

## Accepted Manuscript

Title: Determination of Pharmaceuticals in Biosolids using Accelerated Solvent Extraction and Liquid Chromatography/Tandem Mass Spectrometry

Authors: Yunjie Ding, Weihao Zhang, Cheng Gu, Irene Xagorarakis, Hui Li



PII: S0021-9673(10)01522-0  
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2010.10.112  
Reference: CHROMA 351541

To appear in: *Journal of Chromatography A*

Received date: 20-7-2010  
Revised date: 24-10-2010  
Accepted date: 26-10-2010

Please cite this article as: Y. Ding, W. Zhang, C. Gu, I. Xagorarakis, H. Li, Determination of Pharmaceuticals in Biosolids using Accelerated Solvent Extraction and Liquid Chromatography/Tandem Mass Spectrometry, *Journal of Chromatography A* (2010), doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2010.10.112

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



## 1 **Abstract**

2 An analytical method was developed to quantitatively determine pharmaceuticals in biosolid  
3 (treated sewage sludge) from wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). The collected biosolid  
4 samples were initially freeze dried, and grounded to obtain relatively homogenized powders.  
5 Pharmaceuticals were extracted using accelerated solvent extraction (ASE) under the optimized  
6 conditions. The optimal operation parameters, including extraction solvent, temperature, pressure,  
7 extraction time and cycles, were identified to be acetonitrile/water mixture (v/v 7:3) as extraction  
8 solvent with 3 extraction cycles (15 minutes for each cycle) at 100 °C and 100 bars. The extracts  
9 were cleaned up using solid-phase extraction followed by determination by liquid  
10 chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry. For the fifteen target pharmaceuticals  
11 commonly found in the environment, the overall method recoveries ranged from 49% to 68% for  
12 tetracyclines, 64% to 95% for sulfonamides, and 77% to 88% for other pharmaceuticals (i.e.  
13 acetaminophen, caffeine, carbamazepine, erythromycin, lincomycin and tylosin). The developed  
14 method was successfully validated and applied to the biosolid samples collected from WWTPs  
15 located in six cities in Michigan. Among the fifteen target pharmaceuticals, fourteen  
16 pharmaceuticals were detected in the collected biosolid samples. The average concentrations  
17 ranged from 2.6 µg/kg for lincomycin to 743.6 µg/kg for oxytetracycline. These results indicated  
18 that pharmaceuticals could survive wastewater treatment processes, and accumulate in sewage  
19 sludge and biosolids. Subsequent land application of the contaminated biosolids could lead to the  
20 dissemination of pharmaceuticals in soil and water environment, which poses potential threats to  
21 at-risk populations in the receiving ecosystems.

## 1 **1. Introduction**

2 Administration of pharmaceuticals is the most common practice for human disease  
3 control and treatments. Large fractions of administrated dosage are, in fact, not assimilated or  
4 metabolized in human body, but released into influents to municipal wastewater treatment plants  
5 (WWTPs) as either parent compounds or bioactive metabolites [1-3]. Unfortunately, currently  
6 operating WWTPs are not designed for effective removal of pharmaceuticals; as a result, a  
7 portion of pharmaceuticals could survive wastewater treatment processes, and disseminate to the  
8 environments via effluents from WWTPs in a dissolved form [4,5] or sorbed pharmaceuticals by  
9 sewage sludge [6]. Most sewage sludge is treated to produce biosolid and is subsequently applied  
10 to agricultural lands for its fertilizer value. This practice undoubtedly introduces sludge-born  
11 pharmaceuticals into soil and water environment where their fate and risks remain largely  
12 unknown [7-12]. There is growing concern regarding the potential impacts of these  
13 pharmaceuticals on at-risk populations in the ecosystems.

14 The information on pharmaceutical compositions and concentrations in land-applied  
15 biosolids is critical to assessing the exposure and potential risks. Analytical methods have been  
16 developed to analyze pharmaceuticals in water [10,11,13,14], animal manure [15-18] and soil  
17 [15,19-21]. In several studies analytical methods have been also reported to identify and quantify  
18 pharmaceuticals in sewage sludge from WWTPs [10,22-26]. These methods are worthy of  
19 further examination for their applicability to multiple classes of pharmaceuticals in sewage  
20 sludge or biosolids [27]. The procedure of the analytical methodology usually consists of  
21 extraction of pharmaceuticals from sludge/biosolid, cleanup of extracts, and analysis using liquid  
22 or gas chromatography. Liquid-solid partitioning is the most common approach utilized in  
23 combination of ultrasonic-assisted extraction [15], microwave-assisted extraction [19] and

1 accelerated solvent extraction (ASE). The extraction efficiency is dependent of sample matrices  
2 and characteristics of target analytes [28-30]. Among these three extraction techniques, ASE  
3 becomes more preferred because it provides apparent advantages such as less solvent assumption,  
4 automatic procedure for simultaneous extraction of multiple samples, short sample preparation  
5 time, and higher extraction recoveries. Solid-phase extraction (SPE) is usually selected as the  
6 cleanup tool for the sludge/biosolid extracts, and the corresponding cartridges commonly used  
7 included Waters Oasis hydrophilic-lipophilic balance (HLB), strong-anion exchange (SAX),  
8 strong cation-exchange (SCX) or their combinations [21,26,31]. The pharmaceuticals are then  
9 analyzed using liquid chromatography with fluorescence or ultraviolet detectors [25,32,33] or  
10 gas chromatography coupled to mass spectrometer [34]. Recently, liquid  
11 chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) became the most efficient tool for  
12 identifying and quantifying trace levels of pharmaceuticals in environmental samples [11,35-38].

13         The objective of this study was to develop a robust, sensitive and practical analytical  
14 method to simultaneously identify and quantify multiple classes of pharmaceuticals in biosolids.  
15 The ASE experimental parameters (i.e., extraction solvent, pressure, temperature, extraction time  
16 and cycles) were optimized to achieve the maximum extraction efficiencies for pharmaceuticals.  
17 SPE was used to pre-concentrate and clean up the ASE extracts. The amounts of pharmaceuticals  
18 were quantitated by a LC-MS/MS equipped with electrospray ionization (ESI) source. The  
19 method was validated, and applied to determine multiple classes of pharmaceuticals in biosolid  
20 samples collected from several WWTPs of different locations in Michigan, USA.

