

# Author's Accepted Manuscript

Screen-printed electrode based electrochemical detector coupled with Ionic liquid dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction and microvolume back-extraction for determination of Mercury in water samples

Elena Fernández, Lorena Vidal, Daniel Martín-Yerga, María del Carmen Blanco, Antonio Canals, Agustín Costa-García



[www.elsevier.com/locate/talanta](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/talanta)

PII: S0039-9140(14)00992-8  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2014.11.069>  
Reference: TAL15282

To appear in: *Talanta*

Received date: 31 July 2014  
Revised date: 31 October 2014  
Accepted date: 4 November 2014

Cite this article as: Elena Fernández, Lorena Vidal, Daniel Martín-Yerga, María del Carmen Blanco, Antonio Canals, Agustín Costa-García, Screen-printed electrode based electrochemical detector coupled with Ionic liquid dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction and microvolume back-extraction for determination of Mercury in water samples, *Talanta*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2014.11.069>

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 galley proof before it is published in its final citable 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.

**Screen-Printed Electrode based Electrochemical Detector Coupled with  
Ionic Liquid Dispersive Liquid-Liquid Microextraction and Microvolume  
Back-Extraction for Determination of Mercury in Water Samples**

Elena Fernández<sup>a</sup>, Lorena Vidal<sup>a\*</sup>, Daniel Martín-Yerga<sup>b</sup>, María del Carmen Blanco<sup>b</sup>, Antonio  
Canals<sup>a\*</sup> and Agustín Costa-García<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Departamento de Química Analítica, Nutrición y Bromatología e Instituto Universitario de  
Materiales, Universidad de Alicante, P.O. Box 99, E-03080 Alicante, Spain.

<sup>b</sup>Departamento de Química Física y Analítica, Universidad de Oviedo, C/Julián Clavería, 8,  
33006 Oviedo, Spain.

\*Corresponding authors: Tel.: +34965909790; fax: +34965909790.

E-mail addresses: lorena.vidal@ua.es (L. Vidal), a.canals@ua.es (A. Canals).

**Abstract**

A novel approach is presented, whereby gold nanostructured screen-printed carbon electrodes (SPCnAuEs) are combined with in-situ ionic liquid formation dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (in-situ IL-DLLME) and microvolume back-extraction for the determination of mercury in water samples. In-situ IL-DLLME is based on a simple metathesis reaction between a water-miscible IL and a salt to form a water-immiscible IL into sample solution. Mercury complex with ammonium pyrrolidinedithiocarbamate is extracted from sample solution into the water-immiscible IL formed in-situ. Then, an ultrasound-assisted procedure is employed to back-extract the mercury into 10  $\mu\text{L}$  of a 4 M HCl aqueous solution, which is finally analyzed using SPCnAuEs.

Sample preparation methodology was optimized using a multivariate optimization strategy. Under optimized conditions, a linear range between 0.5 and 10  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  was obtained with a correlation coefficient of 0.997 for six

calibration points. The limit of detection obtained was  $0.2 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ , which is lower than the threshold value established by the Environmental Protection Agency and European Union (*i.e.*,  $2 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  and  $1 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ , respectively). The repeatability of the proposed method was evaluated at two different spiking levels (3 and  $10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and a coefficient of variation of 13% was obtained in both cases. The performance of the proposed methodology was evaluated in real-world water samples including tap water, bottled water, river water and industrial wastewater. Relative recoveries between 95 and 108% were obtained.

**Keywords:** liquid-phase microextraction, dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction, ionic liquid, mercury, screen-printed electrode, water samples.

## 1. Introduction

Mercury is one of the most well-known toxic elements and even the World Health Organization places it between the first ten chemicals or group of chemicals of major public health concern [1]. Mercury exists in different forms with different properties, namely elemental or metallic (*i.e.*,  $\text{Hg}^0$ ); inorganic (*i.e.*,  $\text{Hg}^{2+}$ ); and organic (*i.e.*,  $\text{MeHg}^+$ ,  $\text{EtHg}^+$ ,  $\text{PhHg}^+$ ). Several factors determine the adverse effects from mercury exposure including its chemical form, the dose, the age and health of the person exposed, and the duration and kind of exposure (*e.g.*, inhalation, ingestion, etc.) [2]. Among the most relevant health effects we can mention damage to the gastrointestinal tract, nervous system, kidneys, respiratory failures and problems during the development of organs in unborn.

