ANALYTICAL LETIERS, 32(4), 827-840 (1999)

# THE IDENTIFICATION AND QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE VERY TOXIC 2,3,7;8-TETRACHLORDIBENZO-P-DIOXIN INTHE PRESENCE OF POLYCHLORINATED DIBENZODIOXINS (PCDDs) AND POLYCIILORINATED DIBENZOFURANS (PCDFs) CONTAI\tINATED SOIL SAMPLES

Kcy Words: Polichlorodibeiizodioxins, Toxic Materials, GC-MS, TCDD, PCDD, PCDf'

M. Pehlivan\*

Selçuk University, Faculty of Education, Department of Chemistiy, 42090 Konya, Turkey

E. Pehlivan

Selçuk University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Chemistry, 42079 Konya, Turkey

M. A. Özler

Muöla University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Chemistuy, Mugla, Turkey

## H. Barlas

Istanbul University, Faculty of Engineering, Environmental Department, Istanbul, Turkey

<sup>\*</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed.

# **ABSTRACT**

This researcht' describes the nature and extent of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD) contamination in the soil samples from a waste cable incineration plant. The samples are collected at different places in the nearest and far away points of the soil around the incineration plant. A procedure which is described for the selective separation of 2,3,7,8-TCDD from ali other PCDDs and PCDFs fractionated on Alumina Woelm B Super I in such a manner that all P.CDDs and PCDFs are eluted prior to 2,3,7,8-TCDD. This procedure allows mor- 'sensitive quantitative determination of 2,3,7,8-TCDD in the soil samples.

## **INTRODUCTION**

\Ve have recently published a procedure <sup>1</sup> which allows the selective determination of PCDDs and PCDFs on the roadside of moto rways. Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDDs) and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs) have been identified as by products in industrial compounds, formed during the combustion processes in the municipal incinerators, in the waste cable buming processes and in the production of some chlorinated aromatic compounds<sup>2</sup>?

Problems concerning the correct determination and interpretation of soil pollution have been considered to be important due to toxic effects. Some of the PCDDs and PCDFs have extremely toxic properties and they are a risk to human health. The most toxic compound appears to be the 2,3,7,8-substituted te trachlordibenzodioxin•<sup>8 10</sup>. Due to its potential bioaccumulation and resistance to metabolism, this halogenated compound has received much scientific attention. üne ofthe scnsitive signs of2,3,7,8-TCDD toxicity in animals is the loss ofbody weight. Although doses are low, it leads to embryotoxicity<sup>11</sup>.<sup>12</sup> If a low detection

limit is desired, the quantitative determination of 2,3,7,8-TCDD in soil samples containing a large amount of TCDDs and TCDFs is diffic ult. In this study, 2,3,7,8-TCDD determination in soil samples coming from the chlorine source of a waste cable incineration plant is described.

The most toxic isomer of PCDDs is 2,3,7,8-TCDD and it has a structural fomula shown in Fig.  $1^{13}$ .

# EXPERil\1ENTAL

#### Equipment

- 1. Gas Chromatography (GC;HP): Hewlett-Packard GmbH, Gennany.
- 2. Mass Spectrometer (MS '1-IP 5970 B): Hewlett-Packard GmbH.
- 3. Bio-Beads S-X3 G I chromatography: Bio Rad, Germany.
- 4. CapiUary Colwnn (Chrompack, CP-Sil 88): Compack International, Holland.

### Chemicals

- 1. <sup>13</sup>C-PCDD/PCDFstandards: Promochemie GmbH, Germany.
- 2. Nitrogen Gas, Helium Gas: Fa. Messer, Germany.
- Organic Solvents: Dichloromethane, Cyclohexane, Hexane, Acetone, Benzene, Toluenes (all ofnanograd purity): Promochemie.
- Kieselgel-Silica Woelm 63-Active, Na<sub>2</sub>SO-1, Conc. H<sub>2</sub>SO-1, AgNO<sub>3</sub>, Alumina B Super 1, Woelm Pharma Eschwege: Promochemie.

