Fast Analysis of Multi-Class Pesticides Panel in Garlic and Cumin Extracts **Using a Single Run LC-High Resolution Mass Spectrometry**

Charles Yang¹, Ed George¹ and Maciej Bromirski², ¹Thermo Fisher Scientific, San Jose, CA, USA; ²Thermo Fisher Scientific, Warsaw, Poland

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To present LC-MS HRAM multi-class pesticide residue analysis methods in cumin and garlic that are robust, rapid, easy to use, and have the sensitivity, accuracy, and precision that is required in order to meet regulatory guidelines. All aspects of these methods represent a 'workflow' from sample to final report for food safety laboratories. A new software feature called AcquireX provides expands the capability of looking for unknown components.

Methods: Cumin and garlic were processed and analyzed to test the core methodology- from sample preparation using a modified QuEChERS protocol (Quick, Easy, Cheap, Effect, Rugged, and Safe) to analysis, data processing, and reporting with LC-MS HRAM and comprehensive data handling software. A compound database of over 700 compounds with Fragments, Retention Time, Spectral library from mzCloud and liquid chromatography conditions was created, along with a single screening and quantitative method. Two MS methods were tested: Full Scan-DIA and AcquireX workflow.

Results: Results demonstrate that the methods are fit-for-purpose for both quantitative and broadspectrum of pesticide residue for quantitation and screening for unknown that can be easily implemented in food safety testing labs. Calibrations with matrix matched standards (MMS) and matrix extracted standards (MES) were performed. Acceptable results were obtained for the key figures of merit: Limit of Quantitation (LOQs), calibration range/linearity, fragmentation matching scoring and spectra library matching.

INTRODUCTION

The demand for quick and simple analysis for a multi-class list of pesticides in large numbers of diverse food samples in agricultural applications is growing year by year. Throughout the world, pesticides are used to control pests that are harmful to crops, humans and animals. These substances can pose a significant health threat and therefore need to be accurately detected at the lowest levels. Government agencies typically set maximum residue levels for pesticides in different products of plant and animal origin at low part per billion (ppb or µg/kg) levels. The regulations present significant analytical challenges with respect to the low limits of quantification and high number of target analytes. Sample preparation is also a critical part of the workflow. The use of QuEChERS (Quick Easy Cheap, Effective, Rugged, and Safe) methods have been widely adopted for the extraction of pesticide residues from a wide range of food matrices including spices. This work describes the method performance parameters using the Thermo Scientific[™] Orbitrap Exploris[™] 120 benchtop mass spectrometer for the quantitation of a targeted list of pesticides at or below maximum residue levels in both cumin and garlic matrices. The optimized method was verified according to SANTE/12682/20191 guidelines and evaluated for compliance with the EU MRL requirements. Due to the acquisition modes, we can also look for unknown compounds not being targeted in the samples.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample Preparation

Sample preparation involves a protocol that was optimized to be easy to implement and reduce matrix co-extractives, resulting in enhanced sensitivity and robustness in electrospray ionization LC-MS HRAM. The basic elements of the preparation procedures are described below using QuEChERS Extraction with no dSPE clean up. Weigh 2 g of each powder spice into a 50 mL conical tube. (For MES) Spike samples of pesticide mega mix @ 1 µg/mL for the levels required at 0.5, 1, 5, 10, 50 and 100 ng/mL final. Let spike sample sit at room temperature for 30 mins. Add 15 mL of water with 1% Acetic Acid; mix for 5 mins and stand at room temperature for 10min soaking. Then add 15 mL of Acetonitrile to the mixture and mix vigorously for 1 min on a benchtop vortexer. Add QuEChERS salt (6G MgSO4, 1.5G Sodium Acetate) to tube and shake vigorously for 1min. Then place in benchtop vortexer for 5 min. Aspirate or pour top layer into 15mL vial. Aspirate 2 mL from vial and filter through a 0.45 µm filter into a HPLC vial. Aliquot 1mL into individual HPLC vials and make calibration levels at 0.5, 1, 5, 10, 50, and 100 ng/mL using mega mix stock.

Instrument Method

Analytical conditions used for the analyses are described here below in Figure 1

Figure 1: LC gradient, mobile phase, column, and API source conditions for the Vanguish Flex Binary UHPLC pump with Orbitrap Exploris[™] 120 mass spectrometer.