Mercury enters in the environment through both biogenic and anthropogenic ways. However, human activities such as mining, burning of fossil fuels, agriculture, paper and electrochemical industries, and household wastes, are the main responsible of the concerning increase of mercury levels in air, soil and water of certain contaminated areas. Monitoring the presence of mercury in natural and drinking waters is of great interest due to its high toxicity and bioaccumulation factor [3]. Mercury concentrations are commonly in the range of low  $\text{ng L}^{-1}$  in environmental waters [3] whereas the permitted level of mercury in drinking water depends on the responsible authorities of each territory. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sets the threshold level at  $2 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  [4], but the European Union establishes the limit at  $1 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  [5].

Electrochemical techniques have been widely employed to determine mercury in natural and drinking waters. Two excellent reviews have been recently published about the latest advances in electrochemical, mainly voltammetric, determination of mercury [6,7]. Electrochemistry offers sensitivity, simplicity, rapid response and inexpensive instrumentation with miniaturization and portable options. A major drawback to be considered results from the difficulty of removing mercury from electrode surface between measurements which leads to memory effect problems [6,7]. However, tedious and time consuming cleaning steps can be avoided with the use of screen-printed electrodes (SPEs), which can be disposable after a single use due to their high cost effectiveness. Several methods based on SPEs have been reported for the determination of mercury in different water samples, including the use of bare gold SPEs [8], and modified SPEs with carbon nanomaterials [9–11], gold films [12,13], gold nanoparticles [14,15], nanohybrid materials [14] and chelating

agents [16]. As can be seen in Table 1, the vast majority of the reported works include a preconcentration step over the working electrode (*i.e.*, deposition time) followed by anodic stripping voltammetry. Gold is commonly employed in working electrodes due to its high affinity for mercury which leads to an improvement in its preconcentration. In addition, mercury suffers from a process named underpotential deposition (UPD) on gold electrodes [7]. The presence of gold promotes the adsorption of mercury atoms on the surface once the ionic metal is reduced forming an amalgam (Au-Hg). The formation of this amalgam is energetically more favored with respect to pure mercury and makes that deposition of mercury on gold occurs at a more positive potential than in normal conditions. As a consequence, the selectivity of the method is generally improved. In this work, screen-printed carbon electrodes modified with gold nanoparticles (SPCnAuEs) are employed as electrochemical transducers in the detection stage. The use of nanoparticles in electroanalysis is continuously growing due to its numerous advantages, related to the unique properties of nanoparticulate materials [17] (*e.g.*, increasing surface area, enhanced mass transport and improving selectivity, catalytic activity and signal to noise ratio).

Liquid-phase microextraction (LPME) [18] appeared in the latest nineties offering undoubted advantages as miniaturized extraction techniques, such as simplicity, easiness to handle, low sample and solvent consumptions, and an important reduction of residues generated. One of the most popular LPME technique is dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (DLLME) [19] which has even come to dominate LPME research publications in the recent years [20]. DLLME is based on the complete dispersion of the small volume of extractant solvent into the sample, normally assisted by a disperser agent. During DLLME,

there is a high contact between phases therefore the extraction is really rapid and effective. After the extraction, phases are separated normally by centrifugation and the enriched phase with analyte is analyzed. Numerous modifications of the original DLLME procedure [19] have been reported up to now [21] including the use of new extractant solvents such as ionic liquids (ILs) [22]. Within the use of ILs, a novel methodology called in-situ IL formation dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (in-situ IL-DLLME) [23,24] has recently been developed. In-situ IL-DLLME is based on the formation of a water-immiscible IL using a metathesis reaction between a water-miscible IL and an ion exchange salt into sample solution. Thereby, the extractant phase is generated in-situ in form of homogeneously dispersed fine drops, the disperser agent is totally avoided and the extraction efficiency generally increases.