## 21 **2. Experimental**

### 22 *2.1. Chemicals and materials*

1 Tetracycline, demeclocycline, chlortetracycline, oxytetracycline, meclocycline,  
2 sulfadiazine, sulfamerazine, sulfamethazine, sulfamethoxazole, carbamazepine, acetaminophen,  
3 caffeine, tylosin and lincomycin were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Chemical Company (St.  
4 Louis, MO, USA). Doxycycline was obtained from Fisher Bioreagents (Pittsburgh, PA, USA).  
5  $^{13}\text{C}_6$ -sulfamethazine was obtained from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories (Andover, MA, USA).  
6 Simeton was purchased from AccuStandard (New Haven, CT, USA). Methanol, sodium  
7 ethylenediaminetetraacetate (EDTA), formic acid, and sulfuric acid were purchased from J.T.  
8 Baker (Phillipsburg, NJ, USA). Acetonitrile was purchased from EMD Chemicals (Gibbstown,  
9 NJ, USA). Waters Oasis hydrophilic-lipophilic balance (HLB) cartridge was purchased from  
10 Waters Corporation (Milford, MA, USA).

## 11 *2.2. Biosolid samples*

12 During the winter season of 2009, six grab biosolid samples were collected from WWTPs  
13 of Lansing, East Lansing, St. Clair, Plainwell, Traverse City, and Imlay City, Michigan, USA.  
14 The biosolids collected from WWTPs of Traverse City, Plainwell, St. Clair, Imlay City, and  
15 Lansing were classified as class B biosolids which meet the criteria for land application. The  
16 biosolids collected from East Lansing WWTP was sent off to landfills. At each sampling site,  
17 one liter of biosolid was collected, and stored in a polypropylene narrow-necked bottle. The  
18 bottles were capped, placed in an iced cooler, and transported immediately to laboratory. The  
19 samples were then freeze-dried to obtain dry solids, ground using a mortar and pestle, passed  
20 through a 0.5 mm sieve, and stored in a refrigerator (-20 °C) prior to use.

## 21 *2.3. Sample extraction and cleanup*

1           The dried biosolid sample was weighed (500.0 mg) into cellulose extraction thimble, and  
2 mixed with diatomaceous earth (5.0 g) to prevent aggregation during extraction process.  $^{13}\text{C}_6$ -  
3 sulfamethazine and meclocycline were used as surrogates for sulfonamide and tetracycline  
4 antibiotics, respectively. The collected biosolid samples had been checked not to contain  
5 meclocycline. 100  $\mu\text{L}$  of  $^{13}\text{C}_6$ -sulfamethazine (1.0 mg/L) and 200 $\mu\text{L}$  of meclocycline (1.0 mg/L)  
6 were spiked into the biosolid samples, which were then placed on a rotator and mixed overnight.  
7 The thimbles were then placed into 22 mL stainless steel extraction cells, and extracted using a  
8 Dionex ASE 200 accelerated solvent extractor (Sunnyvale, CA, USA). The extraction solvent  
9 and operating conditions had been optimized in which acetonitrile and water mixture (v/v = 7:3)  
10 was used. The samples were preheated for 5 min, and then extracted at 100 °C under 100 bars.  
11 The static extraction period was set 15 min with three extraction cycles. The flushing solvent was  
12 100% of cell volume, and extraction cells were purged with  $\text{N}_2$  for 120 s. The extracts were  
13 collected and transferred to volumetric flasks, and diluted to 100 mL with deionized water. The  
14 pH value of the solution was adjusted to ~3.0 using  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ . An aliquot of 10.0 mL of the diluted  
15 solution passed through a preconditioned HLB solid-phase cartridge (Waters Corporation,  
16 Millford, MA, USA) at a rate of 1 mL/min. The analyte-loaded HLB cartridge was rinsed with 3  
17 mL of deionized water, and eluted by 5 mL of methanol-water mixture (v/v = 1:1) containing  
18 150 mg/L EDTA. The elute volume was reduced to 1.0 mL using a gentle  $\text{N}_2$  flow to concentrate  
19 the samples, which took ~45 min. The prepared samples were transferred to amber LC  
20 autosampler vials, and 10 ng of simeton (internal standard) was added prior to LC-MS/MS  
21 analysis.

#### 22 *2.4. Liquid chromatography and tandem mass spectrometry*

1 The prepared samples were analyzed using a LC-MS/MS system consisting of a  
2 Shimadzu high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC, Columbia, MD, USA) fully  
3 integrated with an Applied Biosystems Sciex 3200 triple quadrupole mass spectrometer (Foster  
4 City, CA, USA). A PEAK Scientific gas generator (NM20ZA, Billerica, MA) was used to supply  
5 gases required for the mass spectrometer. Turbo IonSpray source of the mass spectrometer was  
6 operated with electrospray ionization source in positive mode, ionspray voltage at 5500 V and  
7 temperature at 600 °C. Curtain gas pressure was 10 psi, collision gas pressure was 6 psi, and ion  
8 source gas pressure was 10 psi. The compound-dependent mass spectrometer parameters were  
9 optimized for each analyte (Table 1). Pharmaceutical concentrations were quantified using  
10 multiple-reaction monitoring mode. Two pairs of precursor/product ion transitions were  
11 simultaneously monitored during analysis in order to unambiguously identify the target  
12 pharmaceuticals in environmental samples [11,39]. The pair of precursor and product 1 ions  
13 were selected to quantify the analytes because the product ion 1 manifested a relatively greater  
14 response abundance than product ion 2.

15 The Shimadzu HPLC system consisted of two LC-20AD pumps, a SIL-20A autosampler  
16 and a DGU-20A degasser operated by a CBM-20A controller. The analytes were separated using  
17 a Phenomenex Luna C<sub>18</sub> column (150 mm × 4.6 mm, particle size: 3 μm, Torrance, CA, USA). A  
18 binary gradient mobile phase was applied with a flow rate of 350 μL/min in which phase A  
19 (water) and phase B (acetonitrile) both contained 0.1 % (v/v) formic acid. The mobile phase  
20 gradient was programmed as: at 0 min 100% phase A; 0 to 2.0 min phase B linearly increased to  
21 12%; 2 to 20 min phase A and phase B held at the ratio of 88:12; 20 to 22 min phase B linearly  
22 increased to 25%; 22 to 35 min phase B increased to 40%; 35 to 40 min phase B increased to  
23 80%, and held at this ratio until 42 min. From 42 to 43 min phase B reduced to 0%, and

1 equilibrated in the flow system for 5 min before next injection. The injection volume was 10  $\mu$ L.  
2 After each sample injection, the first three-minute elution was diverted to waste through a built-  
3 in valve, and then switched to the inlet of tandem mass spectrometer.

