known.

539 Table 3 illustrates the RE% ranges of target analytes, corresponding to the PE% values obtained at
540 the three spiking levels and reported in the same table. Recoveries higher than 80% were obtained for
541 HYIBUs and O-DMNAP; moreover, for these analytes, the recovery ranges were quite narrow
542 (difference between minimum and maximum RE% $\approx 10\%$). For ASA, SAL and KET, RE% values
543 were lower, even though still satisfactory, being them in any case $\geq 50\%$. The lowest observed
544 recoveries were in the range 40%-50% and concerned the most hydrophobic compounds.

545 According to the RE% values discussed above, the most polar analytes (i.e. ASA, SAL, HYIBUs and
546 O-DMNAP, $\log K_{ow} \leq 2.25$) exhibited RE% in matrix comparable with those in solvent, whereas for
547 the most hydrophobic compounds, larger differences were found (Fig. 3A), thus evidencing in the
548 latter case a stronger competitive effect of matrix components on the partitioning process occurring
549 during the SPE phase.

550 Our RE% values can be compared to the ones obtained in the studies mentioned above with regards
551 to the matrix effect. Peysson et al. [13], who attempted the RE% calculation at three different spike
552 levels (250, 1000 and 25000 ng g⁻¹), obtained results for SAL, DIC, KET and IBU only at the highest
553 spiking concentration (RE% = 48-98%), due to a low method sensitivity; moreover, for NAP, the
554 very strong matrix signal suppression did not allow any recovery evaluation. The recovery data herein
555 obtained were comparable or higher than those achieved by Radjenovic and co-workers [23], for
556 KET, IBU and NAP (33-49%), whereas for DIC the same authors reported a value as high as 122%.
557 The same extraction and clean-up procedure performed on aerobic sludge collected in two Spanish
558 WWTPs, showed for these analytes a much higher recovery performance (from 81% to 125%) [40],
559 highlighting that the analysis of similar matrixes can give rise to very different method performances.

560 3.3.3 Evaluation of the overall method sensitivity and precision

561 The QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS method was evaluated for sensitivity, linearity and
562 precision. Table 4 summarizes the results obtained for these performance parameters.

563 Method detection limits (MDLs) were established by replicated analysis (n=5) of 1 g-aliqouts of the
564 “sludge mix” sample spiked with decreasing concentrations of target compounds and were taken as
565 the concentration that gave rise to a mean signal-to-noise ratio (s/n) equal to three. The MQLs were
566 assessed by the same approach, but considering s/n equal to ten.

567 Very good method sensitivities were achieved for target analytes in the optimized experimental
568 conditions, being MDLs and MQLs included in the ranges of 0.065-6.7 and 0.22-22 ng g⁻¹,
569 respectively (Table 4). These limits were found to be lower or comparable than others previously

570 published regarding the LC-MS/MS analysis of NSAIDs in sludge samples processed with various
571 sample preparation techniques, with the exception of the determination of IBU and NAP by Jelic and
572 co-workers, who quantified these analytes at one-two magnitude orders lower (see Table S2 of the
573 “Supplementary Material”) [13, 23, 40, 41].

574 Linearity was evaluated in matrix, by spiking a “sludge mix” QuEChERS extract to concentration
575 ranges included between MQLs and 500-1000 ng g⁻¹, depending on the analyte investigated. Hence,
576 two-three magnitude orders were covered, obtaining in any case R² ≥ 0.995 (Table 4).

577 Finally, the method showed very good intra-day and inter-day precisions, with RSD%_{intra} and
578 RSD%_{inter} in the ranges of 3.1-9.6% and 5.1-12.8%, respectively, as estimated by means of triplicated
579 QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis of a representative sludge sample spiked to the
580 following final concentration: 5 ng g⁻¹ for SAL; 10 ng g⁻¹ for ASA, DIC, 4'-HYDIC, KET, NAP and
581 FEN; 25 ng g⁻¹ for O-DMNAP; 50 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU and HYIBUs.

