Detection of s-Triazine pesticides in natural waters by modified large-volume direct injection HPLC

Beale, David; Kaserzon, Sarit; Porter, Nichola; Roddick, Felicity; Carpenter, Peter

https://researchrepository.rmit.edu.au/esploro/outputs/9921858206701341/filesAndLinks?institution=61RMIT_INST&index=null

Beale, D., Kaserzon, S., Porter, N., Roddick, F., & Carpenter, P. (2010). Detection of s-Triazine pesticides in natural waters by modified large-volume direct injection HPLC. *Talanta*, 82(2), 668–674.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2010.05.030>

Published Version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2010.05.030>

Repository homepage: <https://researchrepository.rmit.edu.au>

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved

Downloaded On 2023/04/26 22:50:48 +1000

Detection of s-Triazine Pesticides in Natural Waters by Modified Large-Volume Direct Injection HPLC

David J. Beale¹ & ^{3†}, Sarit L. Kaserzon¹, Nichola A. Porter¹ & ^{3*}, Felicity A.
Roddick² & ³ and Peter Carpenter¹

¹School of Applied Sciences, RMIT University, GPO Box 2476, Melbourne 3001, Australia.

²School of Civil, Chemical and Environmental Engineering, RMIT University, GPO Box 2476, Melbourne 3001, Australia.

³Water Quality Research Australia (formally the CRC for Water Quality and Treatment), Private Mail Bag 3, Salisbury, South Australia 5108, Australia.

Abstract: There is a need for simple and inexpensive methods to quantify potentially harmful persistent pesticides often found in our water-ways and water distribution systems. This paper presents a simple, relatively inexpensive method for the detection of a group of commonly used pesticides (atrazine, simazine and hexazinone) in natural waters using large volume direct injection high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) utilizing a monolithic column and a single wavelength ultraviolet-visible light (UV-vis) detector. The best results for this system were obtained with a mobile phase made up of acetonitrile and water in a 30:70 ratio, a flow rate of 2.0 mL min⁻¹, and a detector wavelength of 230 nm. Using this method, we achieved retention times of less than three minutes, and detection limits of 5.7 µg

[†] Present address: CSIRO Land and Water, PO Box 56, Highett 3190, Australia.

^{*} Corresponding author at: School of Applied Sciences (Applied Chemistry), RMIT University, GPO Box 2476, Melbourne 3001, Australia.
Tel.: +61 3 9925 1787; fax: +61 3 9639 1321.

E-mail address: nichola.porter@rmit.edu.au (Nichola A. Porter).

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: 5

Deleted: V

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

L⁻¹ for atrazine, 4.7 µg L⁻¹ for simazine and 4.0 µg L⁻¹ for hexazinone. The

performance of this method was validated with an inter-laboratory trial against a National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) accredited liquid chromatography – mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) method commonly used in commercial laboratories.

Keywords: Atrazine, Direct injection HPLC, Hexazinone, Natural organic matter, Natural waters, and Simazine.

Introduction

It is common practice for water utilities to apply a risk approach to pesticide residue monitoring in drinking water catchments, where pesticides are identified and the risk of contamination is calculated (i.e., solubility and mobility of pesticide being applied in conjunction with the proximity and rate of application) [1]. This information is used to inform the water utility's monitoring programme. Current Australian drinking water guidelines do not enforce a sampling program frequency (although it is recommended to sample for pesticide residues monthly), nor do they specify which pesticides are to be monitored, as no single method of analysis is suitable for all the organic compounds that may be present in water. Each compound, or perhaps group of compounds, has specific analytical requirements, so monitoring for all of them would be extremely costly, time consuming, and probably unjustified [2]. To highlight the deficiencies in current monitoring programs, Benotti *et al.* investigated pharmaceutical and endocrine disrupting compounds (including atrazine) in drinking water from the USA [3]. Their study concluded that the level of tertiary treatment currently applied by 19 water utilities resulted in atrazine and other potentially harmful chemicals passing through to finished drinking water, and in some instances

Deleted: 4.4

Deleted: 3.8

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Deleted: Pesticides are an integral part of modern agriculture. It is estimated that at the beginning of the 21st century pesticide use worldwide exceeded US\$8 billion per annum, while herbicides accounted for 37% of total use [1, 2]. Two classes of herbicides that have received a great deal of attention in recent times are the quaternary ammonium heterocyclic s-triazines and the triazinone based pesticides. Triazine and triazinone herbicides represent widely used selective pesticides characterized by three heterocyclic nitrogen atoms in ring structures. They are generally used to control broadleaf and grassy weeds in agricultural areas, plantations, and in public and industrial landscapes [3]. The most commonly used s-triazines are atrazine, simazine, cyanazine, prometon and propazine; metribuzin and hexazinone are commonly used triazinone pesticides. ¶ These pesticides are relatively stable in water, extremely persistent and have been detected in ground and surface waters in Australia, the UK and the US with residual levels exceeding the World Health Organization guidelines [4-7]. ¶ Continued application of these herbicides within Australia has prompted community concern as expressed in national newspaper reports by Dayton and Denholm [8] who reported an increase in observed health effects arising from pesticide over-spraying in surrounding communities in Tasmania, Australia. Denholm [9], noted simazine in Australian swimming pools at levels above the Australian allowable daily intake limit of 20 µg L⁻¹ [10]. Similarly, Cornish [11] reported runoff of an estimated 1.5 tonnes of atrazine from farmland into surrounding oceans near the Great Barrier Reef by floodwaters (after Lewis *et al.* [12]). ¶ It is common practice for water utilities to apply a risk approach to pesticide residue monitoring in drinking water catchments, where pesticides are identified and the risk of contamination is calculated (i.e., solubility and mobility of pesticide being applied in ... [1]

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

at concentrations as high as $0.9 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (note current US EPA drinking water guidelines for atrazine are set at $3 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ [4]). Of greater concern was the presence of atrazine in waters in areas where this compound was not believed to be in use [3].

While current standard methods recommended for the determination of pesticide residues are satisfactory with respect to detection limits and analytical performance, they are often criticized for the time and costs involved. The development of new cost effective and rapid methodologies is becoming increasingly desirable because they enable water utilities to increase the frequency of sampling and broaden the range of pesticides analysed, giving them a better picture of the state of contamination in their system. As such, many researchers are looking for new techniques that address this time and cost problem, and to achieve this, some are considering enhancement and further development of liquid chromatographic techniques, in particular HPLC, UPLC and LC as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of recent developments in rapid pesticide analysis by HPLC

Method	Analyte	Separation Column	Extraction type	Retention time (T_R) (minutes)	Limit of Detection (LOD) ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	Reference
HPLC-UV	Atrazine	RP-C18	SPE	34	-	[5]
	Simazine (33 pesticides analysed in 90 minutes)			23		
HPLC-UV	Atrazine	RP-C18	Liquid	10	0.1	[6, 7]
	Simazine			12.6	0.04	
LC-ES-MS	Atrazine	ACQUITY BEH C18	SPE	2.37	0.0006	[8]
	Simazine			1.91	0.00008	
UPLC-ESI-MS/MS	Atrazine	BEH C18 column	SPE	2.3	0.006	[9]
	Simazine			1.6	0.01	
HPLC-UV	Hexazinone	RP-C18	Direct injection	7.9	0.3	[10]
LC-EIS-MS	Atrazine	XDB-C18	Direct injection	4.39	0.3	[11]
	Simazine			4.36		