Different LPME techniques including single-drop microextraction [25,26], DLLME [27–29], in-situ IL-DLLME [23] and task-specific IL ultrasound-assisted DLLME [30] have been employed for the determination and speciation of mercury in water samples. In these works, bulky and expensive chromatographic systems [25, 28, 29], capillary electrophoresis [27], UV-Vis spectrometry [23], cold vapor [30] and electrothermal vaporization atomic absorption spectrometry [26] were used as separation and detection techniques, respectively.

The approach presented here employs an in-situ IL-DLLME followed by an ultrasound-assisted microvolume back-extraction and SPCnAuEs as electrochemical transducers for the determination of mercury in water samples. This combination exploits the advantages of including a miniaturized sample preparation step with the high sensitivity and specificity that offers the

electrochemical determination of mercury using SPCnAuEs. LPME provides a high preconcentration of the analyte and a clean-up step for dirty matrices employing low amounts of sample and chemicals. In addition, considering the low volume of sample needed for analysis with SPEs, they appear as an alternative and perfectly compatible detection methodology after miniaturized extraction techniques, thus avoiding classical and bulky analytical instrumentation [31]. A multivariate optimization strategy has been adopted for the optimization of the sample preparation and the applicability of the method has been tested studying real-world water samples.

## 2. Experimental part

### 2.1. Reagents and water samples

A stock standard solution of  $\text{Hg}^{2+}$  ( $1000 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ) was prepared by dissolving  $\text{Hg}(\text{OAc})_2$  ( $\geq 99\%$ ) from Fluka (Stenheim, Germany) in ultrapure water. Working solutions were prepared by proper dilution of the stock standard. The 1-hexyl-3-methylimidazolium chloride IL ( $[\text{Hmim}][\text{Cl}]$ ) ( $98\%$ ) was purchased from Iolitec (Heilbronn, Germany). The lithium bis[(trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl]imide ( $\text{LiNTf}_2$ ) salt and the chelating agent ammonium pyrrolidinedithiocarbamate (APDC) ( $\sim 99\%$ ) were supplied by Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). A solution of  $2 \text{ mg mL}^{-1}$  of the chelating agent was prepared by dissolving APDC in ultrapure water. Reactive grade NaCl and NaOH ( $\geq 97\%$ , pellets) were from ACS Scharlau (Barcelona, Spain). Fuming HCl ( $37\%$ ) was supplied by Merck (Madrid, Spain). The ultrapure water employed for preparing all solutions was obtained with a Millipore Direct System Q5<sup>TM</sup> purification system from Ibérica S.A. (Madrid, Spain).

Standard Au<sup>3+</sup> tetrachloro complex (1.000 ± 0.002 g of AuCl<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup> in 500 mL of 1.0 M HCl) was purchased from Merck. Solutions of 1 mM AuCl<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup> were prepared by suitable dilution of this standard solution in 0.1 M HCl.

Tap water was collected from the water-supplied network of the lab in the Department of Physical and Analytical Chemistry of the University of Oviedo (Spain). Bottled water (San Benedetto mineral water, Valencia, Spain) was purchased in the supermarket. River water from Nora river was collected in Tiñana (Siero, Spain) and industrial wastewater was from Galicia (Spain). The wastewater contained a chemical oxygen demand of 7 mg O<sub>2</sub> L<sup>-1</sup> and 5 mg L<sup>-1</sup> of suspended solids. All water samples were stored at 4 °C and were used without any further pretreatment. Initial analysis with the developed method confirmed that mercury levels were undetectable in the four selected water samples.

## 2.2. Apparatus and electrodes

An ultrasounds bath from Elma (Singen, Germany) was used to assist the back-extraction procedure.

An Autolab PGSTAT 12 potentiostat from EcoChemie (Utrecht, The Netherlands) controlled by Autolab GPES software version 4.8 was used for electrochemical experiments.

Screen-printed carbon electrodes (SPCEs) (ref. DRP-110) with three electrode configuration were purchased from DropSens (Oviedo, Spain). The working electrode, with a disk-shaped of 4 mm of diameter, and the counter electrode were made of a carbon ink whereas the pseudo-reference electrode



was made of silver. Specific connectors obtained from DropSens (ref. DRP-DSC) were used for the connexion of the SPCEs to the potentiostat.