582 3.4 Method application to real samples

583 The method was successfully applied to the identification and quantitative determination of selected
584 NSAIDs and their metabolites in sewage sludge samples collected in the five WWTPs described in
585 the Section 2.2. Matrix matched calibration approach and sample spiking with surrogate standards
586 (2.5 ng g⁻¹ for DIC D4 and KET D3; 10 ng g⁻¹ ASA D3 and NAP D3; 25 ng g⁻¹ for IBU D3 and 2-
587 HYIBU D6) were adopted for ME correction and PE evaluation.

588 Table 5 summarizes the mean concentrations of NSAIDs and their metabolites found in real sludge
589 samples. For target compounds detected in real samples with s/n values in between 3 and 10 the
590 MDL-MQL interval was reported.

591 The highest number of analytes (eight out of the thirteen target compounds) was detected in sample
592 A, which refers to the sludge collected in the “Baciacavallo” WWTP, the facility receiving by far the
593 highest hydraulic loading (about 130000 m³ d⁻¹ of treated wastewater, compared to 2000-40000 m³
594 d⁻¹ of the other WWTPs), with a large percentage of civil contribution (about 60%). Interestingly, a

595 high number of NSAID metabolites was generally detected in the investigated samples, thus
596 highlighting the importance to include these analytes in environmental studies regarding this drug
597 class. As an example, Fig. 5 illustrates the MRM chromatograms that highlight the presence of IBU,
598 1-HYIBU, 2-HYIBU and 3-HYIBU in in the spiked “sludge mix” and in a sludge sample collected
599 at the Baciacavallo facility.

600 SAL was quantified in all samples, even when its precursor (i.e. ASA) was below MDL (see Table
601 5) and in four out of the five investigated sludge was the most abundant analyte. In this regard, it
602 should be noted that in a recent database focusing on the fate of 184 pharmaceuticals, personal care
603 products and their metabolites in European WWTPs, SAL was reported as the predominant
604 compound in the inlet [42]. Moreover, among the elsewhere investigated pharmaceutical compounds
605 and metabolites, SAL was found as the most abundant analyte in biological sludge from various
606 European WWTPs [9, 43]. However, for this compound an important natural contribution can be
607 hypothesized, since it is synthesized by plants within the shikimate pathway [44].

608 Within the other NSAIDs herein studied, DIC, FLU, KET, IBU and NAP were the analyte most
609 frequently investigated in sludge samples [9, 10, 13, 23, 40, 41, 43, 45]. For a same NSAID (e.g. IBU
610 and KET), very wide concentration ranges (from below detection limits to hundreds of ng g⁻¹) and
611 frequency of occurrence were observed, depending on the geographical area and the kind of WWTP
612 investigated, which however treated in all cases municipal wastewater. In this regard, it should also
613 be remarked that the sensitivity of the analytical method employed was in some cases not suitable for
614 assessing concentration levels of few ng g⁻¹ or lower, thus determining a sort of “zero level
615 occurrence” of most target analytes [10, 13, 23, 41]. Concentrations and number of positive samples
616 herein found for these analytes were generally lower than those elsewhere reported, notwithstanding
617 the high sensitivity provided by our on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS method. This finding was probably due
618 to the peculiar textile-municipal mixed origin of wastewater treated in the WWTPs investigated in
619 this study.

620 **4 Conclusions**

621 The QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS method proposed in this paper represents an innovation in
622 terms of sample preparation and analysis of NSAIDs and their metabolites in sewage sludge, one of
623 the more complex environmental matrices, from the analytical viewpoint. In fact, for the first time,
624 the QuEChERS extraction of biological sludge was successfully coupled with a fully automatic pre-
625 concentration and purification of the extract and the LC-MS/MS analysis. This analytical approach
626 offers several advantages, such as the minimization of sample handling and the improvement of the
627 overall analytical throughput, being the total analysis time (about 30 min per sample) the lowest
628 reported in literature.

629 Both the QuEChERS extraction and the chromatographic analysis were optimized, providing
630 satisfactory overall method recoveries and low matrix effects. Very low detection limits (from tens
631 of pg g^{-1} to ng g^{-1} of freeze-dried sludge, depending on the compound considered) were also achieved.
632 Even though this study was not designed as an environmental monitoring of target compounds in
633 sludge and included only a few samples collected in a brief period, the results showed that NSAIDs
634 and, above all their metabolites, are present in the investigated matrix.