#### 4 *2.5. Method validation*

5 External standard solutions were prepared in methanol-water mixture (v/v = 1/1)  
6 containing 150 mg/L EDTA. The same background solution was also used to elute analytes from  
7 the HLB cartridge during the cleanup step of sample extracts. Standard curves were established  
8 with the concentrations spanning 2 orders of magnitude. The method sensitivity was determined  
9 by analyzing pharmaceuticals at  $\sim$ 20  $\mu$ g/L for 10 times using the ASE extracts fortified with  
10 target compounds, and standard deviation of these measurements was calculated. Limit of  
11 detection (LOD) was estimated as three times the standard deviation, and limit of quantification  
12 (LOQ) was defined as ten times the standard deviation. To evaluate extraction efficiency and  
13 repeatability of the overall method, the selected target pharmaceuticals and two surrogates (i.e.,  
14  $^{13}\text{C}_6$ -sulfamethazine and meclocycline) were spiked into biosolid samples, and mixed together  
15 overnight. Eight replicates of spiked biosolid samples were prepared followed by accelerating  
16 solvent extraction, SPE cleanup and LC-MS/MS analysis (described above). Biosolid control  
17 samples without spiked pharmaceuticals were also prepared; the amounts of pharmaceuticals  
18 measured in the control were subtracted from the amounts measured in the spiked samples. The  
19 sample matrix effects on the responses of tandem mass spectrometer was evaluated via spiking  
20 known amounts of target pharmaceuticals into the extract of biosolid which was obtained by  
21 ASE followed by the SPE cleanup. The measured pharmaceutical concentrations in the spiked  
22 samples were subtracted by the background pharmaceutical amounts originally present in the  
23 biosolids, and compared with the amounts of the spiked analytes.

### 1 3. Results and discussion

#### 2 3.1. Selection of extraction solvent

3 The biosolid sample collected from Lansing WWTP was fortified with carbamazepine,  
4 sulfamethazine, sulfamethoxazole, tetracycline, chlortetracycline and oxytetracycline with  
5 concentrations ranging from 780 to 1862  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  on dry matter basis, and subjected to ASE using  
6 water and organic solvent mixtures. The extracted concentrations of pharmaceuticals were  
7 subtracted by the measured concentrations of the corresponding compounds in the unfortified  
8 biosolid sample, and reported in Table 2. Extraction solvents used here were aqueous methanol  
9 or acetonitrile mixtures with volume ratios of organic solvent to water 7:3, 5:5 and 3:7. Several  
10 previous studies indicated that polar organic solvents (e.g. acetonitrile, methanol) and water  
11 mixtures manifested the superior capability to extract pharmaceuticals from sewage sludge and  
12 soil [17,26,35]. Among the extraction solvents tested, it appeared that higher extraction  
13 efficiencies were achieved for the mixtures containing greater contents of organic solvent (Table  
14 2). Acetonitrile/water mixture ( $v/v = 7:3$ ) was more effective to remove pharmaceuticals from  
15 biosolids than methanol/water mixture. Therefore, acetonitrile/water mixture ( $v/v = 7:3$ ) was  
16 chosen as the extraction solvent in this study. To evaluate the influence of pH on extraction  
17 efficiency, pH of acetonitrile/water mixture ( $v/v = 7:3$ ) was adjusted to  $\sim 2.0$  using hydrochloric  
18 acid, and then extracted the selected pharmaceuticals from the biosolid. The use of acidified  
19 extraction solvent, in fact, lowered extraction efficiency by 36% for tetracycline, 42% for  
20 chlortetracycline, and 75% for oxytetracycline compared to unacidified acetonitrile/water  
21 mixture; no apparent discrepancy was observed for extraction of carbamazepine and  
22 sulfonamides. Several previous studies indicated that acidified water-organic solvent mixture  
23 (e.g.,  $\text{pH} < 2.5$ ) enhanced extraction recoveries of pharmaceuticals, but the target

1 pharmaceuticals were not the same as those in this study [25,26]. The acidification of extraction  
2 solvent protonates the acidic functional groups (e.g., carboxylic acids and phenols) in the organic  
3 fractions of sewage sludge/biosolids, and thereby reducing electrostatic interactions between  
4 sewage sludge/biosolid and cationic moiety of tetracyclines. In these previous studies, sand was  
5 used to mix with sewage sludge or soil samples prior to extraction [25,26,40]. Diatomaceous  
6 earth, used as the dispersant of biosolid in our study, could release a certain amount of inorganic  
7 cations (e.g.,  $\text{Na}^+$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  etc.) which could effectively suppress the interactions of biosolid with  
8 cationic speciation of tetracyclines hence resulting in a higher extraction efficiency.

### 9 *3.2. Optimization of ASE operating parameters*

10 High pressure is applied during ASE operation in order to keep extraction solvent in  
11 liquid state while temperature is held at or above the boiling point. The application of high  
12 pressure also facilitates the contact of extraction solvent with analytes via penetrating into the  
13 domains in biosolids where the extraction solvent could not enter under normal atmospheric  
14 pressure. In this study four levels of pressure (55, 80, 100, and 130 bars) were applied to the  
15 extraction, and the corresponding extracted concentrations are reported in Table 3. The  
16 pharmaceutical concentrations at different extraction pressures were compared using a linear-  
17 mixed model (SAS 9.1 software, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Significant level was set at  
18  $p < 0.05$  with 95% confidence. The results indicate that the extraction efficiencies at pressure of  
19 100 bars were significantly higher than those conducted at other pressures ( $p = 0.0049$ ). This  
20 extraction pressure falls within the similar range reported in several previous studies [25,26].

21 Static extraction with 2 or 3 consecutive cycles was conducted at 100 °C and under 100  
22 bars. Two periods of the static extraction time (15 vs. 25 min) were tested for extraction

1 efficiency (Table 3). In general, prolonging extraction time and more extraction cycles achieve  
2 greater extraction efficiency [41,42]. For the static time of 15 min vs. 25 min with the same  
3 numbers of extraction cycles, the analysis of the linear-fixed model results indicated no  
4 significant difference ( $p = 0.897$ ) of extraction efficiencies. This suggests that 15 min of static  
5 period is sufficient for the analytes to approach partition equilibrium between biosolid and  
6 solvent. However, increase of consecutive extraction cycles from 2 to 3 significantly enhanced  
7 the extraction efficiencies for all pharmaceuticals tested ( $p = 0.0002$ ). In each extraction cycle  
8 the induction of fresh solvent into the sample cell reestablishes new partition equilibrium for the  
9 analytes between the added solvent and the biosolid residues. This partitioning process drives the  
10 release of biosolid-sorbed pharmaceuticals to extraction solvent phase. Taken together, the  
11 observation of enhanced extraction efficiencies of 3 consecutive cycles (versus 2 cycles), and no  
12 apparent difference with prolonged static time (25 vs. 15 min), warrant that the optimal operative  
13 condition consists of 3 extraction cycles with 15 min static time in each cycle.

