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Abstract

In this pilot study, a method for the determination of phthalates in honey was developed. The following phthalates are included: dimethyl phthalate, diethyl phthalate, di-isobutyl phthalate, di-n-butyl phthalate, bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, and di-(n-octyl) phthalate. For the preparation of the samples, the method of liquid-liquid extraction with hexane with an ultrasonic bath was used. The analysis of the prepared samples was performed using gas chromatography and a mass detector. The method is reliable, sensitive, and reproducible with a detection limit of 0.28 - 1.38 μg/kg. This paper presents the results of testing samples of honey stored in glass and plastic packaging for three years in order to determine the migration of phthalates. Dimethyl phthalate was not found in the tested samples stored in plastic and glass packaging. Diethyl phthalate was not found in samples stored in glass packaging while the concentration of diethyl phthalate in samples from plastic packaging was 3.34 μg/kg. The concentrations of di-isobutyl phthalate, di-n-butyl phthalate and bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, determined in samples from glass packaging were 5.32, 1.32 and 4.45 μg/ kg, and in honey samples from plastic packaging 15.84, 16.01 and 14.44 μg/kg. Concentrations of di-(n-octyl) phthalate were less than the LOQ in both types of samples.
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Kratak sadržaj

U ovoj pilot studiji razvijena je metoda za određivanje ftalata u medu. Predmetni ftalati su: dimetil ftalat, dietil ftalat, di-isobutil ftalat, di-n-butil ftalat, bis(2-etilhexil) ftalat i di-(n-octil) ftalat. Za pripremu uzorka je korišćena metoda tečno-tečne ekstrakcije sa hexanom uz pomoć ultrazvučnog kupatila. Analiza pripremljenih uzoraka je rađena primenom gasne hromatografije kuplovane sa masenim detektorom. Metoda je pouzdana, osetljiva i reproducibilna sa granicom detekcije od 0,28 – 1,38 μg/kg. U ovom radu prikazani su rezultati ispitivanja uzoraka meda koji je skladišten u staklenoj i plastičnoj ambalaži tokom tri godine s ciljem utvrđivanja migracije ftalata. Dimetil ftalat nije nađen u ispitanim uzorcima skladištenim u plastičnoj i staklenoj ambalaži. Dietil ftalat nije nađen u ispitanim uzorcima skladištenim u plastičnoj ambalaži, dok je koncentracija dietil ftalata u uzorcima skladištenim u stakloj ambalaži bila 3,34 μg/kg. Koncentracija di-isobutil ftalata, di-n-butil ftalata i bis(2-etilhexil) ftalata, ispitanih u uzorcima meda skladištenih u stakloj ambalaži je bila 5,32, 1,32 and 4,45 μg/kg, a u uzorcima meda skladištenog u plastičnoj ambalaži 15,84, 16,01 i 14,44 μg/kg. Koncentracije di-(n-octil) ftalata su bile manje od LOQ u obe vrste uzoraka.

Ključne reči: GC-MS, plastična ambalaža, DiBP, DBP, DEHP

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, plastic is increasingly used for food packaging due to the low cost of materials, its potential for thermal sealing, optical properties, and it is also suitable for making different shapes and sizes. Due to these properties, plastic products for food packaging and beverages have surpassed the use of materials such as glass or tinplate. Plastic packaging has many advantages - it is light, resistant, and easy to shape, i.e. it can be formed in different shapes and...
sizes and thus adapted to different types of food, from solids to liquids. Plastic packaging provides good protection against damage. However, from the chemical point of view, when it comes to biodegradability, its harmful effects are the subject of a great number of research papers today. EU Regulation 1935 dating from 2004 is based on the fact that all materials or objects that come into direct or indirect contact with food must be inert enough to prevent the transfer of things to food in the quantities that are large enough to endanger human health or cause unacceptable changes in food composition or deterioration of its organoleptic properties. Plastic can be decomposed into compounds harmful to human health. These are divided into organic and inorganic compounds. The first group includes amines, phenols, and phthalates. In order to obtain softer and more flexible plastic products, so-called softeners are added during their production, and phthalates are the subject of this pilot study.

