

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY DEPARTMENT OF NUCLEAR SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS





Improving Analytical Capabilities and Quality of Measurement Results for Mercury Monitoring in the Marine Environment

E. Vasileva-Veleva, S. Azemard, A.M. Orani



" Expert Consultations Meeting on Mercury Monitoring on Soil and Biota", 13 and 14 of May 2019, Monaco

The only Environment Laboratory in UN System

1961 - Laboratory established in the Oceanographic Museum
1988 -Temporary facilities in the Louis II Football Stadium
1998 - Permanent facilities on the Port of Monaco







IAEA Environment Laboratories



The primary goal of the International Atomic Energy Agency's Environment Laboratories (IAEA EL) in Monaco is to help Member States to understand, monitor and protect the marine environment.

Among its multiple tasks, IAEA - EL in Monaco acts as the analytical support centre for IAEA Member States laboratories and is the pillar of the Quality assurance program for the determination of nuclear and non nuclear pollutants including mercury and methylmercury in the marine environment.

The Mercury cycle





Why mercury is a subject of concern?



- Hg is a global pollutant with high toxicity and possible bioaccumulation.
- Mercury concentrations in the oceans and in marine biota have risen due to anthropogenic emissions.
- Global climate change may complicate the response of global ecosystems to mercury emission reductions.



UNEP report "Mercury as a global pollutant "2013

Member Nations now needs to establish/strengthen monitoring efforts in order to assess mercury contamination in the environment

Quality assurance of the monitoring data, is essential for their effective use for environmental assessments and decision making

Why is harmonised knowledge on mercury monitoring so important ?

- Comparability of monitoring data
- Accurate environmental assessments
- Effectiveness of mercury pollution control



NAEL activities improving MSs capabilities for mercury monitoring

Build the technical capacity of the national and regional laboratories for assessing mercury pollution by:

- ✓ Organisation of global ILC and targeted proficiency tests
- ✓ Production of matrix certified reference materials
- ✓ Developing fit-for-purpose recommended analytical procedures
- ✓ Reference measurements
- ✓ Training of laboratory practitioners from laboratories of IAEA Member States.

ILC for Trace Elements including Mercury and MeHg



541

Global ILC Statistics



| ILC | Participants | Report HgT | Report MeHg | Performed Speciation [*] |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| ILC-SEDIMENT- 2018 | 81 laboratories from 48 countries | 49 (60%) | 4 (5%) | 8% |
| ILC-BIOTA-2017 (Fish) | 49 laboratories from 32 countries | 35 (71%) | 6 (12%) | 17% |
| ILC-BIOTA-2013 (Clam) | 108 laboratories from 52 countries | 60 (55%) | 17 (15%) | 28% |
| ILC-SEDIMENT- 2011 | 72 laboratories from 38 countries | 37 (51%) | NA | NA |

* % of participant reporting Hg that report MeHg as well

Global ILC IAEA 461(Clam): Total Hg



| | Satisfactory | Questionable | Unsatisfactory |
|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| z-score | 80% (45%) | 7% | 13% |
| Zeta-score | 74% (43%) | 13% | 13% |



Global ILC IAEA 461(Clam) : MeHg



| | Satisfactory | Questionable | Unsatisfactory |
|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| z-score | 82.4% (12%) | 5.9% | 11.8% |
| Zeta-score | 84.6% (13%) | 7.7% | 7.7% |



Production of CRM





Production of CRM



Certification of mercury and methyl mercury in marine biota IAEA 452 Scallop matrix

Lines represents reference value and associated expanded uncertainty (k=2), error bar represents expanded uncertainty as reported by laboratories, participating in the certification



CRMs for Trace Elements including Mercury and MeHg

| IAEA – Code | Sample Type | Analyte Groups | Year | Availability |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------|--------------|
| IAEA 475 | Marine Sediment | Trace elements & MeHg | 2019 | On-going |
| IAEA-476 | Fish Homogenate | Trace elements & MeHg | 2017 | Yes |
| IAEA-436-A | Tuna fish | Trace elements & MeHg | 2016 | Yes |
| IAEA-470 | Marine biota-Oyster | Trace elements & MeHg | 2015 | Yes |
| IAEA-461 | Marine biota-Clams | Trace elements & MeHg | 2013 | Yes |
| IAEA-458 | Marine Sediment | Trace elements | 2013 | Yes |
| IAEA-457 | Marine Sediment | Trace elements | 2012 | Yes |
| IAEA-456 | Marine Sediment | Trace elements & MeHg | 2012 | Yes |
| IAEA-452 | Marine biota-scallop | Trace elements & MeHg | 2010 | Yes |

http://nucleus.iaea.org/rpst/



In the case of mercury



- 1. Data produced are oceanographically inconsistent
- 2. "Different methods measuring different fractions of mercury"
- 3. "Complexity of sample matrix and the definition of the measurant
- 4. Errors in the quantification of the analytical blank"
- 5.Lack o matrix matching CRM

6. Sound and realistic combined uncertainty estimation associated with the declared measurement results is nearly always lacking, which makes the comparison of different sets of results difficult

→ ACCURACY OF MEASUREMENT DATA: IT MATTERS!