14         Increasing temperature in ASE operation resulted in enhanced extraction of the  
15 pharmaceuticals from biosolid (Table 3). The extraction temperature was tested at 50, 75, and  
16 100 °C with the pressure of 100 bars, 3 extraction cycles and static period of 15 min in each  
17 cycle. The extraction efficiencies were observed to significantly increase with increasing  
18 temperature ( $p < 0.0001$ ). Therefore, higher temperature is preferred in the ASE operation.  
19 However, considering thermal stability of analytes, the extraction was not conducted at  
20 temperature  $>100$  °C. In this study, the temperature of 100 °C was selected as optimal operating  
21 condition. The increase of temperature enhances dissolution of pharmaceuticals in extraction  
22 solvent and hence increasing extraction efficiencies. At the same time, the viscosity of extraction  
23 solvent and surface tension on biosolid surfaces decrease as temperature increases, which also

1 facilitates the solvent to access the domains where the analytes are present. In addition, the  
2 enhanced extraction efficiency could be due to accelerating mass transfer rate from sample  
3 matrices to solvent at increased temperature.

### 4 *3.3. Method validation*

5 The linear ranges of standard curves and correlation coefficients, along with method  
6 LOD and LOQ values, are reported in Table 4. The standard curves were prepared with two  
7 order of magnitude, and demonstrated an excellent linearity with the correlation coefficients ( $r^2$ )  
8  $>0.999$ . The described method was tested for simultaneous extraction and determination of 15  
9 pharmaceuticals in biosolid, which manifested varying levels of LOD and LOQ. For the class of  
10 sulfonamides the LOD ranged from 0.6  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  (for sulfamethazine) to 15.0  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  (for  
11 sulfadiazine) on dry weight basis of biosolid. This method was less sensitive for tetracycline  
12 antibiotics as shown with the LOD ranging from 4.6  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  (for doxycycline) to 146  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  (for  
13 tetracycline). The overall method recoveries reported were the average of eight replicates of  
14 spiked samples ranging from 49.3% to 94.6%. The standard deviations of the recoveries ( $n = 8$ )  
15 were  $< 10\%$  indicating the reported method achieved satisfactory repeatability. It was noted that  
16 tetracycline antibiotics manifested the relatively lower recoveries ranging from 49% to 68%  
17 (Table 4). This range of recoveries fell within the low end of the recovery range (i.e., 47.2% to  
18 125 %) reported by Jacobsen et al. [17] in which tetracyclines were analyzed in swine manure  
19 using the similar analytical approach. However, the extraction recovery of tetracycline (53.8%)  
20 measured in this study is significantly greater than (~27%) reported by Lillenberg et al. [26]. The  
21 overall recoveries for sulfonamides (from 63.6 % to 94.6%) are comparable with the results in  
22 several previous studies [17,26,37]. For instance, sulfamethazine manifested the highest recovery

1 (94.6%) in this study; the similar results were also reported for extraction of sulfamethazine from  
2 swine manure (84.1% to 97.8%) [17], and from sewage sludge (104%) [37].

3 The manifestation of relatively low recoveries (e.g. ~50%) of the overall method for a  
4 certain class of pharmaceuticals such as tetracyclines could be attributed to inefficient extraction  
5 of ASE operation, analyte loss during SPE cleanup, and/or matrix effects on mass spectrometer  
6 responses from extracts. The loss of target analytes during SPE cleanup step was < 11 %  
7 (describe below). To examine sample matrix effects on mass spectrometer responses, standard  
8 addition method was used in which the analytes were spiked into biosolid extracts after ASE  
9 treatment and SPE cleanup. The spiked pharmaceutical concentrations were tested at two levels:  
10 10-23 µg/L and 100-232 µg/L. The ratios of measured concentrations to the corresponding  
11 spiked concentrations ranged from 0.90 to 1.15, indicating matrix effects caused a minimal  
12 impact to the overall method recovery. Therefore, the low recoveries measured in this study  
13 result primarily from inefficient extraction of pharmaceuticals from ASE procedure, particularly  
14 for the class of tetracycline antibiotics which usually demonstrate a great affinity with sorbents.

#### 15 *3.4. SPE cleanup*

16 In order to evaluate the extent of pharmaceutical loss during SPE cleanup step, the target  
17 compounds were spiked into biosolid extracts after ASE treatment. The solution passed through  
18 the preconditioned HLB cartridge, followed by an elution with methanol-water mixture (v/v =  
19 1:1) containing 150 mg/L EDTA and analyzed by LC-MS/MS. Two concentration levels (10-23  
20 µg/L and 98-232 µg/L) of pharmaceuticals were spiked into the biosolid extracts (i.e., after ASE  
21 treatment). The measured pharmaceutical concentrations were subtracted by the amount  
22 pharmaceuticals originally present in the samples, and compared to the spiked concentrations

1 (Table 5). For most pharmaceuticals, the recoveries of spiked amount ranged from 86.8 to 120%,  
2 indicating that the loss of analytes during SPE cleanup step was minimal. Demeclocycline and  
3 lincomycin manifested relatively higher recovery (i.e., 155 % for demeclocycline at 12.7  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ,  
4 and 176% for lincomycin at 134.6  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), which was attributed to the experimental variations  
5 since reasonable recoveries were obtained for these two compounds at another concentration.  
6 Therefore, the relatively low recoveries of the overall method for some analytes (e.g.,  
7 tetracyclines) could be attributed to the inefficient extraction from biosolids during the ASE step.

### 8 *3.5. Application to biosolid samples*

9 Biosolid samples were collected at WWTPs of six cities (Lansing, East Lansing, St Clair,  
10 Plainwell, Traverse City, and Imlay City) in Michigan, USA. These samples were extracted  
11 using the optimized method described above. The samples were conducted in triplicates. The  
12 measured concentrations and the corresponding standard deviations ( $n = 3$ ) are presented in  
13 Table 6. Among these samples, 14 out of the 15 target pharmaceuticals were found except  
14 tylosin. The average concentrations of the pharmaceuticals manifested a relatively wide range  
15 from 2.6 to 743.6  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  (Table 6). The calculated standard deviations for all the measurements  
16 were  $< 17\%$ , indicating a reasonable repeatability of the analysis. Tetracycline antibiotics were  
17 frequently detected with the concentrations ranging from 36.6 to 743.6  $\mu\text{g/kg}$ . Doxycycline was  
18 detected in all 6 biosolid samples with concentrations ranging from 159.9 to 292.4  $\mu\text{g/kg}$ .  
19 Relatively higher concentrations of tetracycline (281.9  $\mu\text{g/kg}$ ) and chlortetracycline (346.6  $\mu\text{g/kg}$ )  
20 were found in the sample of Lansing WWTP compared to the samples collected from other five  
21 WWTPs. Oxytetracycline was detected in four biosolid samples from 51.9 to 743.6  $\mu\text{g/kg}$ . Trace  
22 amounts of demeclocycline were found in three biosolid samples (i.e., 36.6, 98.2 and 131.2