### 2.3. In-situ IL-DLLME and microvolume back-extraction

Under optimum conditions, 20 mg of [Hmim][Cl] were placed in a test tube and dissolved in 4 mL of aqueous standards or sample solutions and the chelating agent (40  $\mu\text{L}$  of 2 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>). The ionic exchange salt LiNTf<sub>2</sub> was added in an equimolar ratio (*i.e.*, 28.3 mg) with the IL [Hmim][Cl], according to previous works [24, 31]. A cloudy solution was immediately formed and the mixture was manually shaken for 0.5 minutes. In order to accelerate phases separation, the tube was then introduced in an ice bath for 5 minutes. Next, the phases were separated by centrifugation for 10 minutes at 5000 rpm. The aqueous phase was removed with a glass pipette, and the formed IL-phase (*i.e.*, 20  $\mu\text{L}$  of [Hmim][NTf<sub>2</sub>]) was withdrawn with a micropipette and deposited in an Eppendorf tube of 0.5 mL. For the back-extraction, 10  $\mu\text{L}$  of 4 M HCl aqueous solution were added to the IL phase and the mixture was sonicated in an ultrasounds bath for 14 min at 90% of power and 37 KHz of frequency. Since direct measurements on the IL were not suitable, back-extraction was necessary for voltammetric analysis. After back-extraction, phases were separated by centrifugation for 5 min at 5000 rpm and the enriched acidic aqueous phase that remained in the upper part was analyzed. The overall procedure is graphically described in Figure 1.

## 2.4. Electrochemical analysis

Gold nanoparticles were generated over the SPCEs surface employing the procedure developed by Martínez-Paredes et al. [32] and previously optimized by Martín-Yerga et al. for the determination of mercury [14]. Briefly, 40  $\mu\text{L}$  of a 1 mM  $\text{AuCl}_4^-$  solution in 0.1 M HCl aqueous solution were dropped onto the SPCE surface and a constant current of  $-100 \mu\text{A}$  was applied for 180 s. After gold nanoparticles deposition, the electrode surface was generously rinsed with ultrapure water and dried at room temperature before use. A new SPCnAuEs was prepared and employed for each experiment. The electrochemical behavior of mercury on SPCnAuEs was previously and deeply studied [14], therefore, no further discussion will be included in the present work.

After back-extraction, 5  $\mu\text{L}$  of the resulting upper acidic aqueous phase was mixed with 37  $\mu\text{L}$  of 0.5 M NaOH in order to obtain a suitable electrolytic medium. A volume of 40  $\mu\text{L}$  of this solution was deposited on the electrode surface for voltammetric measurements. Mercury was determined by square-wave anodic stripping voltammetry employing previous optimized conditions [14]. Mercury was preconcentrated over SPCnAuEs by applying a constant potential of +0.3 V for 240 s. Thereafter, the potential was recorded between +0.3 V and +0.55 V at a frequency of 80 Hz, amplitude of 30 mV and step potential of 4 mV. All experiments were carried out at room temperature.

## 2.5. Data processing

An anodic peak corresponding to the reoxidation of mercury appears at approximately +0.42 V and the height of this peak was employed for the quantification of the analyte. The "base line correction" option provided by

GPEs software was employed to get more defined peaks, specially at low concentrations, and to obtain more reliable and accurate measurements.

A two-step multivariate optimization strategy, using Plackett-Burman and central composite designs, was carried out to determine the optimum conditions of sample preparation. Minitab 15 statistical software (State College, PA, USA) was employed to construct the experimental design matrices and evaluate the results.

### **3. Results and discussion**

#### **3.1. Optimization of sample preparation**

##### **3.1.1. Screening step**

Plackett-Burman design is a two-level fractional factorial design that ignores interaction between factors and therefore main effects can be calculated with a reduced number of experiments leading to a saving in resources and time. The Plackett-Burman design results very useful in the first steps of a project when many factors are initially considered but finally only a few show important effects [33]. A saturated Plackett-Burman design was used to construct the matrix of experiments, including 11 factors: eight real factors and three dummy factors. The effects of dummy factors were used to evaluate the experimental error [34,35]. The eight real experimental factors selected at two levels were: amount of [Hmim][Cl], amount of chelating agent, ionic strength, sample pH, volume of HCl acceptor solution during back-extraction, back-extraction time, power and frequency of the ultrasounds bath. Table 2 shows the experimental factors and levels considered in the Plackett-Burman

design. A total of twelve experiments were randomly performed using aqueous standards of  $25 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ .

The data obtained were evaluated using an ANOVA test and the results were visualized with the Pareto chart shown in Figure S1 (Electronic Supplementary Material). The length of each bar was proportional to the influence of the corresponding factor and the effects that exceed each reference vertical line can be considered significant with 95% and 90% probability, respectively.

According to Figure S1, the ultrasounds frequency and HCl volume were statistically significant factors, with 95% probability, showing a negative effect. The negative effect of the frequency is in agreement with the fact that at high ultrasounds frequencies, cavitation bubbles are more difficult to create as a result of the shorter duration of rarefaction cycles. Higher amplitudes (*i.e.*, power) would be necessary to ensure that cohesive forces in the liquid were overcome and maintain a certain cavitation energy [36]. For the HCl volume, the negative effect is easily explained considering that if less volume of acid is used, a higher concentration of the analyte is obtained in the final acceptor solution. The ultrasounds device employed during this work only accepted two discrete values of frequency, namely 37 and 80 KHz, thus this significant factor could not be included in the following optimization step and was fixed in its lower level. As a consequence, back-extraction time and amount of [Hmim][Cl], which showed significant effects with 90% probability (see Fig. S1), were included in the next optimization step. Back-extraction time showed a positive effect whereas for the amount of [Hmim][Cl] the effect was negative. These effects revealed that the mass transfer during back-extraction is not as

instantaneous as during in-situ IL-DLLME, and it is enhanced if low amounts of [Hmim][NTf<sub>2</sub>] are formed, probably related to diffusion effects from the bulk of the IL to the contact surface with the HCl aqueous solution.

The other four real factors considered in screening step with non-significant effects were fixed at the following levels: amount of chelating agent, 40  $\mu\text{L}$  (2 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>); ionic strength, no addition of NaCl; sample pH, the pH of water without any adjustment; and ultrasounds power, 90%.

### 3.1.2. Optimization of significant factors

Central composite design (CCD) combines a two-level full factorial design ( $2^k$ ) with  $2k$  star points, where  $k$  is the number of factors being optimized, and one point at the center of the experimental region. In order to ensure the rotatability of the model, star points were set at  $\alpha = \sqrt{k} = 1.682$  whereas the central point was repeated five times to provide an orthogonal design [33]. CCD was used to evaluate and optimize main effects, interaction effects and quadratic effects of the three considered factors. Table 3 shows the low and high levels, the central and star points of the considered factors in the optimization step. Nineteen experiments were randomly performed using aqueous standards of 25  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ .

The data obtained were also evaluated using an ANOVA test. The coefficients of the factors and the  $p$ -values are listed in Table S1 (Electronic Supplementary Material).

Significant factors with 95% probability (*i.e.*,  $p$ -value < 0.05) were HCl volume, back-extraction time and the quadratic effects of back-extraction time and amount of [Hmim][Cl], which confirms the curvature of the system and its

fitting with the proposed second-grade polynomial system. The adjustment obtained expressed as  $r^2$  value was 92%.

The response surfaces obtained using the CCD are shown in Figure 2. Pairs of factors were considered separately in order to easily interpret the effect of each one on the response of the system. Thus, Figure 2a shows the response surface which results of plotting HCl volume vs back-extraction time, for 40 mg of [Hmim][Cl]; Figure 2b shows the response surface obtained as a function of HCl volume and amount of [Hmim][Cl], whilst back-extraction time is fixed at 10 min; and Figure 2c shows the surface response corresponding of the effects of back-extraction time and amount of [Hmim][Cl], with established HCl volume at 40  $\mu\text{L}$ . As expected, HCl volume has a negative effect (Fig. 2a and 2b) and the response of the system increases when the HCl volume decreases. For the back-extraction time, the response of the system increases with the time (Fig. 2a and 2c) until reaching a maximum at 14 min. Both, 10  $\mu\text{L}$  for HCl volume and 14 min for the back-extraction time, were adopted as the optimum conditions for the proposed methodology. As can be seen in Fig. 2b and 2c, the effect of the amount of [Hmim][Cl] also presents a maximum over 40 mg, although the variation of the response is really slight between 40 and 20 mg. Thus, considering the sign of the effect of this factor obtained in the Plackett-Burman design, which was negative, and the importance of waste reduction, 20 mg of [Hmim][Cl] were finally chosen for the validation of the method.