Development, validation and distribution of recommended analytical procedures



The use of reference and recommended analytical procedures is important for:

- Comparability of data for environmental assessments
- Improving quality assurance of monitoring data, produced in different MSs laboratories
- The effective use of the generated database and decision making

Reference and Recommended Analytical Procedures for Hg and MeHg





Uncertainty (how well do I know the result)

Witth curtesy to TrainMiC programme

ISO/IEC 17025



7.2.2 Validation of method

Validation is the confirmation by examination and the provision of objective evidence that the particular requirements for a specific intended use are fulfilled
7.2.2.1

Note 2: The techniques used for the determination of the performance of a method should be one of, or a combination of, the following:

Calibration using reference standards

- Comparison of results achieved with other methods
- Systematic assessment of the factors influencing the results
- Assessment of the uncertainty of the results based on scientific understanding of the theoretical principles of the method and practical experience.

Validation of the analytical procedure



Performance parameters

- □ Selectivity
- □ Linearity, measuring interval
- 🗆 LOD, LOQ
- □ Repeatability, Reproducibility
- □ Trueness
 - □Recovery
- □ Ruggedness (robustness)
- □ Uncertainty
- □ Traceability

Comparison with primary method of measurements

EURACHEM Guide

Estimation of measurement uncertainty



- Error propagation using partial differentiation
- More practical to use numerical approach

Kragten's method (Analyst, 1994, 119, 2161)

Guidelines provided by ISO Guide to the Expression of

Uncertainty in Measurement

Dedicated software used

2%-15%

GUM Workbench[®] (Metrodata GmbH, Germany)

Uncertainties reported with coverage factor k = 2

Specific treatment for the uncertainties on (semi) additive corrections applied to individual isotope signal intensities (instrumental background, isobaric interferences, dead time effects)

Key steps in the attainment of traceability



Mathematical modeling of the entire measurement system demonstrating the traceability to the mole, the kilogram and the second



Reference methods



Reference methods



The analytical procedure to establish reference values for Hg amount contents in marine samples is based on **ID ICP-MS applied as a primary method of measurement**.





Cold vapor matrix-independent ID ICP- MS for reference measurements of mercury in seawater, sediments and biota



Method development and validation studies for total Hg

n(²⁰⁰Hg)/n(²⁰²Hg)

IAEA-475: sediment IAEA-470: oyster 0.10.1 4 2.1 2.9 Seawater: ~ 2 ng/kg Materials Isotope dilution U,% Certified value / U. % $C \pm U$, $\mu g/kg$ (k=2) PT value **IAEA-470** 20.1 (0.7) 3.5 21.2 (2.1) 9.9 IAEA-475 29.9 (1.5) 30.2 (1.3) 4.5 5.0 1.96 (0.06) .10-3 1.9 (0.5) ·10⁻³ BCR-579 3.0 26 PT Seawater I 4.83 (0.14) ·10⁻³ 4.84 (0.11) ·10⁻³ 2.2 3.0 9.85 (0.23) ·10⁻³ PT Seawater II 9.86 (0.90) ·10⁻³ 9.1 2.4 34.2 (0.5) ·10⁻³ 34.1 (1.8) ·10⁻³ 1.6 PT Seawater III 5.3

s.u. on repeatability within bottle

s.u. on concentration of diluted ERM AE-640

- s.u. on mass of added spike to sample
- s.u. on repeatability of ²⁰⁰Hg/²⁰²Hg ratio in 4 replicate blends
- s.u. on instrumental background

Gas phase sample introduction

✓ separate Hg from matrix

²⁰⁰Hg: ¹⁸⁴W¹⁶O⁺ and ²⁰²Hg: ¹⁸⁶W¹⁶O⁺

- \checkmark reduce memory effects
- ✓ increase sensitivity

A. Krata, E. Vassileva, E. Bulska, Talanta , 160, 2016, 562-569

Hyphenated techniques for mercury species using direct and species-specific Isotope Dilution ICP-MS