1  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) from WWTPs in Plainwell, East Lansing, and St. Clair. Sulfonamides were also  
2 frequently detected, and the corresponding concentrations ranged from 4.8 (sulfamethoxazole) to  
3 668.9  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  (sulfamerazine). For other six pharmaceuticals (acetaminophen, carbamazepine,  
4 caffeine, erythromycin, lincomycin and tylosin), the measured concentrations spanned from 2.6  
5 to 370.4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ . Caffeine and carbamazepine, both of which are solely used by humans, were  
6 detected in the biosolids from five cities except Imlay City. Interestingly, Imlay City has the least  
7 populations among the six cities; this might be the reason responsible for the least occurrence of  
8 human medicine in the biosolid of Imlay City WWPT [43]. Tylosin is commonly used as  
9 veterinary pharmaceutical to control livestock infection and promote livestock growth. It is  
10 reasonable that no samples were found to contain tylosin in municipal WWTP biosolids.  
11 Acetaminophen was detected in three biosolid samples from Lansing, East Lansing and St. Clair  
12 with concentrations of 88.6 to 370.4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ . In fact, these three cities have more populations than  
13 Plainwell, Traverse City, and Imlay City.

#### 14 **4. Conclusions**

15 This study describes an efficient and reproducible analytical approach for simultaneous  
16 determination of multiple classes of pharmaceuticals in biosolids. The experimental steps  
17 consisted of accelerated solvent extraction of freeze-dry biosolid sample, and cleanup by solid-  
18 phase extraction followed by simultaneous analysis by liquid chromatography/tandem mass  
19 spectrometry. The extraction parameters of ASE including extraction solvent, temperature,  
20 pressure, static period and extraction cycle were optimized to achieve satisfactory extraction  
21 efficiency. Overall, this method offers less laborious work, automatic extraction procedure, less  
22 consumption of organic solvent and relatively high extraction efficiency. The method has been  
23 tested successfully for simultaneously determining multiple classes of pharmaceuticals in

1 WWTP biosolids collected from different locations. The results also suggest that many  
2 pharmaceuticals could survive wastewater treatment processes and accumulate in solid phase  
3 (e.g., biosolids). Land application of the contaminated biosolids could result in the dissemination  
4 of pharmaceuticals in soil and water environment. Chronic exposure to low levels of antibiotics  
5 might exert selection pressure on development of antibiotic resistant bacterial strains in the  
6 environment.

## 7 **Acknowledgments**

8 This study was supported in part by Agriculture and Food Research Initiative Competitive Grant  
9 2009-65102-05847 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, American Water  
10 Works Association Research Foundation, and the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station.

## 11 **References**

- 12 [1] B. Halling-Sorensen, S.N. Nielsen, P.F. Lanzky, F. Ingerslev, H.C.H. Lutzhoft, S.E.  
13 Jorgensen, *Chemosphere* 36 (1998) 357.
- 14 [2] B.G. Plosz, H. Leknes, H. Liltved, K.V. Thomas, *Sci. Total Environ.* 408 (2010) 1915.
- 15 [3] M. Leclercq, O. Mathieu, E. Gomez, C. Casellas, H. Fenet, D. Hillaire-Buys, *Arch.*  
16 *Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 56 (2009) 408.
- 17 [4] C.G. Daughton, T.A. Ternes, *Environ. Health Perspect.* 107 (1999) 907.
- 18 [5] T.A. Ternes, *Water Res.* 32 (1998) 3245.
- 19 [6] M. Carballa, F. Omil, J.M. Lema, M. Llompart, C. Garcia-Jares, I. Rodriguez, M. Gomez,  
20 T. Ternes, *Water Res.* 38 (2004) 2918.
- 21 [7] D.R. Lapen, E. Topp, C.D. Metcalfe, H. Li, M. Edwards, N. Gottschall, P. Bolton, W.  
22 Curnoe, M. Payne, A. Beck, *Sci. Total Environ.* 399 (2008) 50.
- 23 [8] N. Lozano, C.P. Rice, M. Ramirez, A. Torrents, *Chemosphere* 78 (2010) 760.
- 24 [9] D.W. Kolpin, E.T. Furlong, M.T. Meyer, E.M. Thurman, S.D. Zaugg, L.B. Barber, H.T.  
25 Buxton, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36 (2002) 1202.
- 26 [10] R.H. Lindberg, P. Wennberg, M.I. Johansson, M. Tysklind, B.A.V. Andersson, *Environ.*  
27 *Sci. Technol.* 39 (2005) 3421.
- 28 [11] W.L. Song, M. Huang, W. Rumbelha, H. Li, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 21 (2007)  
29 1944.
- 30 [12] T.A. Ternes, *Trends Anal. Chem.* 20 (2001) 419.
- 31 [13] Y.H. Lin, C.Y. Chen, G.S. Wang, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 21 (2007) 1973.
- 32 [14] R. Lindberg, P.A. Jarnheimer, B. Olsen, M. Johansson, M. Tysklind, *Chemosphere* 57  
33 (2004) 1479.