635 **References**

- 636 [1] M. Anastassiades, S.J. Lehotay, D. Stajnbaher, F.J. Schenck, Fast and easy multiresidue
637 method employing acetonitrile extraction/partitioning and “dispersive solid-phase extraction”
638 for the determination of pesticide residues in produce, *J. AOAC Int.*, 86 (2003) 412-431.
639 [2] S.J. Lehotay, K. Maštovská, A.R. Lightfield, Use of buffering and other means to improve
640 results of problematic pesticides in a fast and easy method for residue analysis of fruits and
641 vegetables, *J. AOAC Int.*, 88 (2005) 615-629.
642 [3] M. Anastassiades, E. Scherbaum, B. Taşdelen, Recent Developments in QuEChERS
643 Methodology for Pesticide Multiresidue Analysis, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA2007.
644 [4] M.C. Bruzzoniti, L. Checchini, R.M. De Carlo, S. Orlandini, L. Rivoira, M. Del Bubba, QuEChERS
645 sample preparation for the determination of pesticides and other organic residues in
646 environmental matrices: a critical review, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 406 (2014) 4089-4116.
647 [5] R.M. De Carlo, L. Rivoira, L. Ciofi, C. Ancillotti, L. Checchini, M. Del Bubba, M.C. Bruzzoniti,
648 Evaluation of different QuEChERS procedures for the recovery of selected drugs and herbicides
649 from soil using LC coupled with UV and pulsed amperometry for their detection, *Anal. Bioanal.*
650 *Chem.*, 407 (2015) 1217-1229.

651 [6] D.A. Bright, N. Healey, Contaminant risks from biosolids land application: Contemporary
652 organic contaminant levels in digested sewage sludge from five treatment plants in Greater
653 Vancouver, British Columbia, *Environ. Pollut.*, 126 (2003) 39-49.

654 [7] R.P. Singh, M. Agrawal, Potential benefits and risks of land application of sewage sludge,
655 *Waste Manag.*, 28 (2008) 347-358.

656 [8] O. Zuloaga, P. Navarro, E. Bizkarguenaga, A. Iparraguirre, A. Vallejo, M. Olivares, A. Prieto,
657 Overview of extraction, clean-up and detection techniques for the determination of organic
658 pollutants in sewage sludge: A review, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 736 (2012) 7-29.

659 [9] B. Albero, C. Sánchez-Brunete, E. Miguel, R. Aznar, J.L. Tadeo, Determination of selected
660 pharmaceutical compounds in biosolids by supported liquid extraction and gas
661 chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1336 (2014) 52-58.

662 [10] K. Kimura, H. Hara, Y. Watanabe, Elimination of Selected Acidic Pharmaceuticals from
663 Municipal Wastewater by an Activated Sludge System and Membrane Bioreactors, *Environ. Sci.*
664 *Technol.*, 41 (2007) 3708-3714.

665 [11] P. Herrero, F. Borrull, E. Pocurull, R.M. Marce, A quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged and
666 safe extraction method followed by liquid chromatography-(Orbitrap) high resolution mass
667 spectrometry to determine benzotriazole, benzothiazole and benzenesulfonamide derivatives in
668 sewage sludge, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1339 (2014) 34-41.

669 [12] M.B.R. Cerqueira, J.R. Guilherme, S.S. Caldas, M.L. Martins, R. Zanella, E.G. Primel,
670 Evaluation of the QuEChERS method for the extraction of pharmaceuticals and personal care
671 products from drinking-water treatment sludge with determination by UPLC-ESI-MS/MS,
672 *Chemosphere*, 107 (2014) 74-82.

673 [13] W. Peysson, E. Vulliet, Determination of 136 pharmaceuticals and hormones in sewage
674 sludge using quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged and safe extraction followed by analysis with
675 liquid chromatography–time-of-flight-mass spectrometry, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1290 (2013) 46-
676 61.

677 [14] M.B.R. Cerqueira, S.S. Caldas, E.G. Primel, New sorbent in the dispersive solid phase
678 extraction step of quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged, and safe for the extraction of organic
679 contaminants in drinking water treatment sludge, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1336 (2014) 10-22.