In summary, the results obtained from the overall optimization process lead to the following experimental conditions: amount of [Hmim][Cl], 20 mg; amount of chelating agent, 40  $\mu\text{L}$  (2 mg  $\text{mL}^{-1}$ ); ionic strength, no addition of NaCl; sample pH, the pH of water without any adjustment; HCl volume, 10  $\mu\text{L}$ ;

back-extraction time, 14 min; ultrasounds power, 90%; and ultrasounds frequency, 37 KHz.

### 3.2. Analytical figures of merit

Quality parameters of the proposed method were evaluated. Under optimized conditions, a concentration range from 0.5 to 25  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  was studied. Finally, the linear working range was established between 0.5 and 10  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ . The calibration curve was constructed using six concentration levels, evaluated by triplicate. The voltammograms corresponding to the blank and the aqueous standards of concentrations from 0.5 to 10  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  are shown in Figure 3. The resulting calibration curve gave a high level of linearity with a correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) of 0.997 ( $N=6$ ). The sensitivity of the instrumental measurements estimated by the slope of the calibration curve was  $(3.0 \pm 0.3) \mu\text{A } \mu\text{g}^{-1} \text{ L}$ . The repeatability of the proposed method, expressed as coefficient of variation (CV), was evaluated by five consecutive analyses of aqueous standards at concentrations of 3 and 10  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ . CV values of 13% were found in both cases. An enrichment factor of 25 was obtained for the proposed procedure, defined as the slope ratio of the calibration curves with and without preconcentration.

The limit of detection (LOD) was estimated according to the Directive 98/83/EC [5], on the quality of water intended for human consumption, as the concentration corresponding to a signal that is five times the standard deviation of the blank. The LOD was found to be 0.2  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ , which is lower than most of the reported works up to now using SPEs (see Table 1), and stands lower than the threshold value established by both, the EPA and the European Union (*i.e.*, 2  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  and 1  $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ , respectively). It is important to point out that the sensitivity

and LOD of the proposed method are significantly better than those obtained in a previous work [14] (*i.e.*,  $0.120 \mu\text{A } \mu\text{g}^{-1} \text{ L}$  and  $3.3 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ , respectively) using the same kind of SPCnAuEs under equal conditions but without sample preparation. In addition, just a few of the reported works using SPEs have shown equal or lower LOD than  $0.2 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$  [10,12,14], however, standard addition method was needed to analyze real-world water samples [12,14].

Therefore, the great but scarcely explored advantages that offer the combination of LPME with electrochemical detection using SPEs have been demonstrated.

### 3.3 Real-world water samples analysis

The applicability of the proposed method to determine mercury in real-world water samples was evaluated studying matrix effects. Four water samples (namely tap water, bottled water, river water and wastewater) were employed for recovery studies. As mentioned before, previous analysis revealed that mercury levels in the samples were under the LOD of the present approach. Three replicated analysis of each water sample were carried out at two different spiking levels ( $1$  and  $7 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ ). Relative recoveries were calculated as the ratio of the signals found in real and ultrapure water samples spiked at the same concentration level. As can be observed in Table 4, relative recoveries ranged from 95 to 108 % in the four water samples, whereas the CV values were between 7 and 15 %. According to these results, it can be concluded that the matrix effects were not significant for the determination of mercury in the four selected water samples.



#### 4. Conclusions

SPCnAuEs have been successfully combined with in-situ IL-DLLME and microvolume back-extraction methodologies for the determination of mercury in water samples, reaching a LOD that satisfies the established legal threshold levels and proving its applicability in real-world water sample analysis. Higher sensitivity and lower LOD were obtained with the proposed methodology compared to those obtained with the same electrochemical transducers but omitting the sample preparation. Therefore, the great and up to now practically unexplored benefits that offer the combination of miniaturized sample preparation techniques with the electrochemical analysis using SPEs have been experimentally demonstrated.