HPLC ICP-MS

n(²⁰⁰Hg)/n(²⁰²Hg) and n(²⁰¹Hg)/n(²⁰²Hg)



Method development and validation studies for total Hg and MeHg

IAEA-476: fish homogenate IAEA-461: Gafrarium tumidum clam IAEA-470: oyster











A. Krata, E. Vassileva, E. Bulska, Talanta , 160, 2016, 562-569



Testing methods



Global Total Hg : Example of Results





Determination of Hg and MeHg in Marine Biota Samples by using Advanced Mercury Analyser

Sample preparation procedure

MeHg in Marine Biota



S.Azemard and E.Vassileva, Food Chemistry, 176, 2016, 367-375.

Validation Parameters

Marine biota samples

| Parameters | MeHg⁺ | |
|-----------------|------------------------|--|
| Recovery | 92-108% | |
| Repeatability | 1.3-3.9% | |
| Reproducibility | 1.7-4.5% | |
| Working range | 0.002-20 µg kg⁻¹ | |
| Linearity | 0.9932 | |
| LOD | 0.5 ngkg ⁻¹ | |
| LOQ | 1 ngkg⁻¹ | |
| Traceability | SI system via CRM | |
| Uncertainty | 17.5% (k=2) | |
| Procedural | | |
| Blank | <0.00 pg | |

S.Azemard and E.Vassileva, Food Chemistry, 176, 2015, 367-375.



Determination of Hg in marine samples by using CV AFS



- Analysis by Dual-Stage Gold Pre-concentration and Direct Atomic Fluorescence
- Direct measurement without pre-concentration
- Applicable to seawater, marine biota and sediment samples

Validation Parameters CV-AFS sediment and biota samples



| Parameter | CV-AFS |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Working range | 0.1 to 5 ng kg ⁻¹ |
| Detection limit | 0.02 -0.05 ngkg ⁻¹ |
| Quantification limit | 0.2-0.5 ngkg ⁻¹ |
| Repeatability | 2-5% |
| Reproducibility | 4-8% |
| Recovery | 96 - 102% |
| Uncertainty (k=2) | 14% (k=2) |

THg in Seawater by CV-AFS



Summary of the Method

• Filtered or Unfiltered sea Water (25ml)

- Digestion 12h with BrCl
- Pre reduction Hydroxylamine ammonium
- Reduction with SnCl₂

3.00

- Double Gold trap Amalgamation
- AFS Detection (automated analyzer Brooks Rand or Tekran)

Results of 3 years external PTs on seawater

Validation Parameters :

| Parameters | |
|------------------------|--|
| Lincority | Demonstrated up to 900pg (36 ng |
| Linearity | kg-1) |
| Working range | 0.8 to 900pg (0.03 to 36 ng kg ⁻¹) |
| LOD | 0.009 ng kg ⁻¹ |
| LOQ | 0.03 ng kg ⁻¹ |
| Repeatability | 7.0 -2.4% (for 0.2 to 5 ng kg ⁻¹) |
| Intermediate precision | 7.3 -2.4% (for 0.2 to 5 ng kg ⁻¹) |
| Recovery | 94 – 103 % |
| | 30% (<i>k</i> =2) with BCR 579 |
| | 15% (k=2) with Spike for recovery |





Validation of: HgT $_{P}$ = HgT $_{D}$ HgT $_{D}$ Samples are analyzed Filtered (HgTD) and unfiltered (HgT)

Solid Sampling CS HR AAS for Hg in marine samples: biota and sediments

| Step | Name | Temp. | Ramp. | Hold | Time | Ar flow |
|------|-----------|-------|--------|------|------|---------|
| | | [°C] | [°C/s] | [s] | [s] | |
| 1 | Drying | 55 | 100 | 1 | 1.2 | Max |
| 2 | Pyrolysis | 300 | 100 | 5 | 7.5 | Max |
| 3 | Gas | 300 | 0 | 5 | 5.0 | Stop |
| | Adaption | | | | | |
| 4 | Atomize | 1000 | 200 | 1 | 4.5 | Stop |
| 5 | Clean | 2450 | 500 | 4 | 6.9 | Max |

Step





P. Mandjukov, A. M. Orani, E. Han and E. Vassileva, Spectrochim. Acta Part B 103-104, 2015, 24-33.



Validation Parameters

| Parameters | Total Hg | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Repeatability | RSD=3.2 % | | |
| Reproducibility | RSD=11 % | | |
| LOD | 0.12 ng Hg | | |
| LOQ | 0.36 ng Hg | | |
| Recovery | 95-101% | | |
| Uncertainty | 8.5% (k=2) | | |
| Traceability | SI system via CRM | | |