680 [15] L. Ciofi, D. Fibbi, U. Chiuminatto, E. Coppini, L. Checchini, M. Del Bubba, Fully-automated
681 on-line solid phase extraction coupled to high-performance liquid chromatography–tandem
682 mass spectrometric analysis at sub-ng/L levels of selected estrogens in surface water and
683 wastewater, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1283 (2013) 53-61.

684 [16] B.T. Røen, S.R. Sellevåg, E. Lundanes, On-line solid phase extraction-liquid
685 chromatography–mass spectrometry for trace determination of nerve agent degradation
686 products in water samples, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 761 (2013) 109-116.

687 [17] T. Vega-Morales, Z. Sosa-Ferrera, J. Santana-Rodríguez, Development and optimisation of
688 an on-line solid phase extraction coupled to ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography–
689 tandem mass spectrometry methodology for the simultaneous determination of endocrine
690 disrupting compounds in wastewater samples, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1230 (2012) 66-76.

691 [18] Osservatorio Nazionale sull'Impiego dei Medicinali (OSMED), National Report on
692 Medicines use in Italy. Year 2013 Roma, 2015.

693 [19] Y. Zhou, D.M. Boudreau, A.N. Freedman, Trends in the use of aspirin and nonsteroidal anti-
694 inflammatory drugs in the general U.S. population, *Pharmacoepidemiol. Drug Saf.*, 23 (2014)
695 43-50.

696 [20] A. Inotai, B. Hankó, Á. Mészáros, Trends in the non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug
697 market in six Central–Eastern European countries based on retail information,
698 *Pharmacoepidemiol. Drug Saf.*, 19 (2010) 183-190.

699 [21] M. Gonzalez-Rey, M.J. Bebianno, Effects of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID)
700 diclofenac exposure in mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis*, *Aquat. Toxicol.*, 148 (2014) 221-230.

701 [22] K. Ji, X. Liu, S. Lee, S. Kang, Y. Kho, J.P. Giesy, K. Choi, Effects of non-steroidal anti-
702 inflammatory drugs on hormones and genes of the hypothalamic-pituitary-gonad axis, and
703 reproduction of zebrafish, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 254-255 (2013) 242-251.

704 [23] J. Radjenović, A. Jelić, M. Petrović, D. Barceló, Determination of pharmaceuticals in sewage
705 sludge by pressurized liquid extraction (PLE) coupled to liquid chromatography-tandem mass
706 spectrometry (LC-MS/MS), *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 393 (2009) 1685-1695.

707 [24] Commission of the European Communities, Commission decision of 12 August 2002
708 Implementing Council Directive 96/23/EC Concerning the Performance of Analytical Methods
709 and the Interpretation of Results (2002/657/EC), Bruxelles, 2002.

710 [25] A. Gentili, Determination of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in environmental
711 samples by chromatographic and electrophoretic techniques, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 387 (2007)
712 1185-1202.

713 [26] N. Vieno, Occurrence of Pharmaceuticals in Finnish Sewage Treatment Plants, Surface
714 Water, and Their Elimination in Drinking Water Treatment Processes, Tampere University of
715 Technology, 666 (2007).

716 [27] J. Blanca, R. Muñoz, P. Muñoz, A. Aranda, R. Díaz, M. Martín de Pozuelo, Analysis of
717 Phenylbutazone residues in horse muscle, *Revista del Comité Científico de la AESAN*, 17 235-
718 246.

719 [28] W. Long, Fast Screening Methods for Analgesics and Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory
720 (NSAIDS) Drugs by HPLC with Agilent Poroshell 120 Columns, *LC-GC Europe*, 27 (2014) 387.

721 [29] D. Mutavdžić Pavlović, S. Babić, D. Dolar, D. Ašperger, K. Košutić, A.J. Horvat, M. Kaštelan-
722 Macan, Development and optimization of the SPE procedure for determination of pharmaceuticals in
723 water samples by HPLC-diode array detection, *J. Sep. Sci.*, 33 (2010) 258-267.

724 [30] D.M. Pavlović, D. Ašperger, D. Tolić, S. Babić, Development and optimization of the
725 determination of pharmaceuticals in water samples by SPE and HPLC with diode-array
726 detection, *J. Sep. Sci.*, 36 (2013) 3042-3049.