### **Experimental Procedure**

The analytical methods developed for the determination of PCDDs and PCDFs and 2,3,7,8-TCDD in the various soil samples entail a sequence of five operations:

- 1. Extraction of PCDD and PCDF from the soil samples
- 2. Preliminary separation of PCDDs and PCDFs from the major matrix constituents



#### FIG.I. The structural formula of2,3,7,8-TCDD

3. Detection of PCDDs and PCDFs in the cleaned-up sampleextract

4. Preliminary separation of 2, 3, 7, 8-TCDD from the PCDDs and PCDFs

5. Detection of 2,3,7,8-TCDD

### Extraction, Separa'tion and Detection of the PCDDs and PCDFs

To obtain **p**; re PCDDs and PCDFs fraction free of other compounds, the extract is subjected to a clean-up procedure using the method below:

### l\lethod

The PCDD/PCDF isomers of the soil samples, were isolated and concentrated by chromatographic techniques in the following sequence:

Soil Sample

,I <sup>13</sup>C-PCDD/PCDFstandards

Soxhlet Extraction

Column Chromatography

### **,**۱

GC/MS Analysis (Selected Ion Monitoring)

The following adsorbents were utilised for the column chromatographic separation:

PEHLIVAN ET AL.

- 1- Kieselgel % 44 H<sub>2</sub>SO.1 (2.5 X 60 cm)
- 2- Macro Alumina B Super 1 (2.5 X 60 cm)
- 3- Mix Column (2 X 30 cm)
- 4- Bio-Beads S-X3 Gel Chromatography (3 X 60 cm)
- 5- Mini Alumina 8 Super l (0.7 X l l cm)

in the separation technique, known amounts of <sup>13</sup>C-PCCD/PCDF standards were injected to the soil samples, and these samples were then extracted in a Soxhlet type extractor. The total PCDD/PCDF isomers of the sample were first isolated and t en concentrated by passing the extract thro1:1gh columns packed with Kieselge(% 44 H<sub>2</sub>SO.1, Macro Alumina 8 Super I, Mix. Column, Bio Beads S-X3 Gel Chromatography, Mini Alumina B Super I columns, all of which \* are "basically chromatographic separation procedures. Quantitative determinati5>ns were then performed by recording the spectra of ali PCDD/PCDF extracts on a GC/MS instrument.

# Separation of 2, 3, 7, 8-TCDD

The GC/MS analyses of the clean-up fraction containing the PCDDs and PCDFs don't allow a correct quantitative detennination of 2,3,7,8-TCDD. For that reason, the eluant is evaporated and the residue is dissolved in 5 mi of benzene. This solution is injected onto a column filled with 3 g Alumina Woelm 8 Super **1** and 2.5 g Na<sub>2</sub>SO-1, prewashed with 50 mi of hexane. This column is eluted with 35 mi of 20 % dichloromethane in hexane mixture. This fraction contains all PCDDs and PCDFs except 2,3,7,8-TCDD. Then the column is eluted with 30 mi 50 % dichloromethane in hexane mixture and 2,3,7,8-TCDD is obtained. This eluant is evaporated to 4 mi and dried in a nitrogen atmosphere and 10 µI benzene is added.

### Detection of 2, 3, 7, 8-TCDD

The final solution was analysed on a GC/MS instrument under the following experimental conditions: A CP Sil 88 capillary column was employed,

and helium was used as a carrier gas, and the temperature of the chromatographic separation was programmed as follows: 130 °C for 1 min. and raised from 130 uc to 240 °c at a rate of 15 °ctmin. The capillary column was directly connected to a mass-selective detector in order to achieve efficient chromatographic separation.