Diesters of 1,2-benzenedicarboxylic acid, better known as phthalates, are a group of man-made chemicals widely used in industry (Meeker et al, 2009). They are present primarily in plastic products, toys, medical instruments, industrial materials, food, and clothing. These compounds have the ability to disrupt the function of the endocrine system. The effects depend on the dose, duration of action, and developmental stage of the organism. The fetus, newborn, and children in puberty are the most vulnerable categories. Exposure to phthalates begins in the intrauterine period, as they freely pass through the placental barrier. It is believed that the side effects of phthalates can be manifested through neurocognitive disorders, allergies, asthma, testicular cancer, liver and kidney damage, insulin resistance and obesity, thyroid dysfunction, and respiratory system irritation. Phthalates in females can lead to anovulation, premature puberty, and changes in the duration of pregnancy (Butala et al, 2004; Yen et al, 2011; Bajkin et al, 2014). Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), dibutyl phthalate (DBP), benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP) and di-isobutyl phthalate (DIBP) (‘the four phthalates’) are listed in Annex XIV to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 as substances that are toxic for reproduction, category 1B. Therefore, phthalate toxicity poses a significant risk to human health.

According to the “Rulebook on the Restrictions and Ban of Production, Placing on the Market and Use of Chemicals (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia RS”, 90/2013, 25/2015, 2/2016, 44/2017, 36/2018 and 9/2020) DBP, DEHP, BBP are prohibited for use in toys and objects intended for child care in concentrations higher than 0.1% of plasticized materials, while di-“isononyl” phthalate (DINP), di-“isodecyl” phthalate (DIDP), di-n-octyl phthalate (DNOP) are prohibited for use in toys and items intended for the care of children that children can put in their mouths in concentrations higher than 0.1% of plasticized materials. Given the harmful effects of phthalates on hu-
man health and the fact that they are increasingly found in plastic food packaging, there is a justified need to place clearly defined restrictions on these compounds in food packaging, and food as well. The honey whose production process does not enable contamination with phthalates, except in the case of packaging and storage in plastic packaging, is the sample whose analysis could prove the migration of phthalates in the product. Also, certain types of honey crystallize during storage—some faster and some slower. Although crystallization is a natural property of honey, a large number of consumers do not like crystallized honey, so in order to decrystallize it, they heat it, which increases the migration of phthalates. In order to prove this, it is necessary to analyse the phthalate content in honey samples. The method of liquid-liquid extraction with hexane and the analysis of the stored samples using gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) were chosen. The goal of this study is to develop and validate a method for the determination of phthalates in honey.

**MATERIAL AND METHODS**

**Honey samples**

For the purpose of determining the presence of phthalates in honey, ten samples of different origin were collected. Honey samples were randomly collected from two sources: honey samples that were brought to the Scientific Veterinary Institute “Novi Sad” (NIV-NS) in plastic jars and honey samples that were collected from NIV-NS’s bee yard in glass jars. All the samples were in their original packaging and were transferred to the laboratory, properly labeled and stored in a dark place at room temperature for 3 years.

**Reagents and materials**

Standards of phthalate acid esters (PAE) were investigated in this study, namely dimethyl phthalate (DMP; C10H10O4), diethyl phthalate (DEP; C12H14O4), diisobutyl phthalate (DiBP; C16H22O4), dibutyl phthalate (DBP; C16H22O4), bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP; C24H38O4), di-n-octylphthalate (DnOP; C24H34O4) they were purchased from Dr. Ehrenstorfer GmbH (Germany). In Table 1, analytical data include Abbreviation, Retention time and Qualitative and Quantitative ion monitoring. N-Hexane was HPLC grade (Carlo Erba, Milan, Italy). The solutions of each phthalate were prepared at concentrations of 1 mg/mL. Phthalates solutions at different concentrations (0.005, 0.01, 0.1, 0.05, 0.5 μg/mL) were prepared by dilution in n-hexane. The solutions were stored in vials at −20 °C. In order to avoid cross-contamination
due to reagents, materials, and laboratory equipment, a thorough cleaning procedure was performed: the glassware was soaked and washed in acetone, dried at 140 °C for at least 4 h. All the solvents used in the analysis were tested in order to check the potential presence of PAE contamination using GC–MS analysis. Ultrapure water was produced by a Milli-Q system (Millipore, Bedford, USA).