727 [31] S. Rodriguez-Mozaz, M.J. Lopez de Alda, D. Barceló, Picogram per liter level determination
728 of estrogens in natural waters and waterworks by a fully automated on-line solid-phase
729 extraction-liquid chromatography-electrospray tandem mass spectrometry method, *Anal.*
730 *Chem.*, 76 (2004) 6998-7006.

731 [32] R.H. Lindberg, M. Östman, U. Olofsson, R. Grabic, J. Fick, Occurrence and behaviour of 105
732 active pharmaceutical ingredients in sewage waters of a municipal sewer collection system,
733 *Water Res.*, 58 (2014) 221-229.

734 [33] A. Togola, N. Baran, C. Coureau, Advantages of online SPE coupled with UPLC/MS/MS for
735 determining the fate of pesticides and pharmaceutical compounds, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 406
736 (2013) 1181-1191.

737 [34] C. Wang, P.R. Gardinali, Detection and occurrence of microconstituents in reclaimed water
738 used for irrigation - a potentially overlooked source, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 405 (2013) 5925-
739 5935.

740 [35] B. Matuszewski, M. Constanzer, C. Chavez-Eng, Strategies for the assessment of matrix
741 effect in quantitative bioanalytical methods based on HPLC-MS/MS, *Anal. Chem.*, 75 (2003)
742 3019-3030.

743 [36] H. Trufelli, P. Palma, G. Famigliani, A. Cappiello, An overview of matrix effects in liquid
744 chromatography-mass spectrometry, *Mass Spectrom. Rev.*, 30 (2011) 491-509.

745 [37] V.C. Fernandes, V.F. Domingues, N. Mateus, C. Delerue-Matos, Multiresidue pesticides
746 analysis in soils using modified QuEChERS with disposable pipette extraction and dispersive
747 solid-phase extraction, *J. Sep. Sci.*, 36 (2013) 376-382.

748 [38] A.G. Frenich, R. Romero-González, M.L. Gómez-Pérez, J.L.M. Vidal, Multi-mycotoxin analysis
749 in eggs using a QuEChERS-based extraction procedure and ultra-high-pressure liquid

750 chromatography coupled to triple quadrupole mass spectrometry, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1218
751 (2011) 4349-4356.

752 [39] M. Mei, D. Zhen-Xia, C. Yun, QuEChERS-ultra-performance liquid chromatography tandem
753 mass spectrometry for determination of five currently used herbicides, *Chinese J. Anal. Chem.*,
754 39 (2011) 1659-1664.

755 [40] A. Jelić, M. Petrović, D. Barceló, Multi-residue method for trace level determination of
756 pharmaceuticals in solid samples using pressurized liquid extraction followed by liquid
757 chromatography/quadrupole-linear ion trap mass spectrometry, *Talanta*, 80 (2009) 363-371.


758 [41] T.A. Ternes, M. Bonerz, N. Herrmann, D. Löffler, E. Keller, B.B. Lacida, A.C. Alder,
759 Determination of pharmaceuticals, iodinated contrast media and musk fragrances in sludge by
760 LC tandem MS and GC/MS, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1067 (2005) 213-223.

761 [42] C. Miège, J.M. Choubert, L. Ribeiro, M. Eusèbe, M. Coquery, Fate of pharmaceuticals and
762 personal care products in wastewater treatment plants – Conception of a database and first
763 results, *Environ. Pollut.*, 157 (2009) 1721-1726.

764 [43] J. Kumirska, N. Migowska, M. Caban, P. Łukaszewicz, P. Stepnowski, Simultaneous
765 determination of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and oestrogenic hormones in
766 environmental solid samples, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 508 (2015) 498-505.

767 [44] R. Fuoco, P. Bogani, G. Capodaglio, M. Del Bubba, O. Abollino, S. Giannarelli, M.M. Spiriti, B.
768 Muscatello, S. Doumett, C. Turetta, R. Zangrando, V. Zelano, M. Buiatti, Response to metal stress
769 of *Nicotiana langsdorffii* plants wild-type and transgenic for the rat glucocorticoid receptor
770 gene, *J. Plant Physiol.*, 170 (2013) 668-675.