Thermo Scientific™ Vanquish™ Flex Binary UHPLC system: Mobile phase: A: Water + 5mM Ammonium formate & 0.1% Formic Acid B: MeOH + 5mM Ammonium formate & 0.1% Formic Acid Injection volume: 1 μl Column: Thermo Scientific™ Accucore™ aQ 100 x 2.1mm x 2.6µm Column temperature: 25° C Flow rate: 300 μl/min Run time: 15 min	Thermo Scientific ™ Orbitrap Exploris ™120 MS:Positive Voltage: 3500VSheath GasSheath GasAuxiliary Gas6 unitsSweep Gas1 unitsIon transfer tube Temp: 290° CVaporizer Temp: 350° CResolution : Full Scan 60,000, DIA 15,000AcquireX : Full Scan 60,000, ddMS2 15,000
---	---


Data Analysis

Data were acquired and processed using Thermo Scientific[™] TraceFinder[™] software to ensure full automation from instrument setup to raw data collection, processing, and reporting. Experiment 1: Data acquired from FS-DIA were analyzed with an extraction mass tolerance of ± 5 ppm for both precursor and product ions. Analytes were quantified based on full scan precursor accurate mass. In addition, confirmation of target pesticides was performed by DIA fragment matching using a curated high-resolution spectral library. Experiment 2: The samples were then analyzed for other contaminants, using a new 'data-mining' software function called AcquireX intelligent data acquisition workflow. This functionality has several workflows One such workflow is called Background Subtraction and uses a blank matrix to automatically generate an exclusion list of matrix co-extractives prior to acquisition, while using a targeted MS2 inclusion list with retention times for added specificity for the targeted pesticides. Data were extracted with a mass tolerance of 5 ppm for both precursor and product ions of targeted pesticides. Analytes were first quantified using the full scan precursor mass trace and then identified using a targeted list of pesticides from a compound database and matched with a spectral library. All data were evaluated against SANTE Guidelines criteria using EC SANTE/12682/2019.1

RESULTS


Experiment 1: Simplified in-house validation for screening and quantitative methods was carried out for targeted pesticides. The linearity of the calibration curves for MMS was assessed over the range from 0.5 to 100 ng/mL to demonstrate the potential of the method for quantitative analysis. The evaluation was based on accurate mass of the analyte at the specified retention time window (± 0.1 min). Full MS scan acquisition-based quantitation using mono-isotopic match, presence of fragment ions (FI), and a high resolution curated pesticide spectral library match (LS) were additionally applied for identification according to References 1 and 2. Acceptance values were set ≤5 ppm for mass accuracy (FS, DIA and dMS2), ± 0.1 min for retention time, reproducibility at limit of quantitation (LOQ) RSD ≤15% and limit of detection (LOD) between 15– 20% RSD with at least one fragment ion (FI) present and ≥50% for LS matching, however reporting standards were set at $\geq 60\%$ and a R2 \geq 0.9800. Figure 2 shows some select pesticides across the retention time range of the method (1–10 min) as well as demonstrates sufficient scans across each peak for accurate quantitation.


Figures 2: Chromatogram of all pesticides in 15 min spiked cumin MMS at 10 ppb. The peak highlighted at 5.92 min is mandipropamid, showing over 11 scans across the full scan quantitation ion.



Recoveries were checked for both cumin and garlic to confirm the extraction protocol was universal for both matrices at 3 different concentration levels (1.3, 6.6, and 13.3 μ g/kg) and n = 5 replicates/concentration. The results show excellent recoveries between 70–120%. Some compounds in 60% range showed excellent precision between replicates and thus are allowable under SANTE guidance, Figure 3A and 3B (respectively). Figure 4 shows a typical results of calibration curves from 0.5 to 100 ppb. Over 95% of the pesticides studied had calibration curves with $r^2 > 0.990$. Confirmation fragment ions are displayed in the middle of each panel at 0.5 ppb with indicator colors (green) easily visible to show passing isotope criteria. The LOQs for both cumin and garlic were determined as outlined by the EU guidelines, with results shown in Figure 5.