Table 1. Chemical data on the compounds investigated in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Retention time (min)</th>
<th>Quantitative ion (m/z)</th>
<th>Qualitative ion (m/z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Di-methyl phthalate</td>
<td>DMP</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>77/194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-ethyl phthalate</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>177/176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-isobutyl phthalate</td>
<td>DiBP</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>104/167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-n-butyl phthalate</td>
<td>DBP</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>205/104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate</td>
<td>DEHP</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>167/206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-(n-octyl) phthalate</td>
<td>DnOP</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>279/104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample pretreatment**

The amount of 5 g of honey and 10 mL of ultra-pure water was put into a 100 mL screw-cap glass centrifuge tube with a conical bottom and vigorously vortexed to for at least 1 min in order to form a homogeneous solution. After that, the solution was mixed with 10 mL of hexane, and submitted to extraction by shaking in a mechanical shaker for 40 min. Then, the organic phase was separated by centrifugation at 3000 rpm for 10 min and collected. The sample was once again extracted with 10 mL of hexane and the above-described procedure was repeated. The two portions of supernatant were collected and transferred to a clear conical flask and evaporated to dryness at 40 °C with a rotary evaporator. The residue was dissolved in 1.0 mL of hexane and the final solution was used for GC–MS analysis (Zhou et al, 2014). The method precision was evaluated, as described by Zhou et al. (2014). The retention times of the peaks and target ions, obtained from the standard solution of phthalates served as a base point for the phthalate’s determination in samples.
**GC-MS Analysis and Instrumentation**

The identification of phthalates was based on a comparison of retention times of the peaks and target ions with those obtained from a standard mixture of phthalates (standards supplied by instrument manufacturer). The quantification was based on external calibration curves prepared from the standard solution of each of the examined phthalates.

The GC operating conditions are shown in Table 2. The verification of the peaks was carried out based on the retention times and target ions were compared to those of external phthalates. A solvent blank was also analyzed, phthalates were detected at the concentrations lower than LOQ.

Table 2. The GC operating conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Agilent 7890B/5977A MSD (Santa Clara, CA, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Fused silica column (30 m × 0.25 μm film of HP-5M-thickness) Agilent Technologies, Inc., (Santa Clara, CA, USA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Temperature  | Injection 280 °C  
MSD 280 °C  
Column 90 °C (1 min hold) to 210 °C at 15 °C / min (hold 2 min); then at the rate of 5 °C/min to 240 °C to hold 5 min; followed by an increase of 5 °C/min to 250 °C, and the followed by an increase of 25 °C /min to 300 °C held for 4 min. |
| Injection volume | 2 μL |

The determination was performed in splitless mode. Carrier gas was Helium, velocity: 35.698 cm/sec; pressure: 7.0 psi. The determination was made at constant flow.

**RESULTS**

**Method Validation**

Method validation and quality control were conducted following the European Commission SANTE /11813/2017 Regulation (European Commission, 2017). The method was validated in terms of the optimal linearity ($r^2 > 0.99$). Precision was evaluated by repeatability in triplicate (50.0 μg/kg, $n = 10$) and
it ranged from 0.79 – 5.72%. Recovery ranged from 88.51% to 112.23%. The obtained results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The average values of LOD, LOQ, precision, linearity, recovery and RSD in honey samples, spiked with 50 μg/kg (n = 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>LOD (^1) (μg/kg)</th>
<th>LOQ (^2) (μg/kg)</th>
<th>Precision (%)</th>
<th>Linearity (^3) ((r^2))</th>
<th>Recovery (%)</th>
<th>RSD (^4) (%O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMP</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>96.65</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td>112.23</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiBP</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>94.62</td>
<td>12.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBP</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.9996</td>
<td>95.12</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHP</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>92.12</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DnOP</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) LOD—Limit of detection; \(^2\) LOQ—Limit of quantification; \(^3\) \(r^2\)—Correlation coefficient; \(^4\) RSD—Precision in case of repeatability