The quantitative evaluation was accomplished by the use of massfragmentograms obtained from GC/MS analyses in the following manner:

The "response factor" of the 2,3,7,8-TCDD isomer was calculated from the mass fragmentogram peak of the  ${}^{13}$ C-2,3,7,8-TCDD stantlar obtained ... experimentally. Then, quantitative calculation was carried out utilising the mass fragmentogram of the isomer and its response factor.

The "m/z ( { d (M+2f" ions of ali the TCDD isomers, and 2,3,7,8-TCDD isomer d  $^{13}$ C-2,3,7,8-TCDD obtained from the analyses of the soil samples are illustrated in Fig.2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4.

#### The Suitability of The Method

in the beginning of the analysis, <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDD;;tandard was injected to the soil sample to determine how muclı <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDDstandard will be lost during the chromatographic separation. If there is some decrease in the amount of <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDDstandard, the same ratio will be considered in our sample. For this, a definite amount of <sup>13</sup>C-1,2,3,4-TCDD comparison sample was injected to the concentrated sample after chromatographic steps. Then GC-MS analysis of <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDD standard and <sup>13</sup>C-1,2,3,4-TCDD comparison sample was done together. The obtained mass fragmentogram was given in Fig. 5. Then, the area and peak height of the mass fragmentogram of <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDD standard and <sup>13</sup>C-1,2,3,4-TCDD compared with each other. As seen in Fig.5, there wasn't any loss. This result proves the reliability of this method for the quantitative dete ination of <sup>12</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDD in soil samples. The difference between peak heights is smaller than the



FIG. 2. The massfragmentogram1 of M' and (M+2t ions oftetraCDDs



FIG. 3. The massfragmentograms of M' and (M+2t ion., of 2,3,7,8-tethaCDD)





and (M+2t ions of <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-tctraCDD standard



FIG. 5. The massfragmentograms of (M+2l lons of uC-2,3,7,8-tetraCDD standard and uC-1,2,3,4-tetraCDD comparison sample

Ion 334.00 amu.

difference between peak areas. For that reason, quantitative calculations were done by using the peak heights.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The aim of the present study is to find the specific concentration of 2,3,7,8-TCDD in the PCDDs and PCDFs contaminated soil samples. \Ve report on the GC/MS properties of chlorinated PCDDs and PCDFs and we also present an analytical method for 2,3,7, TCDD.

Some of the PCDDs and PCDFs have extraordinary toxic properties, and *!* have been the subject of rri ch interest. They are now generally associated with the confourties when organic materials and a chlorine source are present. \_The isomer analyses of PCDDs and PCDFs contaminated soil samples exhibited the known broad spectrum of toxic dioxin and foran isomers. Because of the extreme toxicity of the 2,3,7,8-TCDD isomer, very sensitive analytical techniques are required. The separation, identification and quantification of 2,3,7,8-TCDD has become very important.

An extract from the soil sample was cleaned up for PCDDs and PCDFs analyses. Total concentration of PCDDs and PCDFs obtained for the different soil samples after GC/MS analyses are given in Tables 1 and 2. The PCDDs and PCDFs results reported in these Tables are the emission from the waste cable incineration plant to the soil for 12 months accumulation.

The PCDDs and PCDFs samples extracted from the soil sample were fractionated as described in the reference l. The separation of 22 mass fragmentograms of(M+) and (M+2f isomers ofTCDDs homologous group from PCDDs and PCDFs arc shown in Fig. 2. In this figure, the most toxic TCDD congener substituted 2,3,7,8-TCDD is shown as the dark black peak. This fraction containing all PCDDs and PCDFs was fractionated on Alumina \Voelm