- 1 [15] P.A. Blackwell, H.C.H. Lutzhoft, H.P. Ma, B. Halling-Sorensen, A.B.A. Boxall, P. Kay,  
2 Talanta 64 (2004) 1058.
- 3 [16] M.Y. Haller, S.R. Muller, C.S. McArdell, A.C. Alder, M.J.F. Suter, J. Chromatogr. A 952  
4 (2002) 111.
- 5 [17] A.M. Jacobsen, B. Halling-Sorensen, Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 384 (2006) 1164.
- 6 [18] N. Prado, E. Renault, J. Ochoa, A. Amrane, Environ. Technol. 30 (2009) 469.
- 7 [19] E. Turiel, A. Martin-Esteban, J.L. Tadeo, Anal. Chim. Acta 562 (2006) 30.
- 8 [20] S. Morales-Munoz, J.L. Luque-Garcia, M.D.L. de Castro, J. Chromatogr. A 1059 (2004)  
9 25.
- 10 [21] P. Vazquez-Roig, R. Segarra, C. Blasco, V. Andreu, Y. Pico, J. Chromatogr. A 1217  
11 (2010) 2471.
- 12 [22] M. Fernandez-Sanjuan, A. Rigol, A. Sahuquillo, S. Rodriguez-Cruz, S. Lacorte, Anal.  
13 Bioanal. Chem. 394 (2009) 1525.
- 14 [23] A.I. Garcia-Valcarcel, J.L. Tadeo, Anal. Chim. Acta 641 (2009) 117.
- 15 [24] I. Aparicio, J.L. Santos, E. Alonso, Anal. Chim. Acta 584 (2007) 455.
- 16 [25] E.M. Golet, A. Strehler, A.C. Alder, W. Giger, Anal. Chem. 74 (2002) 5455.
- 17 [26] M. Lillenberg, S. Yurchenko, K. Kipper, K. Herodes, V. Pihl, K. Sepp, R. Lohmus, L.  
18 Nei, J. Chromatogr. A 1216 (2009) 5949.
- 19 [27] M.S. Diaz-Cruz, M.J. Garcia-Galan, P. Guerra, A. Jelic, C. Postigo, E. Eljarrat, M. Farre,  
20 M.J.L. de Alda, M. Petrovic, D. Barcelo, Trends Anal. Chem. 28 (2009) 1263.
- 21 [28] P. Navarro, N. Etxebarria, G. Arana, Anal. Chim. Acta 648 (2009) 178.
- 22 [29] L. Sanchez-Prado, C. Garcia-Jares, M. Llompарт, J. Chromatogr. A 1217 (2010) 2390.
- 23 [30] C. Blasco, A. Di Corcia, Y. Pico, Food Chem. 116 (2009) 1005.
- 24 [31] Y.F. Nie, Z.M. Qiang, H.Q. Zhang, C. Adams, J. Chromatogr. A 1216 (2009) 7071.
- 25 [32] J. Raich-Montiu, J. Folch, R. Compano, A. Granados, M.D. Prat, J. Chromatogr. A 1172  
26 (2007) 186.
- 27 [33] H. Rebiere, B. Mazel, C. Civade, P.A. Bonnet, J. Chromatogr. B: Anal. Technol. Biomed.  
28 Life Sci. 850 (2007) 376.
- 29 [34] E. Van Hoeck, F. Canale, C. Cordero, S. Compernelle, C. Bicchi, P. Sandra, Anal.  
30 Bioanal. Chem. 393 (2009) 907.
- 31 [35] M.P. Hermo, D. Barron, J. Barbosa, Anal. Chim. Acta 539 (2005) 77.
- 32 [36] H. Nakata, K. Kannan, P.D. Jones, J.P. Giesy, Chemosphere 58 (2005) 759.
- 33 [37] M.S. Diaz-Cruz, M.J.L. de Alda, D. Barcelo, J. Chromatogr. A 1130 (2006) 72.
- 34 [38] T.A. Ternes, M. Bonerz, N. Herrmann, D. Loffler, E. Keller, B.B. Lacida, A.C. Alder, J.  
35 Chromatogr. A 1067 (2005) 213.
- 36 [39] A. Ghanem, P. Bados, L. Kerhoas, J. Dubroca, J. Einhorn, Anal. Chem. 79 (2007) 3794.
- 37 [40] C. Crescenzi, A. Di Corcia, M. Nazzari, R. Samperi, Anal. Chem. 72 (2000) 3050.
- 38 [41] P. Popp, P. Keil, M. Moder, A. Paschke, U. Thuss, J. Chromatogr. A 774 (1997) 203.
- 39 [42] E. Bjorklund, S. Bowadt, T. Nilsson, L. Mathiasson, J. Chromatogr. A 836 (1999) 285.
- 40 [43] K.A. Peeler, S.P. Opsahl, J.P. Chanton, Environ. Sci. Technol. 40 (2006) 7616.
- 41

1 Table 1. Precursor, product ions and mass spectrometer parameters used to identify and quantify pharmaceuticals.

Pharmaceuticals	Precursor ion (m/z)	Product ion 1 (m/z)	Product ion 2 (m/z)	DP <sup>a</sup> (Volts)	EP <sup>b</sup> (Volts)	CEP <sup>c</sup> (Volts)	CE <sup>d</sup> (Volts)	CXP <sup>e</sup> (Volts)
Sulfadiazine	250.9	108.2	156.1	37	9	30	27	36
Sulfamerazine	264.9	155.7	172.4	45	4	20	22	10
Sulfamethazine	279.0	186.1	162.0	37	5	20	23	18
Sulfamethoxazole	254.1	156.2	107.8	38	8	15	22	14
Chlortetracycline	479.2	444.2	462.2	40	4	27	27	40
Demeclocycline	465.0	448.1	430.3	36	9	30	27	36
Doxycycline	445.4	428.2	339.3	33	9	50	31	45
Oxytetracycline	461.3	426.4	444.2	28	7	22	21	41
Tetracycline	445.4	428.2	339.3	33	9	50	31	45
Acetaminophen	152.0	110.0	93.0	40	10	150	23	31
Caffeine	195.0	138.0	110.0	49	5	20	29	16
Carbamazepine	237.1	194.3	165.4	50	3	14	23	18
Erythromycin	734.6	576.4	558.4	17	11	30	32	48
Lincomycin	407.3	126.3	359.2	56	5	22	33	11
Tylosin	916.5	174.0	771.9	63	9	36	47	14

2

3 <sup>a</sup> declustering potential. <sup>b</sup> entrance potential. <sup>c</sup> cell entrance potential. <sup>d</sup> collision energy. <sup>e</sup> collision cell exit potential

4

1 Table 2. Extracted concentrations of pharmaceuticals vs. spiked concentrations from biosolid by water-organic solvent mixtures using accelerating  
 2 solvent extraction<sup>a</sup>.

Pharmaceuticals	Spiked conc. ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Extraction solvents						
		<b>acetonitrile/ water (7:3)</b>	acetonitrile/water (7:3), pH 2.0	acetonitrile /water (5:5)	acetonitrile /water (3:7)	methanol/ water (7:3)	methanol/ water (5:5)	methanol/ water (3:7)
Sulfamethazine	982	<b>947 <math>\pm</math> 21<sup>b</sup></b>	920 $\pm$ 31	551 $\pm$ 25	393 $\pm$ 11	758 $\pm$ 24	475 $\pm$ 23	368 $\pm$ 28
Sulfamethoxazole	780	<b>564 <math>\pm</math> 29</b>	710 $\pm$ 13	494 $\pm$ 17	266 $\pm$ 28	541 $\pm$ 27	459 $\pm$ 20	339 $\pm$ 17
Chlortetracycline	1512	<b>786 <math>\pm</math> 18</b>	456 $\pm$ 5	540 $\pm$ 17	306 $\pm$ 23	708 $\pm$ 20	525 $\pm$ 24	373 $\pm$ 22
Oxytetracycline	1862	<b>1008 <math>\pm</math> 25</b>	261 $\pm$ 21	627 $\pm$ 24	308 $\pm$ 12	776 $\pm$ 14	655 $\pm$ 10	360 $\pm$ 10
Tetracycline	1518	<b>1065 <math>\pm</math> 28</b>	681 $\pm$ 76	538 $\pm$ 4	282 $\pm$ 39	628 $\pm$ 36	359 $\pm$ 20	302 $\pm$ 35
Carbamazepine	840	<b>700 <math>\pm</math> 32</b>	705 $\pm$ 53	480 $\pm$ 34	272 $\pm$ 19	437 $\pm$ 27	260 $\pm$ 18	214 $\pm$ 15