Figures 3: Pesticide recoveries in cumin (A) and garlic (B) at 1.3, 6.6 and 13.3 ng/mL for n = 5 replicates





Figures 4: The quantitation and confirmation ions along with calibration range from 0.5 to 100 ppb for Triflumizolem @0.5 ppb





Experiment 2: The implementation of the AcquireX Background Exclusion workflow also helps in identification of targeted and unknown contaminates using a unique routine to automatically create an exclusion list based on LC-MS analysis of the matrix blank. The instrument method is automatically updated with the exclusion list, so when subsequent samples are analyzed, MS2 experiments are not performed on matrix background signals. As a result, more cycle time is spent on triggering MS2 on the relevant ions of interest. This is groundbreaking for data processing because it minimizes false-positives and -negatives. TraceFinder software can efficiently process these new complex data files and extract results for both targeted quantitation and unknown screening workflows. TraceFinder software can easily go from a targeted quantitation workflow to unknown screening workflow. For example, Figure 7 shows an unknown compound found in garlic to be proxan, a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug used to treat pain or inflammation in humans, which could have found its way through the water supply to the farm.

Figures 6: Unknown compound found in garlic and ID as Proxan and antiinflammatory drug.

	1000		MES_blnk_03	MES_10																	
	Mass		MS Area	MS Are	a																
	Aa	•			-																
194.9967		N/A			1,315,422,981																
314.1387		N/A			1,423,892,078																
323.0263		N/A		0	337,780,547																
118.9985 137.0090		N/A			1,229,086,260																
417.0175		N/A		0	694,662,435																
209.0124		N/A			1,298,620,565																
111.0264		N/A		0	423,141,410																
417.0175		N/A		0	604,949,315																
145.0140		N/A		0	682,481,469																
235.0280		N/A		0	637,444,952																
237.0437 List			ss 😄 Mono Isote	0 opic Mass 🗠			Potential ID 🗢	Area -a	Height a	Database -	mzVault	÷ ₽ × Elemental C ∧	Peak Ide			ID Source Detai					n Score (9
List Selected		-a Ma		opic Mass 🗠	Retention Time				1000 C			Elemental C ^	T COR TON		u ID Source →	ID Source Detai		ic 👍 For		Isotopic Patter	n Score (%
List Selected	- = · 238.0	- Ma = 398 237	• = 0824	opic Mass 🗠 • 237.0825	Retention Time	• 3.21	Δa ▼ 3	= • 87,011,192	= • 71,598,808.01	∆a • N/A	∆a • N/A	Elemental C ^	T COR TON	Selected		<u>A</u> a -		• <u>A</u> a			n Score (9
List Selecter	- = - 238.00 242.1	 Ma 398 237 176 241 	• = 0824 2477	opic Mass ← - 237.0825 241.1104	Retention Time	• 3.21 3.26	δα ▼ 3 3	8 7,011,192 29,594,603	= + 71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62	Aa ▪ N/A N/A	∆a • N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Aa N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (%
List Selected	- = -] 238.00 -] 242.11 -] 159.00	 Ma 398 237 176 241 553 158 	• = 0824 2477 0579	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580	Retention Time	• 3.21 3.26 3.43	An → 3 3 3	= • 87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449	= • 71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54	Aa • N/A N/A N/A	∆a • N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Aa N/A N/A N/A	₽□ 1	Selected	∆ª • ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	→ ∆a N-(Chloroacetyl)u	ea C3H	• H5CIN2O;		n Score (9
List Selected	 = · 238.0 242.1 159.0 159.0 	 Ma 398 237 176 241 553 158 553 158 	 0.824 2.477 0.579 0.579 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581	Retention Time =	- 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50	An • 3 3 3 3	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407	= • 71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10	≜a • N/A N/A N/A N/A	Aa • N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Aa N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (9
List Selected Aa	E 238.00 2 242.11 1 159.00 1 159.00 2 236.11	- Ma = 398 237 176 241 1553 158 553 158 131 235	 .0824 .2477 .0579 .0579 .1056 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581 235.1058	Retention Time	- 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50 3.50	An • 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407 34,452,632	71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10 18,749,936.16	Aa • N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Aa • N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Aa N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (9