771 [45] J. Radjenović, M. Petrović, D. Barceló, Fate and distribution of pharmaceuticals in
772 wastewater and sewage sludge of the conventional activated sludge (CAS) and advanced
773 membrane bioreactor (MBR) treatment, *Water Res.*, 43 (2009) 831-841.



774

775 **Fig. 1.** Reconstructed MRM chromatograms based on the quantifier transitions illustrating the elution
 776 order on the resolution of target compounds on the investigated instrumental configurations. (A)
 777 Strata-X/PFP; (B) Strata C8/PFP; (C) Strata C18-E/BP (see paragraph 3.1.3). Peak number: (1) ASA;
 778 (2) 2-HYIBU; (3) 3-HYIBU; (4) 1-HYIBU; (5) O-DMNAP; (6) SAL; (7) 4'-HYDIC; (8) KET; (9)
 779 FEN (10) NAP; (11) FLU; (12) IBU; (13) DIC (see paragraph 2.1 for acronyms meaning).

780



781


782 **Fig. 2.** Mean values (n=5) of normalized peak areas of target analytes obtained after the on-line SPE-
 783 LC-MS/MS analysis as a function of the dilution factor applied to a reference standard solution in
 784 CH₃CN (see paragraph 3.1.4) on following SPE cartridges: (A) Strata-X; (B) Strata C18-E. Error bars
 785 represent standard deviations. Values with the same letter are not statistically different at 5%
 786 significance level according to the Dunnett T3 nonparametric test. See paragraph 2.1 for acronyms
 787 meaning.

788

789


790

791



792

793 **Fig. 3.** Mean values (n=5) of recovery percentage of target analytes in acidic water/CH₃CN 90/10
 794 solution as a function of the acidic water/methanol relative percentage in the eluent mixture employed
 795 during the “loading phase”. (A) Strata-X; (B) Strata C18-E; (C) Strata C8. Error bars represent
 796 standard deviations. Values with the same letter are not statistically different at 5% significance level
 797 according to the Dunnett T3 nonparametric test. See paragraph 2.1 for acronyms meaning.




798

799 **Fig. 4.** Mean values (n=3) of matrix effect for target analytes obtained submitting a representative
 800 sludge sample to the QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS analysis. Error bars represent standard
 801 deviations. See paragraph 2.1 for acronyms meaning.

802

803



804

805 **Fig. 5.** MRM chromatogram, retention times (Rt) and signal-to-noise ratio (s/n) of selected
 806 compounds in the spiked “sludge mix” (first row) and in a sludge sample collected at the Baciacavallo
 807 WWTP (second row). (A) 2-HYIBU (Rt=6.91, 30 ng g⁻¹), 3-HYIBU (Rt=7.44, 30 ng g⁻¹) and 1-
 808 HYIBU (Rt=8.01, 30 ng g⁻¹); (B) IBU (Rt=10.15, 40 ng g⁻¹); (C) 2-HYIBU (Rt=6.90, 5.6-18 ng g⁻¹),
 809 3-HYIBU (Rt=7.48, 5.0-16 ng g⁻¹) and 1-HYIBU (Rt=8.06, 15.3 ng g⁻¹); (D) IBU (Rt=10.20, 6.7-22
 810 ng g⁻¹). Note that for compounds detected with s/n included in the range 3-10, the MDL-MQL interval
 811 was reported. See paragraph 2.1 for acronyms meanin

812 **Table 1.** Characteristics of the sorbent cartridges investigated in this study.