3  
 4 <sup>a</sup> Operation conditions: 100 bars, 100°C, 3  $\times$  15 min. <sup>b</sup> measured concentration: mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (n = 3)

5

1 Table 3. Extraction efficiency of pharmaceuticals under varying accelerating solvent extraction parameters

Pharmaceuticals	Spiked Conc. ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Pressurized liquid extraction conditions										
		Pressure (bar)				Extraction time (min)				Temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )		
		55	80	<b>100</b>	130	2 $\times$ 15	<b>3 <math>\times</math> 15</b>	2 $\times$ 25	3 $\times$ 25	50	75	<b>100</b>
Sulfadiazine	466	270 $\pm$ 6	246 $\pm$ 6	<b>293 <math>\pm</math> 13</b>	243 $\pm$ 16	192 $\pm$ 12	<b>264 <math>\pm</math> 28</b>	193 $\pm$ 18	250 $\pm$ 27	300 $\pm$ 23	342 $\pm$ 18	<b>338 <math>\pm</math> 24</b>
Sulfamerazine	414	249 $\pm$ 10	222 $\pm$ 17	<b>289 <math>\pm</math> 7</b>	242 $\pm$ 15	200 $\pm$ 28	<b>269 <math>\pm</math> 22</b>	188 $\pm$ 23	240 $\pm$ 15	277 $\pm$ 14	326 $\pm$ 33	<b>308 <math>\pm</math> 29</b>
Sulfamethazine	491	437 $\pm$ 12	385 $\pm$ 11	<b>456 <math>\pm</math> 11</b>	396 $\pm$ 26	439 $\pm$ 24	<b>453 <math>\pm</math> 25</b>	420 $\pm$ 10	444 $\pm$ 35	380 $\pm$ 19	422 $\pm$ 26	<b>446 <math>\pm</math> 32</b>
Sulfamethoxazole	390	274 $\pm$ 17	256 $\pm$ 33	<b>279 <math>\pm</math> 11</b>	264 $\pm$ 26	203 $\pm$ 34	<b>285 <math>\pm</math> 27</b>	174 $\pm$ 12	312 $\pm$ 22	243 $\pm$ 11	248 $\pm$ 15	<b>266 <math>\pm</math> 24</b>
Chlortetracycline	756	413 $\pm$ 22	488 $\pm$ 14	<b>434 <math>\pm</math> 29</b>	365 $\pm$ 20	393 $\pm$ 44	<b>397 <math>\pm</math> 19</b>	401 $\pm$ 52	408 $\pm$ 60	579 $\pm$ 42	556 $\pm$ 20	<b>572 <math>\pm</math> 48</b>
Demeclocycline	507	316 $\pm$ 10	151 $\pm$ 8	<b>304 <math>\pm</math> 11</b>	300 $\pm$ 12	193 $\pm$ 29	<b>311 <math>\pm</math> 43</b>	193 $\pm$ 23	272 $\pm$ 51	323 $\pm$ 19	313 $\pm$ 40	<b>404 <math>\pm</math> 32</b>
Doxycycline	509	335 $\pm$ 7	266 $\pm$ 5	<b>355 <math>\pm</math> 12</b>	328 $\pm$ 6	335 $\pm$ 26	<b>342 <math>\pm</math> 36</b>	367 $\pm$ 26	298 $\pm$ 42	266 $\pm$ 24	328 $\pm$ 32	<b>348 <math>\pm</math> 45</b>
Oxytetracycline	931	496 $\pm$ 43	483 $\pm$ 54	<b>523 <math>\pm</math> 60</b>	580 $\pm$ 20	457 $\pm$ 41	<b>491 <math>\pm</math> 52</b>	438 $\pm$ 30	505 $\pm$ 21	503 $\pm$ 52	614 $\pm$ 51	<b>604 <math>\pm</math> 85</b>
Tetracycline	759	398 $\pm$ 52	315 $\pm$ 37	<b>475 <math>\pm</math> 50</b>	340 $\pm$ 49	377 $\pm$ 30	<b>394 <math>\pm</math> 24</b>	466 $\pm$ 45	432 $\pm$ 38	431 $\pm$ 42	456 $\pm$ 46	<b>481 <math>\pm</math> 35</b>
Acetaminophen	788	617 $\pm$ 21	579 $\pm$ 12	<b>761 <math>\pm</math> 32</b>	724 $\pm$ 10	432 $\pm$ 30	<b>592 <math>\pm</math> 35</b>	464 $\pm$ 34	583 $\pm$ 69	648 $\pm$ 43	571 $\pm$ 26	<b>653 <math>\pm</math> 39</b>
Caffeine	391	406 $\pm$ 8	397 $\pm$ 12	<b>309 <math>\pm</math> 10</b>	308 $\pm$ 10	259 $\pm$ 24	<b>315 <math>\pm</math> 12</b>	248 $\pm$ 24	318 $\pm$ 11	289 $\pm$ 31	299 $\pm$ 17	<b>333 <math>\pm</math> 26</b>
Carbamazepine	420	377 $\pm$ 29	365 $\pm$ 38	<b>389 <math>\pm</math> 45</b>	347 $\pm$ 28	281 $\pm$ 25	<b>365 <math>\pm</math> 26</b>	321 $\pm$ 14	349 $\pm$ 28	371 $\pm$ 36	384 $\pm$ 14	<b>378 <math>\pm</math> 13</b>
Erythromycin	636	231 $\pm$ 22	266 $\pm$ 28	<b>408 <math>\pm</math> 28</b>	358 $\pm$ 26	432 $\pm$ 28	<b>541 <math>\pm</math> 35</b>	450 $\pm$ 20	509 $\pm$ 26	394 $\pm$ 38	474 $\pm$ 48	<b>498 <math>\pm</math> 53</b>
Lincomycin	538	424 $\pm$ 11	480 $\pm$ 21	<b>449 <math>\pm</math> 22</b>	385 $\pm$ 9	356 $\pm$ 15	<b>382 <math>\pm</math> 10</b>	347 $\pm$ 15	385 $\pm$ 23	377 $\pm$ 38	388 $\pm$ 35	<b>406 <math>\pm</math> 39</b>
Tylosin	484	363 $\pm$ 14	359 $\pm$ 26	<b>365 <math>\pm</math> 25</b>	277 $\pm$ 14	366 $\pm$ 22	<b>407 <math>\pm</math> 54</b>	371 $\pm$ 33	403 $\pm$ 19	380 $\pm$ 36	396 $\pm$ 27	<b>428 <math>\pm</math> 21</b>

2

1

2 Table 4. Linear range and correlation coefficient ( $r^2$ ) of standard curves, method limit of detection (LOD), limit of quantification  
 3 (LOQ), and recovery.