List Selected	238.00 238.01 242.11 159.00 236.11 198.12	 Ma 398 237 176 241 553 158 553 158 	 = 0.0824 2.477 0.0579 0.0579 1.056 1.205 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581	Retention Time	- 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50	An • 3 3 3 3 3 3 0	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407 34,452,632 25,397,186	71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10 18,749,936.16 11,967,173.56	Aa • N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Aa • N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Aa N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (9
List Selected Aa	 238.00 242.11 159.00 159.00 236.11 198.13 207.112 		 = 0.0824 2477 0.0579 0.0579 1.056 1.205 1.1519 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581 235.1058 197.1207	Retention Time	 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50 3.50 3.59 	An • 3 3 3 3 3 3 0 0	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407 34,452,632 25,397,186 27,721,632	71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10 18,749,936.16	<u>A</u> a ▼ N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Aa V/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Aa N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (9
List Selected	 238.00 242.11 159.00 159.00 236.11 198.12 207.112 194.92 	 Ma 398 237 176 241 158 158 153 158 153 158 131 235 280 197 593 206 	 = 0.824 2.477 0.579 0.579 1.056 1.205 1.519 9.893 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581 235.1058 197.1207 206.1520	Retention Time	- 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50 3.50 3.50 3.59 3.72	<u>6a</u> ▼ 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0 0 0 3	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407 34,452,632 25,397,186 27,721,632 15,422,981	71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10 18,749,936.16 11,967,173.56 6,869,346.62	<u>A</u> a • N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	A= ▼ N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ &a N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (%
List Selected	238.00 238.01 242.11 159.00 159.01 159.01 236.11 198.12 207.11 194.99 314.11	 Ma 237 241 253 158 253 158 235 235	 e 0824 2477 0579 1056 1205 1519 9893 2949 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581 235.1058 197.1207 206.1520 193.9894	Retention Time	* 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50 3.50 3.59 3.72 3.93	6a ▼ 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0 0 0 3 4	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407 34,452,632 25,397,186 27,721,632 15,422,981 23,892,078	71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10 18,749,936.16 11,967,173.56 6,869,346.62 30,985,083.82	<u>A</u> a ▼ N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	A= ▼ N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ Åa N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (9
List Selected	238.00 238.01 242.11 159.00 159.01 236.11 236.11 207.11 207.11 144.91 314.11 323.01 137.00	Ma 3988 237 176 241 553 158 553 158 131 235 280 197 593 206 667 193 3887 313	 = 0824 2477 0579 0579 1056 1205 1205 1519 9893 2949 0188 0016 	237.0825 241.1104 158.0580 158.0581 235.1058 197.1207 206.1520 193.9894 313.1315	Retention Time	* 3.21 3.26 3.43 3.50 3.50 3.59 3.72 3.93 3.93 3.96	An ▼ 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 0 0 0 3 4 2 3	87,011,192 29,594,603 3,186,449 33,957,407 34,452,632 25,397,186 27,721,632 15,422,981 23,892,078 37,780,547 54,318,132	71,598,808.01 34,046,417.62 2,133,602.54 18,713,841.10 18,749,936.16 11,967,173.56 6,869,346.62 30,985,083.82 20,199,261.22	Δa • N/A N/A N/A N/A	δa • N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Elemental C ^ & & N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	1 2	Selected	∆n • ChemSpider ChemSpider	<u>A</u> ∎ • 70077 7631	 Aa N-(Chloroacetyl)ur proxan 	ea C3H	+ H5CIN2O; H8OS2		n Score (9

CONCLUSIONS

Concise statement of the findings, indicating future research directions.

- Large pesticide panels for quantitative analysis and screening at levels below pr at EU MRLs have been shown to provide excellent sensitivity and robustness in a routine laboratory setting for cumin and garlic.
- The QuEChERS extraction procedure demonstrated good recovery and precision, with only 1 µL required for injection to meet EU SANTE validation guidance.
- Ongoing work is required to evaluate the more unknown detected compounds that did not have an identification but only molecular formula assignment which will require either chemical synthesis, NMR or other techniques to prove the authenticity of the unknown.

TRADEMARKS/LICENSING

© 2021 Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. All rights reserved. All trademarks are the property of Thermo Fisher Scientific and its subsidiaries. This information is not intended to encourage use of these products in any manner that might infringe the intellectual property rights of others.

PO66076 EN0921S



Thermo Fisher SCIENTIFIC

thermo scientific