P. Mandjukov, A. M. Orani, E. Han and E. Vassileva, Spectrochimica Acta part B 103-104, 2015, 24-33.

Determination of MeHg in Marine Samples with GC-pyr-AFS







Automatic purge and trap iso-thermal packed GC-Pyr-AFS

Automatic purge and trap Capillary GC-Pyr-AFS

Methods for MeHg determination in seawater, marine biota and sediment samples are based on aqueous ethylation derivatization, purge & trap preconcentration, GC separation and AFS detection

Assay of Different Extraction Conditions





Validation Parameters



L. Carrasco and E. Vassileva, Analytica Chimica Acta <u>853</u>, 2015, 167–178.

L. Carrasco and E.Vassileva, Talanta, 122, 2014,106-114.



MeHg in Seawater by GC-AFS





Tekran

Brooks Rand



Validation via External comparisons

Validation Parameters :



■IAEA Results (Mean ± U (k=2)) ●Brooks Rand ILC (Mean ± STD) ▲Geotraces 2016 (Median ± MAD) ×Published (Mean ± STD)

(Manuscript under preparation)

| Parameters | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Linearity | Demonstrated up to 7pg (0.12ng/l) |
| Working range | 0.2 to 7pg (0.0035 to 0.12ng/l) |
| LOD | 0.001 ng/l |
| LOQ | 0.004 ng/l |
| Repeatability | 3.3% at 0.05ng/l (4.5% at 0.007ng/l) |
| Intermediate precision | 2.9% at 0.05ng/l |
| Recovery | 94 % |
| Uncertainty (U) | 15-25% (<i>k</i> =2) |

Regional monitoring studies for Hg and MeHg



Baltic Sea: Hg and MeHg determination. Pollution history study



Namibia: Baseline monitoring of total Hg along the Namibian coast.



Caribbean region: Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Colombia. Surface and core samples collected in areas with specific historical Hg contamination

Results: Total and methyl mercury profiles in Colombian sediment



Mercury was used in the production of chlorine **in Alkalis plant in Colombia** and waste waters were discharged directly into the sea.

New Developments and Progress in the EnvironmentalIAEAPollution Studies

Atoms for Peace and Development

Hg isotopes are used to fingerprint, identify and trace the source of pollution

Mercury Isotope Ratios





Hg isotopes can be used to trace pollution sources, biogeochemical cycling and reactions involving Hg in the environment

Application of Hg isotope ratios for pollution

Hg isotopes can undergo two types of fractionation, depending on chemical/physical processes in which they are involved:

• MDF = Mass Dependent Fractionation $\delta^{xxx}Hg(\%) = \left\{ \left[\left(\frac{xxx}Hg/^{198}Hg \right)_{sample} / \left(\frac{xxx}Hg/^{198}Hg \right)_{SRM3133} \right] - 1 \right\} \times 100$ where ^{xxx}Hg = selected Hg isotope SRM 3133 = Hg standard *As convention, the equation for* $\delta^{202}Hg$, *involving the ratio* $\frac{202}Hg/^{198}Hg$, *is used to express the MDF*

• MIF = Mass Independent Fractionation $\Delta^{xxx}Hg = \delta^{xxx}Hg - (\delta^{202}Hg \times \beta)$

where ^{xxx}Hg = selected Hg isotope

B = 0.252, 0.502 and 0.752 for 199 Hg, 200 Hg and 201 Hg respectively

Hg in Baltic sediment core



Hg and MeHg profiles: pollution history Hg isotope ratios in sediments



The most probable source of Hg is coal combustion. Highest Hg inputs recorded at the beginning of the 20th century.

Support Capacity Building of Member States to Protect the Marine Environment

Promote excellence in analysis - training of scientists via TC projects and Regional Seas programmes

Dissemination of recommended analytical methods for mercury and methylmercury via peer review papers, scientific presentations and IAEA reports 

PUI project on Seafood safety

Conclusions



Sound strategies for marine chemical monitoring are based on measurement systems, capable of producing comparable analytical results with demonstrated quality.

The IAEA's EL supports the improvement of the worldwide performance of monitoring laboratories and the availability of reliable analytical data for global mercury monitoring.



Acknowledgment

- Mr. Lius Carrasco
- Mr. P. Mandjukov
- Ms. Agniezka Krata
- Ms. Irena Wysocka

Thank You