# TABLE 1

# The Contribution of Individual Congeners of Ali PCDD/PCDF (ng/g) in The

	Sam le 1	Sam le2	Sam le3
Total TetraCDD	20.50	13.00	9.00
-2,3,7,8-TetraCDD	0.63	0.55	0.27
Total PentaCDD	37.80	21.00	10.40
-1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD	2.92	2.04	1.29
Total HexaCDD	41.60	24.40	21.30
-1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDD	2.39	1.98	1.62
-1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDD	4.79	2.83	2.59
-1,2,3,-7,8,9-HexaCDD	3.59	2.26	1.83
Total HeptaCDD	66.80	43.30	42.50
-1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDD	34.01	23.30	23.00
Total OctaCDD	63.80	16.20	50.00
Total PCDD	230.50	118.00	141.20
Total TetraCDF	154.00	52.40	45.10
-2,3,7,8-TetraCDF	24.73	6.85	6.41
Total PentaCDF	218.70	92.20	66.70
-1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDF	50.73	13.65	10.42
-2,3,4,7,8-PentaCDF	16.62	7.03	4.62
Total HexaCDF	201.70	1 14.00	101.40
-1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDF	46.26	16.29	20.20
-1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDF	27.91	13.33	13.76
-1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDF	3.99	3.70	2.90
-2,3,4,6,7,8-HexaCDF	5.88	6.67	6.52
Total HeptaCDF	357.60	102.10	<b>l</b> 10.50
-1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDF	201.39	65.40	74.40
-1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HeptaCDF	59.03	18.20	21.90
Total OctaCDF	179.00	40.20	45.00
Total PCDF	1111.00	409.70	376.70
Total Toxic Equivalent (TE)	27.77	11.05	10.61

**Different Soil Samples** 

### **TABLE2**

# The Contribution of Individual Congeners of Ali PCDD/PCDF (ng/g) in The

	Sam le 4	Sam le 5	Sam le 6
Total TetraCDD	90.60	1.04	0.65
-2,3,7,8-TetraCDD	0.28	0.03	0.02
Total PentaCDD	13.10	2.57	1.55
-1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD	0.88	0.17	0.08
Total HexaCDD	15.70	3.16	1.90
-1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDD	0.95	0.21	0.10
-1,2,3,6,7,8-He aCDD	1.77	0.37	0.19
-1,2,3,7,8,9 <u>·</u> HexaCDD	1.15	0.24	0.10
Total HeptaCDD	16.80	5.60	3.04
-1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDD	10.90	3.29	1.56
Total OctaCDD	17.30	5.26	2.71
Total PCDD	72.50	17.71	9.05
Total TetraCDF	38.30	6.49	3.01
-2,3,7,8-TetraCDF	4.50	096	0.43
Total PentaCDF	55.20	9.97	5.30
-1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDF	<b>l</b> 1.95	1.46	0.76
-2,3,4,7,8-PentaCDF	3.29	0.69	0.35
Total HexaCDF	42.90	10.95	5.84
-1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDF	9.21	2.44	1.31
-1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDF	5.32	1.40	0.69
-1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDF	1.06	0.32	0.13
-2,3,4,6,7,8-HexaCDF	2.48	0.61	0.24
Total HeptaCDF	50.40	15.63	7.75
-1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDF	30.46	8.19	4.14
-1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HeptaCDF	7.35	2.68	1.07
Total OctaCDF	28.40	10.51	5.42
Total PCDF	215.20	53.55	27.32
Total Toxic Equivalent (TE)	6.40	1.33	0.68

**Different Soil Samples** 

B Super 1 column and 2,3,7,8-TCDD is separated from the others and the fragmentograms of(M), (M+2f 2,3,7,8-TCDD are shown in Fig. 3.

The adsorption behaviour of 2,3,7,8-TCDD on the Alumina Woelm B Super 1 shown in Fig. 3, differs significantly from all other PCDDs and has not been obtained by other chromatographic techniques, such as HPLC.