Although LC-MS methods offer significant reductions in detection limits, and considerable effort has been expended to reduce retention times by employing fast short narrow bore columns and high mobile flow rates operating under increased pressure (*i.e.*, retention times commonly achieved between *ca.* 2 to 5 minutes for atrazine and simazine [8, 9, 11]). Shortening the analytical run time is an important step towards high sample throughput often required in commercial laboratories conducting routine pesticide monitoring. Run times of several tens of minutes is not acceptable and emphasis has been directed towards ensuring maximum chromatographic resolution in a significantly reduced time. However, LC-MS methods are still considered to be highly sophisticated and expensive pieces of equipment requiring specialized personnel to operate and interpret MS data [12]. In contrast, conventional HPLC-UV methods are typically more robust, cheaper and easier to operate, but fall short in terms of required detection limits and the time required for analysis. Recent advancements in monolithic column technology have lead to an improvement in peak resolution and combined with HPLC, provide an affordable option for fast screening of samples prior to confirmation by LC-MS if required. In general, resolution between solute bands depends on the square root of column efficiency (*i.e.*, the number of theoretical plates (NTP)), which in turn is proportional to the reciprocal of particle diameter ($1/d_p$) of the column packing material. Concurrently the pressure drop across the column is inversely proportional to the square of d_p . Attempts to obtain greater NTP by decreasing particles size, results in significant increases in instrument operational pressure often exceeding the instrument specifications. The structure of monolithic columns overcomes this problem [13].

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: [19, 20, 22]), they are

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: 23

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: conventional methods. ¶

Deleted: In

Deleted: which

Deleted: exceeds

Deleted: 24

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Monolithic columns are prepared by in-situ polymerization of monomers in a column, providing greater flexibility than densely packed columns, and a wider range of monomers can be used with integrated structures that can increase the overall porosity. The higher porosity leads to an increase in permeability which consequently results in a decrease in the required operational pressure. Coupled with the presence of small-sized mono structure skeleton, higher efficiencies can be expected. Up to now, monolithic columns have been used mainly for the determination of biological amino acids and drug residues [14], although there have been some instances of monolithic chromatography for pesticide analysis (see Table 2). However, its application to natural waters without pre treatment is limited [15].

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: 25

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: modified

Deleted: flow injection and sequential injection techniques

Deleted: e.g. Chocholouš *et al.* [26].

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Table 2: Summary of chromatography monolithic separation methods for pesticide analysis.

Method	Analyte	Sample matrix	Extraction type	Retention time (T_R) (minutes)	Limit of Detection (LOD) ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	Reference
HPLC-UV	Fenoxycarb	Veterinary sprays	SPE	1.8	2000	[16]
	Permethrin			7.2	1000	
HPLC-MS/MS	Atrazine	Natural waters	SPE	ca. 2.0	0.002	[17]
	Simazine			ca. 1.5	0.001	
	(plus 9 additional pesticides)					
CEC	17 different pesticides and metabolites	milliQ	-	<2.1	-	[18]

While monolithic columns have been used previously for the determination of pesticides; the application has involved specialised expensive equipment (e.g. HPLC-MS/MS) or has been applied to sample matrices comprising concentrated formulations [16, 17]. Similarly, more conventional methods (utilising packed columns) have relied on specific extraction techniques, increased operating pressures and sophisticated detectors to remove interferences, concentrate target analytes and decrease detection limits. The purpose of this research is to devise a simple, affordable, robust HPLC method utilising a monolithic column and UV-vis detection for the determination of pesticides in natural waters without any pre-treatment (e.g. sample extraction). As such, this paper describes the development of a rapid, cost effective, large volume direct injection HPLC method utilizing a monolithic column with UV detection for the combined determination of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone in natural waters. The development of the proposed method is described and compared to a conventional packed column. The method is applied to natural water samples and cross validated against a commercially operated, NATA

Deleted: ¶ This	
Formatted: Not Highlight	
Formatted	... [2]
Formatted	... [3]
Formatted	... [4]
Formatted	... [5]
Formatted	... [6]
Formatted	... [7]
Formatted: Not Highlight	
Formatted	... [8]
Formatted	... [9]
Formatted	... [10]
Formatted	... [11]
Formatted	... [12]
Formatted	... [13]
Formatted	... [14]
Formatted	... [15]
Formatted	... [16]
Comment [N1]: Are t	... [17]
Comment [DB2]: Yes	... [18]
Formatted	... [19]
Formatted	... [20]
Formatted	... [21]
Formatted	... [22]
Formatted	... [23]
Formatted	... [24]
Formatted	... [25]
Formatted	... [26]
Formatted	... [27]
Formatted	... [28]
Formatted	... [29]
Formatted	... [30]
Formatted	... [31]
Formatted	... [32]
Formatted	... [33]
Formatted	... [34]
Formatted	... [35]
Formatted	... [36]
Formatted	... [37]
Formatted	... [38]
Formatted	... [39]
Formatted	... [40]
Formatted	... [41]
Formatted	... [42]
Formatted: Right: 18 pt	

accredited, MS method (conducted by SGS Consulting, Australia). An investigation into possible interferences is also presented.

Materials and methods

Solution preparation

A stock solution of atrazine (9.8 g L^{-1} ; Supelco, Germany. Neat analytical standard (NAS)), was prepared in 10 mL acetonitrile and sonicated for an hour. Similar stock solutions of simazine (10.0 g L^{-1} ; Supelco, USA. NAS) and hexazinone (10.0 g L^{-1} ; Supelco, USA. NAS) were also prepared. Working standard solutions of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone were prepared daily in MilliQ water. Stock solutions were stored at 4°C in the dark when not in use.

Dissolved organic carbon (DOC)

After filtration using $0.45 \mu\text{m}$ hydrophilic membrane (Durapore PVDF) dissolved organic carbon (DOC) in water samples was determined in triplicate using a Sievers 820 TOC analyser.

Direct injection HPLC

HPLC with direct injection was carried out with a Waters HPLC pump (M-6000A, Waters Associates Inc., USA.) operated isocratically. $500 \mu\text{L}$ Aqueous samples were injected via a Waters HPLC injection valve fitted with a $500 \mu\text{L}$ loop using a 2 mL glass barrel syringe. The injected sample was passed through a monolithic column RP-18e, $50\text{-}4.6 \text{ mm}$ (by Chromolith, Merck); for comparison a secondary column was used, a C8, $5 \mu\text{m}$, $250 \text{ mm} \times 4.6 \text{ mm}$ (model 831815 Spherisorb, Phase Separations, USA) packed column that was substituted with the monolith column. The HPLC system was connected to a UV-vis detector (SPD-10AV, Shimadzu, Japan) set at 230

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Comment [N3]: Where are the details for the C8 column? You have them in the results but not here where they are supposed to be.

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

nm, coupled to a chart recorder (Model 3395, Hewlett Packard, USA) and a personal computer operating ChemStation (Agilent, USA). Where noted, chromatograms were digitised from paper chromatograms and reproduced using GraphClick software, (Mac OS X, Arizona Software, Switzerland).