**Concentration of phthalates in honey**

The pilot study results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Concentration of phthalates in honey and blank (μg/kg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Blank (hexan + water)</th>
<th>3 years stored honey in glass jar(^1)</th>
<th>3 years stored honey in plastic jar(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMP</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiBP</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>15.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBP</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHP</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DnOP</td>
<td>&lt;LOQ</td>
<td>&lt; LOQ</td>
<td>&lt; LOQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Average concentration of 5 measurements of 3 years stored honey in glass jar; 
\(^2\) Average concentration of 5 measurements of 3 years stored honey in plastic jar
DISCUSSION

Various analytical methods, liquid and gas chromatographic techniques with different detectors have been used to determine phthalates over the years. (Glaser et al., 1981; Prokůpková et al., 2002; Batlle & Nerín, 2004; Li et al., 2004; Xu et al., 2007; Farajzadeh et al., 2012; Yan et al., 2012), LC–UV (Jen and Liu, 2006; Ling et al., 2007; Li et al., 2008; Zhao et al., 2008; Kamarei et al., 2011), GC–MS (Penalver et al., 2000; Feng et al., 2005; Serôdio & Nogueira, 2006; Sørensen, 2006; Shen et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2008; Regueiro et al., 2008; Cacho et al., 2012; Jiao et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2012; Yan et al., 2012; Kong et al., 2012) and LC–MS/MS (López-Jiménez et al., 2005). GC–MS detection methods for the identification and quantification of phthalates are most commonly used for routine analyses due to their relatively high sensitivity and selectivity. In addition to the development of methods for quantifying phthalates, a significant step in this process is the development of a method for sample preparation. Over the years, different techniques and matrices have required different methods of sample preparation and optimization, in order to obtain a fast and reliable method of preparation. Besides SPE preparation (Harris et al., 1997; Liu et al., 2008; Li et al., 2008; Kamarei et al., 2011; Yan et al., 2012), single-drop microextraction (Batlle and Nerín, 2004), solid phase microextraction (Penalver et al., 2000; Prokůpková et al., 2002; Li et al., 2004; Feng et al., 2005), liquid-liquid extraction were also used (LLE) (Zhou et al., 2014).

In this study, performance development methods included verification of linearity, limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ), precision, recovery using a Guardiennes for pesticides residues (SANTE/2019). The calibration curves were obtained by measuring standard solutions injected in five level of concentration (0.005; 0.01; 0.05; 0.1; 0.5 μg/mL). Figure 1. shows chromatograms of solvent blank (water and hexane) and standard solution, which means that the applied parameters of the method will enable phthalates separation. The linearity of the method was determined by calibration in five calibration levels and good linearity characterized by a coefficient of linearity was obtained for all phthalates of interest > 0.999 ($r^2 > 0.999$). LOQ and LOD were determined by injecting five consecutive samples of the first calibration point (0.005 μg / mL) with an acceptable accuracy of ± 20%. The accuracy was assessed on the basis of the data obtained by injecting standard solutions in five replicates in two calibration levels. It ranged between 0.78 – 5.72. Recovery was determined by spiking a sample of honey into two concentration levels and two mean values obtained are shown as a result. Recovery values range between 88.51 - 112.23% which is in line with the Sante guidelines. The result of the recovery, which corresponds to the recommendation for residual
determinations, also shows us that the applied phthalate extraction method is satisfactory. During the development of the method, no calibration method was used through the matrix, but a blank sample was taken that underwent the same preparation procedure as the honey sample and contained water and hexane. The obtained results on the presence of phthalates in the blank are shown in Table 4. Namely, the values of phthalates in the blank are quantified, but below the LOQ values with a low level of confidence and therefore are not shown. However, it is important to point out that the solvent blank must work due to the wide distribution of phthalates. Notardonato et al (2020) got linearity > 0.999, but recovery was in the range from 69.3 to 98.8%. Zhou et al (2014) also got good linearity and recovery was between 82.9 – 110.9%.