Support	Functionalization	Commercial name	Carbon load (%)	Surface area (m ² g ⁻¹)	Particle size (μm)	Dimension (mm)
Silica	Octadecyl endcapped	Strata C18-E	18	500	20	20 x 2
Silica	Octyl	Strata C8	10.5	500	20	20 x 2
Polymer	Styrene-N-vinylpiperidinone	Strata-X	n.a.	800	25	20 x 2

813 n.a. = not available

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829 **Table 2**
 830 Retention time (Rt, obtained under the experimental conditions described in Section 2.4) and optimized MS/MS parameters of target analytes. (CE)
 831 collision energy (reported in bracket, together with the related product ion); (DP) declustering potential; (EP) entrance potential and (CXP) collision
 832 cell exit potential. See Section 2.1 for acronym meaning.
 833

Compound	Rt (min)	Precursor Ion	Product Ions (CE)		DP	EP	CXP
			Quantifier Ion	Qualifier Ion			
ASA	6.56	179	137 (-15)	93 (-30)	-40	-9	-10
ASA D3	6.56	182	138 (-10)	94 (-30)	-40	-9	-10
SAL	8.23	137	93 (-25)	—	-60	-9	-10
DIC	10.18	294	250 (-25)	214 (-28)	-60	-5	-10
DIC D4	10.18	298	254 (-15)	217 (-30)	-60	-9	-10
4'-HYDIC	9.43	310	266 (-15)	230 (-15)	-60	-9	-10
FEN	9.59	253	209 (-15)	153 (-30)	-60	-9	-10
FLU	10.14	243	199 (-15)	—	-40	-9	-10
KET	9.47	253	209 (-10)	—	-60	-10	-15
KET D3	9.47	256	212 (-10)	—	-60	-10	-15
IBU	10.20	205	161 (-10)	—	-60	-9	-15
IBU D3	10.20	208	164 (-10)	—	-60	-5	-10
1-HYIBU	7.96	221	177 (-10)	—	-40	-9	-10
2-HYIBU	6.80	221	177 (-10)	—	-40	-9	-10
2-HYIBU D6	6.80	227	183 (-15)	—	-40	-8	-10
3-HYIBU	7.35	221	177 (-10)	—	-40	-10	-15
NAP	9.53	229	169 (-40)	185 (-10)	-50	-10	-10
NAP D3	9.53	232	169 (-40)	188 (-10)	-50	-9	-10
O-DMNAP	8.08	215	171 (-20)	169 (-40)	-80	-10	-20

834
 835
 836
 837

838 **Table 3**
 839 Mean values (n=3) and standard deviation of overall analytical process efficiency (PE%) and overall
 840 method recovery (RE%) ranges of target analytes evaluated on three aliquots (1 g each) of a
 841 representative sludge sample fortified with three concentration levels. Spike level 1: 5 ng g⁻¹ for SAL,
 842 DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN and KET; 10 ng g⁻¹ for ASA, NAP and O-DMNAP; 25 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU
 843 and HYIBUs; spike level 2: 25 ng g⁻¹ for SAL, DIC, 4'-HYDIC, FEN and KET; 50 ng g⁻¹ for ASA,
 844 NAP and O-DMNAP; 125 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU and HYIBUs; spike level 3: 250 ng g⁻¹ for SAL, DIC,
 845 4'-HYDIC, FEN and KET; 500 ng g⁻¹ for ASA, NAP and O-DMNAP; 1250 ng g⁻¹ for FLU, IBU and
 846 HYIBUs. PE% values with the same letters are not statistically different at 5% significance level,
 847 according to the Dunnett T3 nonparametric test. See Section 2.1 for acronym meaning.

Compound	Spike level 1	Spike level 2	Spike level 3	RE% range
	PE%	PE%	PE%	
ASA	67±7 (a)	46±2 (b)	50±4 (b)	52-76
SAL	48±12 (a)	45±8 (a)	38±4 (a)	58-74
DIC	44±3 (a)	31±1 (b)	30±1 (b)	37-55
4'-HYDIC	29±1 (a)	22±1 (b)	22±1 (b)	42-55
FEN	26±3 (a)	24±3 (a)	30±4 (a)	37-46
FLU	31±2 (a)	36±2 (ab)	37±1 (b)	39-47
KET	60±2 (a)	44±2 (b)	41±2 (b)	50-74
IBU	36±3 (a)	43±6 (a)	42±3 (a)	41-49
1-HYIBU	81±11 (a)	84±8 (a)	88±3 (a)	86-96
2-HYIBU	90±10 (a)	81±7 (a)	82±2 (a)	87-96
3-HYIBU	89±9 (a)	88±8 (a)	94±1 (a)	94-101
NAP	30±1 (a)	35±2 (b)	40±1 (c)	36-48
O-DMNAP	71±4 (a)	81±6 (a)	82±5 (a)	82-94

848
 849
 850
 851

852 **Table 4**

853 Method Detection Limits (MDLs), Method Quantification Limit (MQLs), linearity range
 854 determination coefficient of linear regression, intra-day (RSD%_{intra}) and inter-day (RSD%_{inter})
 855 precision of the QuEChERS-on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS method, evaluated in a representative mix of
 856 sludge from the five investigated WWTPs (see paragraph 2.2). See paragraph 2.1 for acronyms
 857 meaning.