Solid phase extraction (SPE)

SPE cartridges (0.5 mg Bond Elute C18) were pre-conditioned with 5 mL methanol followed by 5 mL MilliQ water (Millipore MilliQ Water System) prior to sample introduction (1 L aliquot, filtered via 0.45 µm hydrophilic membrane) at 2–4 mL min⁻¹ using a 12 port vacuum SPE manifold (Varian, Australia) and Visiprep SPE tubing (Varian, Australia). The SPE cartridges were then air dried under a vacuum and eluted using 4 mL of 90:10 methyl-tert-butyl-ether : ethyl acetate. Samples were then evaporated to dryness under nitrogen and reconstituted in 40:60 (v:v) MeOH:H₂O, to final eluent volume of 5.0 mL.

LC-MS

LC - MS/MS analysis was carried out at SGS Australia Pty Ltd. Instrumentation comprised an LC (Agilent 1200 Series) with a Waters Atlantis T3 column and a MS/MS system (Applied Biosystems API 3200). A mixed 100 µL sample volume was injected into the LC using an auto-sampler. Samples were analysed without pre-concentration using a buffered mobile phase (MeOH:H₂O). Quantification ions used were 216/174 m/z for atrazine, 202.1/132.1 m/z for simazine, 253.2/171.2 m/z for hexazinone. The full method can not be entirely disclosed due to intellectual confidentiality but it is NATA accredited and follows ISO 9001 QC protocols (SGS 2009).

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Comment [N4]: Should be in methods

Mmm maybe, but I think it is okay here, it relates only to this graph... have made an addition in the methods

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, English (Australia)

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Statistical methodology

The analytical performance was assessed by determining the limit of detection (LOD),

limit of quantification (LOQ) and practical method detection limit (MDL), where

LOD was calculated using a signal to noise ratio (S/N) of 3, LOQ was calculated

using S/N of 10, and the MDL was calculated using the lowest standard (n=8), where

the SD was calculated and multiplied by the student t-value at a 95% confidence level

[19].

Results and Discussion

Mobile phase optimisation

A mobile phase method development triangle was created according to Harris [19].

Method development triangles are a systematic process applied in HPLC to develop a

mobile phase suitable for the separation of the target analytes using a combination of

solvents; in this case MeOH; ACN, acetonitrile; and H₂O, MilliQ water. Solvents

were varied from 10 to 90% v:v at intervals of 10, 30, 50, 70, and 90% for

combinations consisting of two solvents; and at 10, 15, 25, 33.3, 85, 75, 67.7%

intervals for mobile phases comprising three solvents until the best separation was

achieved. While combinations of MeOH, ACN and water mobile phases were all

effective for analysing the individual triazine compounds, hexazinone and simazine

co-eluted when all three compounds were present; however, this was overcome

utilising a 30:70 (v:v) ACN:H₂O mobile phase. It is important to note the HPLC

column was maintained under stable standard laboratory conditions (ca. 22°C) and all

working solutions were brought to room temperature prior to analysis. Since it was

the intention to develop a cheap robust HPLC method a column heater (e.g. a

thermostatically controlled column) was not implemented.

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Deleted: x standard deviation (SD) of the baseline (n=4)

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Deleted: x SD of the baseline (n=4)

Deleted: one sided paired

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Deleted: distribution

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Deleted: .

Comment [N5]: Add reference

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Deleted: [27]

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: ;

Deleted: of

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Comment [DB6]: It is approximately 22 C...without the ca. it comes across as a finite temp which it isnt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Effect of mobile phase flow rate

The effect of the mobile phase flow rate on the direct injection HPLC analysis of atrazine, hexazinone and simazine was investigated over 0.25 – 3.00 mL min⁻¹ in 0.25 mL min⁻¹ increments. However, the mobile phase flow rate when using the monolithic column did not significantly influence the instrument operating pressure or the quality of the chromatography (*i.e.*, peak width and resolution). Consequently, a flow rate of 2.0 mL min⁻¹ was selected for all subsequent experiments because it was the flow rate which achieved the best baseline separation between all analytes selected and was the fastest flow rate that could be used with the packed C8 column enabling a comparison between the two columns under the same conditions to be made.

Effect of injection volume

The effect of the sample injection volume on the direct injection HPLC analysis of atrazine, hexazinone and simazine was investigated over 100 – 1000 µL. It was found that the analyte peak area steadily increased as the volume increased from 100 µL to 1000 µL; however, the best peak shape was achieved using 500 µL. Injection volumes larger than 500 µL distorted the symmetry of the peak, causing peaks to become broader. All subsequent analysis was performed using a filled 500 µL sample injection loop.

Effect of detector wavelength

A number of researchers have investigated atrazine, hexazinone or simazine at wavelengths between 220 and 223 nm for atrazine and simazine, as well as hexazinone at 244 nm [21, 22]. However, when applying these wavelengths for the simultaneous determination of atrazine, hexazinone and simazine (*e.g.*, either 220-3 nm or 244 nm) there is a decrease in analyte sensitivity for either atrazine and

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted:

Deleted:)

Comment [DB7]: Deleted minimum

Comment [N8]: For both columns?

Deleted: , namely because:

Deleted: minimum f

Deleted: it

Deleted: at a

Comment [N9]: Put in the methods section

Deleted: which

Deleted: compared

Deleted: a

Deleted: C8

Deleted: , 5 µm, 250 mm x 4.6 mm (model 831815 Spherisorb, Phase Separations, USA) [28].

Comment [N10]: What is this reference for?

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: [29, 30].

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

simazine or hexazinone (depending on the wavelength selected) unless a diode-array detector (DAD) is employed. In the absence of a DAD, the analysis has to be performed utilizing a common wavelength. As illustrated in Figure 1, the UV spectra of atrazine and simazine intersect with the spectra of hexazinone at *ca.* 230 nm.

Figure 1 also shows that the influence of DOC at 230 nm relative to 220 nm

potentially poses a problem if present at high concentrations and is found to co elute with the target analytes in natural water samples.

Deleted: an increased

Deleted: d

Figure 1: UV spectra of atrazine, hexazinone, and simazine ($500 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in MilliQ water and a natural water sample containing 11.1 mg L^{-1} dissolved organic carbon.

Limit of detection

Pesticides at standard concentrations over the range $5\text{-}50 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ were prepared in MilliQ water and analysed using the best operating conditions determined: sample injection volume of $500 \mu\text{L}$, mobile phase of $30:70 \text{ ACN:H}_2\text{O}$ at 2 mL min^{-1} with detector wavelengths of 220, 230 and 244 nm. The analytical and statistical

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

parameters obtained for the determination of the three pesticides by direct injection HPLC are summarised in Table 3. Figure 2 illustrates the difference in chromatographic separation over the three different wavelengths for the monolithic column.

Deleted: 2.

Deleted: The use of 230 nm reduced the sensitivity by 35% for atrazine compared to the wavelength for its maximum sensitivity (λ_{max}), 33% for hexazinone and 34% for simazine. Nevertheless the reduction in sensitivity had a minimal effect on the detection limits. Hence it is possible to analyse a range of triazines using a constant wavelength with a simple monowavelength UV detector while still achieving good analytical sensitivity for all three target analytes.¶
The analytical performances between the packed and monolithic columns are comparable (*i.e.*, the analytical figures of merit (LOD) for the monolithic column are within $\pm 0.7 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ at 220 and 244 nm; and $\pm 5 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ at 230 nm when directly compared with the packed column). The great advantage of the monolithic column over the packed column is the reduction in retention time for each analyte, resulting in a significantly reduced analysis time and operating pressure; *i.e.*, 1.5 mL min⁻¹

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Table 3- Summary of analytical figures of merit for the determination of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone in MilliQ water by direct injection HPLC.