![SIM mode blank chromatographs (hexane and water) (above) and phthalate standard with a concentration of 0.05 μg/g (below).](image)

Notardonato et al (2020) also used gas chromatograph (GC) coupled with ion trap mass spectrometry (GC-MS) with selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode for phthalates determination same like Goodman W. (2009) who made an application note for determination of phthalates using GC-MS. If we look the condition parameters, we can see that we all had used similar parameters. We all used silica column with same diameters (30 m x 0.25 mm x 0.25 μm),
while the start temperature was not exactly the same, but it was similar (between 90 and 100 °C). However, the response for each compound was linear with $r^2$ greater than 0.999 for all phthalates compounds and for all authors. In this study we analyzed and found phthalates in honey. Some other authors also reported phthalates contamination of honey (Notardonato et al., 2020; Zhou et al, 2014; Lo Turco et al, 2016). The concentration that we registered was much lower than that found by other authors who analyzed more samples (Notardonato et al., 2020; Lo Turco et al, 2016).

DMP and DnOP were not detected in these ten honey samples, while other analyzed phthalates were present. The maximum contents of PAEs were within 16.01 μg/kg for DBP; 15.84 μg/kg for DiBP; 14.44 μg/kg for DEHP; 3.34 μg/kg for DEP.

These examinations show that the samples in glass bottle had lower level of phthalates. Notardonato et al. (2020) analyzed 47 nectar honey samples and they found DMP in only one sample while DEP were found in 5 samples in the range from 25.4 to 374 μg/kg; DIPB were detected in six samples ranging between 28.7 and 553.1 μg/kg, DBP was in the range from 11.5 to 996.8 μg/kg; DEHP was detected in 37 samples in the range from 4.9 to 502.8 μg/kg and DnOP in range from 5.1 to 888.2 μg/kg in 25 samples. Our examination shows a lower level of contamination in honey than in other studies (Lo Turco et al, 2016; Notardonato et al., 2020;).

As some plastic can migrate from food through different materials, the EU Commission has defined the presence and the levels of small amounts of additives in food. Particularly, according to the EU Regulation No. 10/2011 and 2005/2018, the safety limit defined by each specific migration limits (SMLs) in food, for DMP, DEP, DiBP, and DnOP is 60 mg/kg, and 0.3, 0.05, and 1.5 mg/kg for DBP, BP-A, and DEHP, respectively. The limit of 60 mg/kg requires consideration: this high value means that the additive is permitted to be used in the polymer production for food packaging and there are no restrictions. The LOQs that we had were lower than the SML set by the EU Commission: this means that the method investigated is sensitive enough to analyze the threshold limits of the different compounds in the collected honey samples.

**CONCLUSION**

In this study, a fast and reliable method for the determination of six phthalates from honey was developed. Using liquid-liquid extraction, satisfactory recovery values were obtained and the analysis was performed on GC-MS. This paper can be considered as a pilot study for the determination of phthalates in honey and honey products. During the analysis, phthalates were found even
in blank solvent, in concentrations lower than LOQ, and their presence even in the blank indicates the need to expand the study. During the test, phthalates were found in all tested honey samples. Given the findings, in the future, we will focus on potential sources of phthalate contamination in the process of production of honey and honey products and will continue more extensive testing of these contaminants not only in honey but also in other foods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was funded by Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia by the Contract of implementation and funding of research work of NIV-NS in 2021, Contract No: 451-03-9/2021-14/200031 and was also supported by Provincial Secretariat for Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of Vojvodina, Contract No: 104-401-4672/2021/01.

Author’s Contribution

B.K. drafting the manuscript and have made substantial contributions to basic idea; B.K. and J.P. carried out the GC-MS analysis and have been involved in drafting the manuscript; J.V. carried out sample collection and sample preparation and performed the statistical analysis; J.V. and R.R. have been involved in drafting the manuscript; B.Đ. have been involved in data collection; J.V. and R.R. revised the manuscript critically.

Competing interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES


5. COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No. 10/2011 of 14 January 2011 on plastic materials and articles intended to come into contact with food


Received: 22.11.2021.