The "response factor" of the Tetra-CDD isomer was calculated from the fragmentogram peaks of the <sup>13</sup>C-standards obtained experimentally. Then, quantitative calculation was carried out utilising the mass-fragmentogram of the isomer and its response f or. <sup>13</sup>C<sub>12</sub> -2 ,3,7,8-TCDD internal stand ds are shown in Fig.4. The retention time of M+ and (M+2f mass fragmentograms is seen approximately as\_-1 .7 minutes. Meanwhile a 5 ng <sup>13</sup>C<sub>12</sub> -2 ,3,7,8-TCDD injected sample giv s-identical results. The quantitative values in Fig. 2 were calculated from the response factors which were obtained from the values of peak height and abundance values as given in Tables 1 and 2.

The determination of 2,3,7,8-TCDD can't be analysed without possibility of its selective loss during clean-up. The (M+), (M+2f mass fragmentograms of <sup>13</sup>C-2,3,7,8-TCDDas an internal standard is shown in Fig.4. The retention time of the native 2,3,7,8-tetraCDD is the same as that of the labelled standard. The isotope ratio (320/322) agrees with the labelled standard.

The total PCDD and PCDF values were over 1 ng/kg as seen in the Table 1. These toxic amounts are quite big for human healtlı. This pollution affects foods, and the food chain is the primary pathway of human exposure to PCDF. PCDF is easily dissolved in fatty oil and is stored in human fatty tissues<sup>3</sup> • The human population is exposed to variable mixtures of polychlorinated dibenzo-pdioxins and dibenzofurans from the environment. The persistence in man of the most toxic substance, 2,3,7,8-TCDD, suggested a half-life of several years. The distribution of various PCDDs and PCDFs was measured in rat tissues. Amounts of the applied dose to rats of over 1 ng/kg can give degeneration of liver tissue, losses of weight, tumors on the liver, lung and nose<sup>9</sup>. The results from this study should reveal that chlorinated aromatic compounds such as 2,3,7,8-substituted TCDD are a potential risk to the public and the environment.

We have demonstrated that the soil samples can be analysed for 2,3,7,8-TCDD very effectively at low levels of detection with this technique. According to our experience the described procedures can also readily be applied to the other industrial products and corresponding waste samples.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGJ\IENT**

\Ve are grateful to SeiçJk University Research Foundation for supporting this research project.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. M. Pehlivan and A.D. Bedük, Ana/. Lell., 25 (11), 2107-2122 (1992).
- 2. H.R. Buser, Cliemosphere, 16 (4), 713-732 (1987).
- G. Choudhary, L.H. Kelty and C. Rappe, Butterworth Publishers, 165-181 (1983).
- T. Zacharewski, M. Harris, S. Safe, H. Thoma, G. Hausschulz, E. Knorr and O. Hutzinger, *Chemosphere*, **18** (1-6), 381-387 (1989).
- T.O. Tieman, M.L. Taylor, J.H. Garret, G.F. Vanness, J.G. Solch, O.A. Dels and D.J. Wafel, *Chemosphere*, **12** (4-5), 595-606 (1983).
- K. Ballschmiter, W. Zoller, Ch. Scholz and A. Notrodt, *Chemosphere*, 12 (4-5), 585-594 (1983).
- J. Casanovas, R. Muro, E. Eljarrat, J. Calxach and J. Rivera, *Fresenius J. Anal. Chem.*, 348, 167-170 (1994).
- C.T. Curtis and H.A. Hattemer-Frey, *Chemosphere*, **16** (**10-12**), 2331-2342 (1987).
- 9. W. Mücke, Cheniosp/iere, 16 (1), 43-48 (1987).

- D.G. Patterson, J.S. Holler, W.T. Belser, E.L. Boozer, C.R. Lapeza and L.L. Noedham, *Chemosphere*, 16 (4), 935-936 (1987).
- **11.** M. van der Berg, M. van Greevenbroek and K. Olie, *C/iemosp/iere*, **15** (**4**), 509-518 (1986).
- 12. R. Krowke, Clieniosphere, 15 (9-12), 2011-2012 (1986).
- 13. Sachstand Dioxine, Umweltbundesamt, (1984).

Received: March 27, 1998 Accepted: November 11, 1998