Compound	MDL (ng g ⁻¹)	Linearity range (ng g ⁻¹) ^a	R ²	RSD% _{intra}	RSD% _{inter}
ASA	0.78	2.6-1000	0.999	4.5	6.2
SAL	0.065	0.22-500	0.997	3.8	5.4
DIC	0.56	1.9-500	0.996	4.2	7.0
4'-HYDIC	1.0	3.3-500	0.995	3.8	6.8
FEN	1.5	5.0-1000	0.997	9.6	12.4
FLU	6.7	22-1000	0.999	3.1	5.6
KET	0.39	1.3-500	0.998	4.8	7.5
IBU	6.7	22-1000	0.998	3.5	5.1
1-HYIBU	4.1	13-1000	0.999	6.0	8.4
2-HYIBU	5.6	18-1000	0.996	7.5	9.6
3-HYIBU	5.0	16-1000	0.996	8.7	10.4
NAP	0.94	3.1-1000	0.999	9.6	12.8
O-DMNAP	2.2	7.4-1000	0.999	5.1	7.5

858 ^a The bottom limits of linearity range represent MQLs

859

860 **Table 5**

861 Mean concentration (n=3) and standard deviation (in brackets) of target compounds in real samples.

862 All results are expressed in ng g⁻¹. Sample A: Baciacavallo WWTP; Sample B: Calice WWTP;

863 Sample C: Cantagallo WWTP; Sample D: Vaiano WWTP; Sample E: Vernio WWTP. See paragraph

864 2.1 for acronyms meaning.

Compound	Sample A	Sample B	Sample C	Sample D	Sample E
ASA	<0.78 ^a	31.7 (1.4)	<0.78 ^a	<0.78 ^a	<0.78 ^a
SAL	44.5 (1.8)	11.7 (0.7)	32.1 (1.2)	57.1 (2.0)	16.6 (0.5)
DIC	<0.56 ^a	0.56 ^a -1.9 ^b	<0.56 ^a	<0.56 ^a	<0.56 ^a
4'-HYDIC	<1.0 ^a	1.8 (0.1)	2.1 (0.3)	1.0 ^a -3.3 ^b	<1.0 ^a
FEN	11.4 (2.5)	<1.5 ^a	5.9 (0.4)	1.5 ^a -5.0 ^b	10.3 (0.4)
FLU	24.8 (2.2)	<6.7 ^a	<6.7 ^a	<6.7 ^a	<6.7 ^a
KET	<0.39 ^a	11.7 (1.5)	<0.39 ^a	0.39 ^a -1.3 ^b	<0.39 ^a
IBU	6.7 ^a -22 ^b	43.0 (2.1)	<6.7 ^a	<6.7 ^a	<6.7 ^a
1-HYIBU	15.6 (2.8)	<4.1 ^a	4.1 ^a -13 ^b	<4.1 ^a	<4.1 ^a
2-HYIBU	5.6 ^a -18 ^b	<5.6 ^a	<5.6 ^a	<5.6 ^a	<5.6 ^a
3-HYIBU	5.0 ^a -16 ^b	<5.0 ^a	<5.0 ^a	<5.0 ^a	<5.0 ^a
NAP	<0.94 ^a	<0.94 ^a	<0.94 ^a	<0.94 ^a	<0.94 ^a
O-DMNAP	10.5 (0.2)	<2.2 ^a	2.2 ^a -7.4 ^b	2.2 ^a -7.4 ^b	2.2 ^a -7.4 ^b

865 ^a MDLs= method detection limits at signal-to-noise ratio of 3.866 ^b MQLs= method quantification limits at signal-to-noise ratio of 10.