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Statistical figures of merit	UV-vis Detector Wavelength								
	220 nm				244 nm		230 nm		
	Atrazine		Simazine		Hexazinone		Atrazine	Simazine	Hexazinone
	Mono. [‡]	Pack. [†]	Mono. [‡]	Pack. [†]	Mono. [‡]	Pack. [†]	Mono. [‡]	Mono. [‡]	Mono. [‡]
Slope	6979	6907	7793	7459	8724	9413	519	369	172
Intercept	-3370	-536	-13483	3413	645	502	-1920	-825	-357
Linear dynamic range ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	5-50	5-50	5-50	5-50	1-50	0.5-50	5-50	5-50	5-50
LOD ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	0.7	0.6	1.8	0.4	0.1	0.3	5.7	4.7	4.0
LOQ ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	1.2	1.5	2.1	1.3	0.4	1.2	10.6	10.7	8.5
MDL ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	1.1	1.4	1.2	3.0	0.9	1.1	4.1	2.5	2.6
SD of the intercept	4916	6180	14221	3891	524	1289	314	272	97
SD of the slope	143	200	280	126	246	245	10	9	3
SD of the regression	6347	9598	19389	6043	719	2412	361	312	111
Correlation coefficient	0.9978	0.9976	0.9921	0.9991	0.9976	0.9973	0.9977	0.9966	0.9980

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Note: HPLC system with monolithic separation column (Mono), retention time(s) for 220/244 nm at flow rate 3.0 mL min^{-1} : atrazine 1.77 mins; simazine 1.12 mins; hexazinone 0.98 mins; and for 230 nm at flow rate 2.0 mL min^{-1} : atrazine 2.71 mins; simazine 1.71 mins; hexazinone 1.53.

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

[†]HPLC system (Packed) described by Beale *et al.* [20] retention time (s) for 220/244 nm at flow rate of 2.0 mL min^{-1} : atrazine 6.77 mins; simazine 4.12 mins; hexazinone 3.98 mins.

Comment [N11]: You are supposed to be doing the comparison at 2 mL min^{-1} I remember pointing this out before.

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Figure 2: Monolithic column chromatograms of $50 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ stock solution of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone with UV-vis detection at 220, 230, and 244 nm.

NOTE: peaks identified as (A) hexazinone; (B) simazine; (C) atrazine. Sample solution consisted of $50 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ pesticide in milliQ water, $500 \mu\text{L}$ injection. Mobile phase 30:70 (ACN:H₂O) with a UV-vis detector (i= λ 220 nm; ii= λ 230 nm; iii= λ 244 nm), flow rate 2.0 mL min^{-1} .

The use of 230 nm reduced the sensitivity by 35% for atrazine compared to the wavelength for its maximum sensitivity ($\lambda_{\max}$), 33% for hexazinone and 34% for simazine. Nevertheless the reduction in sensitivity had a minimal effect on the detection limits. Hence, it is possible to analyse a range of triazines using a constant wavelength with a simple mono wavelength UV detector while still achieving good analytical sensitivity for all three target analytes.

The analytical performances between the packed and monolithic columns are comparable (*i.e.*, the analytical figures of merit (LOD) for the monolithic column are within $\pm 1.4 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ at 220 and 244 nm; and $\pm 5.2 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ at 230 nm when directly compared with the packed column). The great advantage of the monolithic column over the packed column is the decrease in operating pressure and the reduction in retention time for each analyte, resulting in a significantly reduced analysis time; *i.e.*, 2.0 mL min^{-1} for the packed column at an operating pressure of 3500 psi and analysis

time of 7 minutes per sample compared to 2.0 mL min^{-1} for the monolithic column at an operating pressure of 500 psi and analysis time under 3 minutes per sample; or 3.0 mL min^{-1} and 600 psi and analysis time under 2 minutes per sample.

Comment [N12]: Maybe you need to get rid of the statement about all subsequent experiments being carried out at 2 mL min^{-1} in the effect of mobile flow rate.

Application to natural samples

To test the effect of dissolved organic matter (as DOC) on the analytical performance of the described direct injection HPLC method, a series of natural water samples with various DOC concentrations were collected throughout Victoria, Australia (see Table 4). Samples were collected using a 1 L grab glass bottles (pre-cleaned with Pyroneg, Johnson Diversey Australia, and triple rinsed with MilliQ water). All samples were stored at 4°C and allowed to equilibrate at room temperature (*ca.* 22°C) prior to analysis.

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: 3

Comment [N13]: Details need to be in methods – with city!

Comment [DB14]: I think it is fine here, it flows on nicely with the application of natural samples – if it gets moved up at the front it may be a little disjointed in terms of flow...this is the similar flow we took for the fia paper last year

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Table 4: Summary of characteristics of natural water samples analysed by direct injection HPLC.

Sample ID tag	Water source	DOC [†] (mg L ⁻¹)	Location in Victoria	Primary land activity
1	Ground water	3.1	South East	Cattle farm
2	Creek (seasonal)	4.5	South East	Livestock
3	river (metropolitan)	6.5	Central	Metropolitan
4	Drinking water catchment	10.7	South West	Agriculture
5	Drinking water catchment*	11.1	East	Natural reserve
6	Drinking water catchment	11.7	South West	Agriculture
7	Drinking water catchment	10.1	North	
8	Drinking water catchment	14.4	North	

Note: *Decommissioned drinking water catchment, closed to public access.

[†]Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) measured using a total organic carbon analyser.

The natural waters spiked with increasing amounts of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone were analysed using the direct injection method at a wavelength (λ) of 230 nm. The position of the DOC peak did not interfere with those of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone in any of the samples analysed ($p < 0.05$ at 95% confidence interval). Statistical analysis of the recovery and relative standard deviation for all natural water samples showed strong correlation between spiked and measured concentrations (Table 5).

Deleted: The natural waters spiked with increasing amounts of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone were analysed using the direct injection method at a wavelength (λ) of 230 nm. The position of the DOC peak did not interfere with those of atrazine, simazine and hexazinone in any of the samples analysed ($p < 0.05$ at 95% confidence interval). Statistical analysis of the recovery and relative standard deviation for all natural water samples showed strong correlation between spiked and measured concentrations (Table 4).[†]

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Table 5: Direct injection HPLC analysis of atrazine, hexazinone and simazine in natural waters.

<u>Concentration ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)</u>	<u>Recovery % (%R_{SD})</u>		
	<u>Atrazine</u>	<u>Hexazinone</u>	<u>Simazine</u>
<u>10.0</u>	<u>105 (6.1)</u>	<u>82 (10.1)</u>	<u>106 (1.5)</u>
<u>15.0</u>	<u>99 (1.3)</u>	<u>89 (8.6)</u>	<u>:</u>
<u>25.0</u>	<u>92 (0.6)</u>	<u>84 (8.2)</u>	<u>95 (0.7)</u>
<u>40.0</u>	<u>82 (0.8)</u>	<u>85 (3.6)</u>	<u>98 (1.4)</u>
<u>50.0</u>	<u>80 (0.3)</u>	<u>80 (4.6)</u>	<u>:</u>
<u>Statistical figures of merit</u>			
<u>Pearson Correlation coefficient</u>	<u>0.9965</u>	<u>0.9993</u>	<u>0.9966</u>
<u>p-value</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>0.67</u>	<u>0.97</u>
<u>Correlation coefficient</u>	<u>0.9930</u>	<u>0.9986</u>	<u>0.9933</u>

NOTE: Each of the 8 water samples at each of the concentrations was analysed in triplicate.