Pharmaceuticals	Linear range ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	$r^2$	LOD ( $\mu\text{g/kg}$ )	LOQ ( $\mu\text{g/kg}$ )	Recovery (%) (n = 8)
Sulfadiazine	5.8 - 580	0.9992	15.0	50.6	63.6 $\pm$ 5.2
Sulfamerazine	5.2 - 518	0.9998	5.5	18.2	71.4 $\pm$ 5.3
Sulfamethazine	6.1 - 614	0.9999	0.6	1.9	94.6 $\pm$ 2.7
Sulfamethoxazole	4.9 - 488	0.9997	1.0	3.3	77.6 $\pm$ 8.0
Chlortetracycline	9.4 - 945	0.9995	37.2	124	49.3 $\pm$ 5.4
Demeclocycline	6.3 - 634	0.9996	25.9	86.3	55.0 $\pm$ 5.0
Doxycycline	6.4 - 636	0.9993	4.6	15.5	68.3 $\pm$ 1.1
Oxytetracycline	11.6 - 1160	0.9997	13.7	45.8	52.4 $\pm$ 5.3
Tetracycline	9.5 - 1960	0.9997	146	488	53.8 $\pm$ 8.7
Acetaminophen	9.8 - 986	0.9994	30.7	102	84.7 $\pm$ 10
Caffeine	4.9 - 488	0.9999	8.4	28.3	79.8 $\pm$ 3.8
Carbamazepine	5.2 - 525	0.9997	2.9	9.7	88.1 $\pm$ 3.1
Erythromycin	8.0 - 795	0.9993	6.6	21.8	79.0 $\pm$ 9.8
Lincomycin	6.7 - 673	0.9999	0.8	2.7	83.6 $\pm$ 9.9
Tylosin	6.0 - 605	0.9992	5.4	18.1	77.3 $\pm$ 5.4

4

5

1 Table 5. Recoveries of solid-phase extraction for pharmaceuticals spiked into biosolid extracts after accelerating solvent extraction.

Pharmaceuticals	Spiked concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Recovery (%) (n = 3)	Spiked concentration ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Recovery (%) (n = 3)
Sulfadiazine	11.6	110.9 $\pm$ 9.8	116.4	102.6 $\pm$ 8.0
Sulfamerazine	10.4	86.8 $\pm$ 6.5	103.5	102.5 $\pm$ 8.3
Sulfamethazine	12.3	91.0 $\pm$ 8.5	122.8	100.9 $\pm$ 6.4
Sulfamethoxazole	9.8	115.2 $\pm$ 8.6	97.5	97.7 $\pm$ 7.1
Chlortetracycline	18.9	95.6 $\pm$ 7.5	189.0	89.1 $\pm$ 9.4
Demeclocycline	12.7	155.5 $\pm$ 16.5	126.8	118.1 $\pm$ 14.2
Doxycycline	18.9	116.9 $\pm$ 9.1	189.8	111.4 $\pm$ 11.3
Oxytetracycline	23.3	98.4 $\pm$ 6.1	232.7	121.1 $\pm$ 10.9
Tetracycline	12.7	108.5 $\pm$ 12.8	127.2	119.4 $\pm$ 9.0
Acetaminophen	19.7	102.1 $\pm$ 8.2	197.1	113.5 $\pm$ 8.9
Caffeine	9.8	103.7 $\pm$ 4.6	97.7	110.0 $\pm$ 5.2
Carbamazepine	10.5	100.5 $\pm$ 8.5	105.0	101.4 $\pm$ 8.0
Erythromycin	15.9	112.4 $\pm$ 11.1	159.0	107.3 $\pm$ 8.1
Lincomycin	13.5	129.2 $\pm$ 13.4	134.6	176.5 $\pm$ 18.9
Tylosin	12.1	98.2 $\pm$ 7.5	120.9	96.8 $\pm$ 8.8

2

3

1 Table 6. Measured pharmaceutical concentrations and standard deviations ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  dry matter) in the collected biosolid samples.

Pharmaceuticals	Sampled wastewater treatment plants					
	Lansing	East Lansing	St. Clair	Plainwell	Traverse City	Imlay City
Sulfadiazine	nd <sup>a</sup>	nd	nd	nd	562.2 $\pm$ 61.4	nd
Sulfamerazine	112.0 $\pm$ 6.3	668.9 $\pm$ 45.5	nd	nd	nd	nd
Sulfamethazine	nd	127.8 $\pm$ 15.8	124.8 $\pm$ 11.8	nd	nd	131.8 $\pm$ 13.0
Sulfamethoxazole	4.8 $\pm$ 0.5	26.1 $\pm$ 3.0	8.8 $\pm$ 1.2	35.9 $\pm$ 4.4	nd	nd
Chlortetracycline	346.6 $\pm$ 22.1	nd	nd	nd	90.2 $\pm$ 10.0 <sup>b</sup>	69.6 $\pm$ 7.6 <sup>b</sup>
Demeclocycline	nd	98.2 $\pm$ 6.2	131.2 $\pm$ 11.3	36.6 $\pm$ 4.0 <sup>b</sup>	nd	nd
Doxycycline	291.2 $\pm$ 22.0	224.3 $\pm$ 30.8	149.6 $\pm$ 11.0	292.4 $\pm$ 48.5	234.0 $\pm$ 26.8	159.9 $\pm$ 19.1
Oxytetracycline	nd	51.9 $\pm$ 4.4	nd	743.6 $\pm$ 21.7	201.4 $\pm$ 17.8	174.2 $\pm$ 4.6
Tetracycline	281.9 $\pm$ 42.3 <sup>b</sup>	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Acetaminophen	370.4 $\pm$ 12.9	101.1 $\pm$ 4.7	88.6 $\pm$ 7.6 <sup>b</sup>	nd	nd	nd
Caffeine	47.9 $\pm$ 5.2	47.1 $\pm$ 6.1	46.9 $\pm$ 3.7	75.5 $\pm$ 4.1	33.9 $\pm$ 3.7	nd
Carbamazepine	6.2 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>b</sup>	4.6 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>b</sup>	5.1 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>b</sup>	16.4 $\pm$ 0.9	22.3 $\pm$ 5.9	nd
Erythromycin	62.8 $\pm$ 5.8	nd	10.4 $\pm$ 0.8	16.8 $\pm$ 1.3	nd	nd
Lincomycin	nd	6.2 $\pm$ 1.1	8.7 $\pm$ 1.4	nd	6.5 $\pm$ 2.0	2.6 $\pm$ 0.2
Tylosin	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd

2  
3 <sup>a</sup> Not detected. <sup>b</sup> Detected but less than limit of quantification.