Samples directly injected into the HPLC without pre-treatment showed a distinct DOC peak within the first 0.7 min compared with standards as shown in the example chromatogram using 244 nm presented in Figure 3. The presence of DOC was confirmed by 3D EEM fluorescence spectroscopy as shown in Figure 4, where distinct humic and fulvic acid fluorophores were observed at 237-260/400-500 and 300-370/400-500 (excitation/emission wavelength) for all of the samples included in this study^[23].

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: [31

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Figure 3: Effect of natural organic matter (dissolved organic matter; DOC) on monolithic chromatography performance.

NOTE: (A) hexazinone; (B) simazine; (C) atrazine. Sample number three (refer to table 2); DOC = 6.5 mg L⁻¹) spiked with 10 µg L⁻¹ pesticide, 500 µL injection. Mobile phase 30:70 (ACN:H₂O) with a UV-vis detector λ 244 nm, flow rate 2.0 mL min⁻¹.

Figure 4: 3D excitation emission matrix (3D EEM) fluorescence spectroscopy in natural water for the confirmation of DOC.

Note: (1) EEM spectrum for sample number six (Table 3). Identification of two humic-like fluorophores (labelled a and b) were determined by observing distinct peaks at 237-260/400-500 and 300-370/400-500 respectively (excitation/emission wavelength)[23]; which were not present in MilliQ water standards (2) fluorescence spectrum for sample 6 at emission wavelength $\lambda=440$ nm over the excitation ranged from 200 to 380 nm. The spectrum indicates the presence of the humic-like fluorophores over a MilliQ blank. The observed peak at 230 nm in the MilliQ sample is an artefact of Raman light scatter.

Method validation

Two blind comparison studies were conducted to evaluate the performance of the described multi-analyte (single wavelength; $\lambda=230$ nm) monolithic HPLC method utilising the natural water samples from drinking water catchment waters spiked with all three pesticides. Sample #s 7 and 8 in Table 4 were spiked at SGS and presented to our laboratory as unknowns. The first study consisted of samples spiked with

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: '

Deleted: 3

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

concentrations between 10 and 50 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ in order to assess the recovery and reproducibility of the direct injection technique described. The second study involved samples spiked with concentrations between 0.1 and 2 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ to assess and compare the analytical performance of the described HPLC method with SPE pre-concentration. In this case the samples were spiked at SGS, analysed at RMIT and then sent back to SGS for reanalysis as a double blind experiment.

The analytical figures of merit for the LC-MS/MS instrument at SGS are presented below in Table 6.

Deleted: 5.

Table 6: LC-MS/MS analytical figures of merit

Analyte	Atrazine	Hexazinone	Simazine
Linear dynamic range ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	0.1 - 10	0.5 - 10	2 - 10
Retention time (minutes)	11.17	10.56	10.62
LOD ^a ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	0.05	0.5	0.1
MDL ^c ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	0.1	2.0	0.5

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

The first set of spiked samples provided by SGS was analysed by direct injection HPLC after filtration. Apart from a significant difference in analysis time *i.e.*, 12 minutes per sample by LC-MS/MS compared with <2 minutes by direct injection HPLC, good correlation between the spiked and measured concentrations was observed as shown in Figure 5; all of the samples were within 90% confidence intervals for all three analytes.

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Figure 5: Blind analysis of spiked natural water samples (10 – 50 µg L⁻¹) provided by SGS (Victoria, Australia).

When using the direct injection method the concentrations of the second set of samples were below the LOD and MDL limits presented in Table 3. Therefore, prior to analysis, pre-concentration (by a factor of 25) of the samples was performed by solid phase extraction. The HPLC instrumentation used was not altered for the analysis of SPE extracts, *i.e.*, the 500 µL injection loop and volume was utilised.

Natural samples pre-concentrated with SPE still showed the presence of DOC within sample extracts, however a 80% reduction in the DOC peak was observed. Although SPE should eliminate the majority of DOC in extracted samples, there is a possibility that during pre-concentration some DOC is retained on and later eluted from the SPE cartridge. This finding is similar to that by Simpson [24], who found that a fraction of DOC can be retained and eluted from the SPE cartridge when performing sample extractions with a sample matrix containing DOC. The degree of retention is

dependent upon a combination of the SPE material, the sample matrix and chemical characteristics of the DOC, and is relatively independent of concentration.

Linear regression was performed on the results obtained from the two systems. The regression between HPLC and LC-MS/MS systems showed a strong relationship between the instruments for all three herbicides as shown in Table 7. This suggests that the HPLC method compared well against the NATA accredited method and has the sensitivity required for triazine and triazinone detection. The reduced recovery observed for hexazinone is probably due to losses during extraction.

Table 7: Statistical figures of merit from analysis of spiked natural water samples (0.1 – 2 µg L⁻¹) provided by SGS (Victoria, Australia).

Statistical figures of merit	Atrazine	Hexazinone	Simazine
Slope	0.8903	0.5278	0.9097
Pearson correlation Coefficient	0.9824	0.9582	0.9512
p-value	0.92	0.33	0.92
Recovery % (%R _{SD})	96 (2.1)	52 (0.7)	91 (6.9)

Interferences

The interference of ‘like’ compounds, in terms of peak resolution and retention time, was investigated utilising known atrazine metabolites, as well as other known triazine pesticide standards. Figure 6 illustrates the co-elution of peaks between simazine and the metabolite 2-hydroxyatrazine (Figure 6 (i)); this was observed for both the monolithic and packed columns. The other triazines analysed did not co-elute under the described conditions.

Deleted: 6.

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Figure 6: An investigation into potential interference with other triazine pesticides and their metabolites

NOTE: Peaks identified as (A) 2-hydroxyatrazine; (B) desisopropylatrazine; (C) desethylatrazine; (1) hexazinone; (2) simazine; (3) atrazine; (4) propazine; (5) ametryn; and (6) prometryne (by injecting neat standards of each pesticide and metabolite, and comparing the retention times of each compound with a combined analyte solution). Mobile phase 30:70 (ACN:H₂O) with a UV-vis detector (λ 220 nm), flow rate 3.0 mL min⁻¹. Chromatogram (i) triazine metabolites overlaid with hexazinone, simazine and atrazine standard chromatogram as a point of reference (500 μ L injection; 100 μ g L⁻¹ metabolite stock solution); (ii) triazine mixture (total of five pesticides) overlaid with chromatogram of target analytes a point of reference (500 μ L injection; 100 μ g L⁻¹ pesticide stock solution). Triazine chromatogram digitised from a paper chromatogram by "GraphClick" (Mac OS X, Arizona Software, Switzerland).

Comment [N15]: Should be in methods

Mmm maybe, but I think it is okay here, it relates only to this graph... have made an addition in the methods

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Conclusion

The analytical performance of two HPLC columns (a conventional packed column and monolithic column) with UV-vis detection at multiple wavelengths were established and compared. It was observed that both columns were able to separate the tested analytes well with sufficient resolution and peak asymmetry, but they differed significantly in analysis time and operating pressure. It was found that the monolithic column was superior in terms of reduced analyte retention times and lower operating backpressure, while limits of detection were slightly better using the packed column. The variation in detector wavelength from 220, 230 and 244 nm was also investigated; it was found that 230 nm was the ideal wavelength for concurrent detection of all three target analytes.

Atrazine, simazine and hexazinone in MilliQ water were concurrently detected in under 3 minutes per sample using large volume direct injection HPLC with limits of detection of 5.7, 4.7 and 4.0 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively, without pre-concentration (validated using LC-MS). The advantage of the described system over more traditional methods and methods described within the literature are two fold: firstly, large volume direct injection of the sample coupled with the monolithic column enables the time for analysis of each sample to be significantly reduced (eliminating the need and time for SPE, along with subsequent affect of limiting operating pressures and flow rates associated with packed columns); secondly, the use of a low cost detector (in relation to more sophisticated detectors; i.e., MS) using a single wavelength enables the cost of the total analysis to be lower, enabling more samples to be analysed.

Cross validation of samples analysed by LC-MS/MS indicated good correlation with samples spiked in the 10 to 50 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ range, with correlation coefficients of better than 0.9965, supported by statistical analysis. Samples spiked at relatively low

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Deleted: Atrazine, simazine and hexazinone in MilliQ water were concurrently detected in under 3 minutes per sample using large volume direct injection HPLC with limits of detection of 5.5, 4.4 and 3.8 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively, without pre-concentration. Validation of the method was performed by an inter laboratory comparison with a NATA accredited LC-MS/MS method using spiked natural water samples.¶

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Comment [N16]: ???

increase run times, faster flow rates etc.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

concentrations of 0.1 to 2.0 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ required preconcentration by SPE. Linear regression of the results from the two systems in the double blind experiment correlated well but recoveries were poorer in the lower concentration range, particularly for hexazinone from which we only recovered 52% suggesting some losses during SPE. Recoveries of 96 and 91% were obtained for atrazine and simazine respectively in the lower concentration range.

Analysis of natural waters showed that various concentrations of DOC from 3.1 to 11.7 mg L^{-1} had no significant affect on the resolution or separation capacity of the described HPLC method. However, while there is some potential for 'like' compounds to co-elute as shown in the case of 2-hydroxyatrazine, the method developed provides a fast, simple, cheap alternative to LC-MS/MS for multi-analyte detection of triazines with similar detection limits, and as such would be an excellent inexpensive screening method.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by Water Quality Research Australia (formally the CRC for Water Quality and Technology) and Melbourne Water. The authors wish to extend their appreciation to Dr R. Considine and Dr N. Crosbie (Melbourne Water) for guidance, financial support and providing samples. The authors also wish to acknowledge and thank Mr A. Pellegrini and Ms A. Stenta (SGS Australia) for the analysis of water samples by LC MS/MS and assisting with the blind study.

References

- [1] D.J. Hamilton, A. Ambrus, R.M. Dieterle, A.S. Felsot, C.A. Harris, P.T. Holland, A. Katayama, N. Kurihara, J. Linders, J. Unsworth, S.S. Wong, Pure and Applied Chemistry, 75 (2003) 1123-1155.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Deleted: , and

Formatted: Line spacing: Double, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text

Deleted: J. Akermann, F., (2007). 'The economics of atrazine'. International Journal of Occupational and environmental Health. 13.¶
[2]. Fishel, F., (2006). 'Pesticides and the environment', in Agriculture MU Guide, University of Missouri. ¶
[3]. LeBaron, H.M., McFarland,

Deleted: E., Burnside, O.C., Homer, M.L., Janis, E.M., & Orvin, C.B., (2008). The triazine herbicides: A milestone in the development of weed control technology, in The triazine herbicides. Elsevier: San Diego. p. 1-12.

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

[2] National Health & Medical Research Council, in: the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines, 2004.

[3] M.J. Benotti, R.A. Trenholm, B.J. Vanderford, J.C. Holady, B.D. Stanford, S.A. Snyder, Environmental Science & Technology, In Press (2009).

[4] US EPA, in: Drinking water contaminants list, (US EPA (Ed.)), 2009.

[5] A. JunkerBuchheit, M. Witzenbacher, Journal of Chromatography A, 737 (1996) 67-74.

[6] Q.X. Zhou, L. Pang, G.H. Xie, J.P. Xiao, H.H. Bai, Analytical Sciences, 25 (2009) 73-76.

[7] Q.X. Zhou, G.H. Xie, L. Pang, Chinese Chemical Letters, 19 (2008) 89-91.

[8] M. Mezcuca, A. Agüera, J.L. Lliberia, M.A. Cortés, B. Bagó, A.R. Fernández-Alba, Journal of Chromatography A, 1109 (2006) 222-227.

[9] G. Gervais, S. Brosillon, A. Laplanche, C. Helen, Journal of Chromatography A, 1202 (2008) 163-172.

[10] B.L. Perkins, R.J. Bushway, L.E. Katz, Journal of AOAC, 82 (1999).

[11] L. Diaz, J. Llorca-Porcel, I. Valor, Analytica Chimica Acta, 624 (2008) 90-96.

[12] U. Ochsenbein, M. Zeh, J.-D. Berset, Chemosphere, 72 (2008) 974-980.

[13] T. Ikegami, N. Tanaka, Current Opinion in Chemical Biology, 8 (2004) 527-533.

[14] Merk, The Chromotography manual, 2009.

[15] M. Kuster, M.L.d. Alda, D. Barceló, Mass Spectrometry Reviews, 25 (2006) 900-916.

[16] P. Chocholous, D. Satinský, R. Sladkovský, M. Pospisilová, P. Solich, Talanta, 77 (2008) 566-570.

[17] A. Asperger, J. Efer, T. Koal, W. Engewald, Journal of Chromatography A, 960 (2002) 109-119.

Deleted: [4]. Kingsbury, J.A., Delzer, D.C., & Hopple, J.A., (2008). *Anthropogenic organic compounds in source water of nine community water systems that withdraw from streams, 2002-05*, in *National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program*, USGS, Editor. USA Department of Interior.¶
[5]. Meakins, N.C., Bubb, J.M., & Lester, J.N., (1994). 'The behaviour of the s-triazine herbicides, atrazine and simazine, during primary and secondary biological waste water treatment'. *Chemosphere*. **28**(9): p. 1611-1622.¶
[6]. Radcliff, G.W., (2002). *Pesticide use in australia*. Chichester: J Wiley and Sons.¶
[7]. Tilbury, A., (1999). 'Bioremediation of atrazi... [43]

Deleted:). Pesticides in pools far above safe limit, in The Australian newspaper. May 18th

Deleted: [10]. National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC), (2004). *Australian drinking water guidelines*, Australian Government, ¶ ... [44]

Deleted:). Rivers pushing herbicides out to sea, in ABC News. February 23rd

Deleted: [12]. Lewis, S.E., Brodie, J.E., Bainbridge, Z.T., Rohde, K.W., Davis, A.M., Masters, B.L., Maughan, M., Devlin, M.J., Mueller, J.¶ ... [45]

Deleted: , Linders, J., Unsworth, J., & Wong, S.S., (2003). 'Regulatory limits for pesticide residues in water - (iupac technical report)'. ¶ ... [46]

Deleted: J. Benotti, M.J., Trenholm, R.A., Vanderford, B.J., Holady, J.C., Stanford, B.D., & Snyder, S.A., (2009). 'Pharmaceuticals and end... [47]

Deleted: J. US EPA, (2009). 'Drinking water contaminants: List of contaminants & their mcls'. [cited 2010 25/2]; Available from: <http://www.epa.gov/safey> ¶ ... [48]

Deleted: J. Junker-Buchheit, A. & Witznacher, M., (1996). 'Pesticide monitoring of drinking water with the help of solid-phase extraction and high-perfo... [49]

Deleted: J. Zhou, Q.X., Pang, L., Xie, G.H., Xiao

Deleted: P., & Bai, H.H., (2009). 'Determination of atrazine and simazine in environmental water samples by dispersive liquid-liquid microextrac... [50]

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

[18] M. Bedair, Z.E. Rassi, ELECTROPHORESIS, 23 (2002) 2938-2948.

[19] D.C. Harris, Qualitative Chemical Analysis, Freeman & Company, 1997.

[20] D.J. Beale, N.A. Porter, F.A. Roddick, Talanta, 78 (2009) 342-347.

[21] I. Baranowska, H. Barchanska, E. Pacak, Environmental Pollution, 143 (2006) 206-211.

[22] Q.X. Zhou, J.P. Xiao, W.D. Wang, G.G. Liu, Q.Z. Shi, J.H. Wang, Talanta, 68 (2006) 1309-1315.

[23] N. Hudson, A. Baker, D. Reynolds, River Research and Applications, 23 (2007) 631-649.

[24] N.J.K. Simpson, Solid-phase extraction: principles, techniques and applications, CRC Press, Harbor City, California, USA, 2000.

Deleted: J. Zhou, Q.X., Xie, G.H., & Pang, L., (2008). 'Rapid determination of atrazine in environmental water samples by a novel liquid phase microextraction'. Chinese Chemical Letters. **19**(1): p. 89-91.

Deleted: [19]. Mezcuca, M., Agüera, A., Lliberia, J.L., Cortés, M.A., Bagó, B., & Fernández-Alba, A.R., (2006). 'Application of ultra performance liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry to the analysis of priority pesticides in groundwater'. Journal of Chromatography A. **1109**(2): p. 222-227.¶
[20]. Gervais

Deleted: , Brosillon, S., Laplanche, A., & Helen, C., (2008). 'Ultra-pressure liquid chromatography-electrospray tandem mass spectrometry for multiresidue determination of pesticides in water'. Journal of Chromatography A. **1202**(2): p. 163-172.¶

[21]. Perkins, B.L., Bushway, R.J., & Katz, L.E., (1999). 'Determination of hexazinone in ground water by direct injection high-performance liquid chromatography'. Journal of AOAC. **82**(6).¶ ... [51]

Deleted: , & Valor, I., (2008). 'Ultra trace determination' ... [52]

Deleted: J. Ochsenbein, U., Zeh, M., & Berset, J.-D., ... [53]

Deleted: J. Ikegami, T. & Tanaka, N., (2004). 'Mon' ... [54]

Deleted: A., & Roddick, F.A., (2009). 'A fast screening' ... [55]

Deleted: P., Wang, W.D., Liu, G.G., Shi, Q.Z., & Wang ... [56]

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: N.J.K., (2000). ' '

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Deleted: Principles

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Deleted: ,

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

Deleted: ' ed. Simpson, N.J.K.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: : CRC Press.

Formatted ... [57]

Formatted: Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Right: 18 pt

Pesticides are an integral part of modern agriculture. It is estimated that at the beginning of the 21st century pesticide use worldwide exceeded US\$8 billion per annum, while herbicides accounted for 37% of total use [1, 2]. Two classes of herbicides that have received a great deal of attention in recent times are the quaternary ammonium heterocyclic s-triazines and the triazinone based pesticides. Triazine and triazinone herbicides represent widely used selective pesticides characterized by three heterocyclic nitrogen atoms in ring structures. They are generally used to control broadleaf and grassy weeds in agricultural areas, plantations, and in public and industrial landscapes [3]. The most commonly used s-triazines are atrazine, simazine, cyanazine, prometon and propazine; metribuzin and hexazinone are commonly used triazinone pesticides.

These pesticides are relatively stable in water, extremely persistent and have been detected in ground and surface waters in Australia, the UK and the US with residual levels exceeding the World Health Organization guidelines [4-7].

Continued application of these herbicides within Australia has prompted community concern as expressed in national newspaper reports by Dayton and Denholm [8] who reported an increase in observed health effects arising from pesticide over-spraying in surrounding communities in Tasmania, Australia. Denholm [9], noted simazine in Australian swimming pools at levels above the Australian allowable daily intake limit of 20 µg L⁻¹ [10]. Similarly, Cornish [11] reported runoff of an estimated 1.5 tonnes of atrazine from farmland into surrounding oceans near the Great Barrier Reef by floodwaters (after Lewis *et al.* [12]).

It is common practice for water utilities to apply a risk approach to pesticide residue monitoring in drinking water catchments, where pesticides are identified and the risk

of contamination is calculated (*i.e.*, solubility and mobility of pesticide being applied in conjunction with the proximity and rate of application) [13]. This information is used to inform the water utility's monitoring programme. Current Australian drinking water guidelines do not enforce a sampling program frequency (although it is recommended to sample for pesticide residues monthly), nor do they specify which pesticides are to be monitored, as no single method of analysis is suitable for all the organic compounds that may be present in water. Each compound, or perhaps group of compounds, has specific analytical requirements, so monitoring for all of them would be extremely costly, time consuming, and probably unjustified [10]. To highlight the deficiencies in current monitoring programs, Benotti *et al.* investigated pharmaceutical and endocrine disrupting compounds (including atrazine) in USA drinking water [14]. Their study concluded that the level of tertiary treatment currently applied by 19 water utilities resulted in atrazine and other potentially harmful chemicals passing through to finished drinking water, and in some instances at concentrations as high as $0.9 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (note current US EPA drinking water guidelines for atrazine are set at $3 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ [15]).

Page 6: [2] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [2] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [3] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [3] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [4] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [4] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [4] Formatted Not Highlight	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Page 6: [5] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00

Not Highlight

Page 6: [5] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [6] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Centered, No bullets or numbering

Page 6: [7] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [7] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [7] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [8] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [8] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [9] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [9] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

Not Highlight

Page 6: [10] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [11] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:21:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, Don't keep with next

Page 6: [12] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [12] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [12] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [13] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [13] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [13] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [13] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [14] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [14] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [15] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Highlight

Page 6: [15] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [16] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [16] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [17] Comment [N1]	Nicky	08/05/2010 15:41:00
Are these really 2000 and 1000 ug/L????		
Page 6: [18] Comment [DB2]	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:41:00
Yes.. the LOD was reported as ug/ml which is the same as mg/l isn't it?		
Page 6: [19] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [19] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [20] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [20] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [21] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [22] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:21:00
Default Paragraph Font, Font: Arial Narrow, English (Australia), Do not check spelling or grammar		
Page 6: [23] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [24] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [25] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:21:00
Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, Don't keep with next		
Page 6: [26] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [26] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [26] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [27] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [27] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [27] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:21:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Italic, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [27] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [27] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar		
Page 6: [28] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [28] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [29] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Highlight

Page 6: [29] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [30] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [30] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [31] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [31] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [32] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:21:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Italic, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [32] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [32] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [33] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [33] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [34] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [34] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [35] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [36] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:21:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, Don't keep with next

Page 6: [37] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight

Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [38] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar		
Page 6: [39] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [39] Formatted	David Beale	09/01/2012 22:20:00
Font: 9 pt, Not Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [40] Formatted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:30:00
Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight		
Page 6: [41] Formatted	David Beale	09/05/2010 22:05:00
Space Before: 6 pt, Line spacing: Double		
Page 6: [42] Formatted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:30:00
Not Highlight		
Page 6: [42] Formatted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:30:00
Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight		
Page 26: [43] Deleted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:20:00
[4]. Kingsbury, J.A., Delzer, D.C., & Hopple, J.A.,(2008). <i>Anthropogenic organic compounds in source water of nine community water systems that withdraw from streams, 2002-05</i> , in <i>National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program</i> , USGS, Editor. USA Department of Interior.		
[5]. Meakins, N.C., Bubb, J.M., & Lester, J.N., (1994). 'The behaviour of the s-triazine herbicides, atrazine and simazine, during primary and secondary biological waste water treatment'. Chemosphere. 28 (9): p. 1611-1622.		
[6]. Radcliff, G.W., (2002). <i>Pesticide use in australia</i> . Chichester: J Wiley and Sons.		
[7]. Tilbury, A., (1999). 'Bioremediation of atrazine-contaminated groundwater'. Journal of Australina Water and Wastewater Association. 26 (6): p. 27-29.		
[8]. Dayton, L. & Denholm, M. (2009). When farm sprays go astray, in The Australian newspaper. April 11th		
[9]. Denholm, M. (		
Page 26: [44] Deleted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:20:00

[10]. National Health and Medical Research Council (NH&MRC), (2004). *Australian drinking water guidelines*, Australian Government, Editor.

[11]. Cornish, M.

Page 26: [45] Deleted

David Beale

08/05/2010 15:20:00

[12]. Lewis, S.E., Brodie, J.E., Bainbridge, Z.T., Rohde, K.W., Davis, A.M., Masters, B.L., Maughan, M., Devlin, M.J., Mueller, J.F., & Schaffelke, B., (2009). '*Herbicides: A new threat to the great barrier reef*'. *Environmental Pollution*. **157**(8-9): p. 2470-2484.

[13]. Hamilton, D.J., Ambrus, A., Dieterle, R.M., Felsot, A.S., Harris, C.A., Holland, P.T., Katayama, A., Kurihara

Page 26: [46] Deleted

David Beale

08/05/2010 15:20:00

, Linders, J., Unsworth, J., & Wong, S.S., (2003). '*Regulatory limits for pesticide residues in water - (iupac technical report)*'. *Pure and Applied Chemistry*. **75**(8): p. 1123-1155.

Page 26: [47] Deleted

David Beale

08/05/2010 15:20:00

J. Benotti, M.J., Trenholm, R.A., Vanderford, B.J., Holady, J.C., Stanford, B.D., & Snyder, S.A., (2009). '*Pharmaceuticals and endocrine disrupting compounds in u.S. Drinking water*'. *Environmental Science & Technology*. **In Press**.

Page 26: [48] Deleted

David Beale

08/05/2010 15:20:00

J. US EPA, (2009). '*Drinking water contaminants: List of contaminants & their mcls*'. [cited 2010 25/2]; Available from:

<http://www.epa.gov/safewater/contaminants/index.html>.

Page 26: [49] Deleted

David Beale

08/05/2010 15:20:00

J. Junker-Buchheit, A. & Witzemberger, M., (1996). '*Pesticide monitoring of drinking water with the help of solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography*'. *Journal of Chromatography A*. **737**(1): p. 67-74.

P., & Bai, H.H., (2009). '*Determination of atrazine and simazine in environmental water samples by dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction with high performance liquid chromatography*'. Analytical Sciences. **25**(1): p. 73-76.

, Brosillon, S., Laplanche, A., & Helen, C., (2008). '*Ultra-pressure liquid chromatography-electrospray tandem mass spectrometry for multiresidue determination of pesticides in water*'. Journal of Chromatography A. **1202**(2): p. 163-172.

[21]. Perkins, B.L., Bushway, R.J., & Katz, L.E., (1999). '*Determination of hexazinone in ground water by direct injection high-performance liquid chromatography*'. Journal of AOAC. **82**(6).

[22]. Diaz, L., Llorca-Porcel

, & Valor, I., (2008). '*Ultra trace determination of 31 pesticides in water samples by direct injection-rapid resolution liquid chromatography-electrospray tandem mass spectrometry*'. Analytica Chimica Acta. **624**(1): p. 90-96.

J. Ochsenbein, U., Zeh, M., & Berset, J.-D., (2008). '*Comparing solid phase extraction and direct injection for the analysis of ultra-trace levels of relevant explosives in lake water and tributaries using liquid chromatography-electrospray tandem mass spectrometry*'. Chemosphere. **72**(6): p. 974-980.

J. Ikegami, T. & Tanaka, N., (2004). '*Monolithic columns for high-efficiency hplc separations*'. Current Opinion in Chemical Biology. **8**(5): p. 527-533.

[25]. Merk (2009). '*The chromatography manual*'. Merk, Editor.

- [26]. Chocholous, P., Satínský, D., Sladkovský, R., Pospíšilová, M., & Solich, P., (2008). '*Determination of pesticides fenoxycarb and permethrin by sequential injection chromatography using miniaturized monolithic column*'. *Talanta*. **77**(2): p. 566-570.
- [27]. Harris, D.C., (1997). '*Qualitative chemical analysis*'. Freeman & Company.
- [28]. Beale, D.J., Porter,

Page 27: [55] Deleted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

A., & Roddick, F.A., (2009). '*A fast screening method for the presence of atrazine and other triazines in water using flow injection with chemiluminescent detection*'. *Talanta*. **78**(2): p. 342-347.

[29]. Baranowska, I., Barchanska, H., & Pacak, E., (2006). '*Procedures of trophic chain samples preparation for determination of triazines by hplc and metals by icp-aes methods*'. *Environmental Pollution*. **143**(2): p. 206-211.

[30]. Zhou, Q.X., Xiao,

Page 27: [56] Deleted	David Beale	08/05/2010 15:20:00
-----------------------	-------------	---------------------

P., Wang, W.D., Liu, G.G., Shi, Q.Z., & Wang, J.H., (2006). '*Determination of atrazine and simazine in environmental water samples using multiwalled carbon nanotubes as the adsorbents for preconcentration prior to high performance liquid chromatography with diode array detector*'. *Talanta*. **68**(4): p. 1309-1315.

[31]. Hudson, N., Baker, A., & Reynolds, D., (2007). '*Fluorescence analysis of dissolved organic matter in natural, waste and polluted waters- a review*'. *River Research and Applications*. **23**: p. 631-649.

[32].

Page 27: [57] Formatted	David Beale	09/05/2010 22:05:00
-------------------------	-------------	---------------------

Indent: Left: 0 pt, Hanging: 36 pt, Line spacing: Double