Although the ice-bath, centrifugation and sonication limit the in-field application of the proposed methodology, authors strongly believe in a promising future for the synergistic combination of LPME with SPEs as detection methodology within the perspectives of developing inexpensive analytical methodologies with portable options for rapid and on-site measurements.

#### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (projects n. CTQ2011-23968 and CTQ2011-24560), Generalitat Valenciana (Spain) (projects n. ACOMP/2013/072, PROMETEO/2013/038 and GV/2014/096) and University of Alicante (Spain) (project n. GRE12-45) for the financial support. E. Fernández and D. Martín-Yerga also thank Generalitat

Valenciana and Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, respectively, for their fellowships.

Accepted manuscript

## REFERENCES

- [1] World Health Organization (June, 2014), [http://www.who.int/ipcs/assessment/public\\_health/chemicals\\_phc/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/ipcs/assessment/public_health/chemicals_phc/en/index.html).
- [2] World Health Organization (June, 2014), <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs361/en/>.
- [3] K. Leopold, M. Foulkes, P.J. Worsfold, Preconcentration techniques for the determination of mercury species in natural waters, *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.*, 28 (2009) 426–435.
- [4] Environmental Protection Agency (June, 2014), <http://water.epa.gov/drink/contaminants/basicinformation/mercury.cfm>.
- [5] COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 98/83/EC of 3 November on the quality of water intended for human consumption.
- [6] C. Gao, X.-J. Huang, Voltammetric determination of mercury(II), *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.*, 51 (2013) 1–12.
- [7] D. Martín-Yerga, M.B. González-García, A. Costa-García, Electrochemical determination of mercury: A review, *Talanta*, 116 (2013) 1091–1104.
- [8] E. Bernalte, C. Marín Sánchez, E. Pinilla Gil, Determination of mercury in ambient water samples by anodic stripping voltammetry on screen-printed gold electrodes, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 689 (2011) 60–64.
- [9] F. Arduini, C. Majorani, A. Amine, D. Moscone, G. Palleschi, Hg<sup>2+</sup> detection by measuring thiol groups with a highly sensitive screen-printed electrode modified with a nanostructured carbon black film, *Electrochim. Acta*, 56 (2011) 4209–4215.
- [10] X. Niu, H. Zhao, M. Lan, Disposable screen-printed bismuth electrode modified with multi-walled carbon nanotubes for electrochemical stripping measurements, *Anal. Sci.*, 27 (2011) 1237–1241.
- [11] G. Aragay, J. Pons, A. Merkoçi, Enhanced electrochemical detection of heavy metals at heated graphite nanoparticle-based screen-printed electrodes, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 21 (2011) 4326–4331.
- [12] A. Mandil, L. Idrissi, A. Amine, Stripping voltammetric determination of mercury(II) and lead(II) using screen-printed electrodes modified with gold films, and metal ion preconcentration with thiol-modified magnetic particles, *Microchim. Acta*, 170 (2010) 299–305.
- [13] S. Laschi, I. Palchetti, M. Mascini, Gold-based screen-printed sensor for detection of trace lead, *Sensors Actuators B*, 114 (2006) 460–465.
- [14] D. Martín-Yerga, M.B. González-García, A. Costa-García, Use of nanohybrid materials as electrochemical transducers for mercury sensors, *Sensors Actuators B*, 165 (2012) 143–150.

- [15] E. Bernalte, C.M. Sánchez, E.P. Gil, Gold nanoparticles-modified screen-printed carbon electrodes for anodic stripping voltammetric determination of mercury in ambient water samples, *Sensors Actuators B*, 161 (2012) 669–674.
- [16] E. Khaled, H.N.A. Hassan, I.H.I. Habib, R. Metelka, Chitosan modified screen-printed carbon electrode for sensitive analysis of heavy metals, *Int. J. Electrochem. Sci.*, 5 (2010) 158–167.
- [17] F.W. Campbell, R.G. Compton, The use of nanoparticles in electroanalysis: An updated review, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 396 (2010) 241–259.
- [18] F. Pena-Pereira, I. Lavilla, C. Bendicho, Liquid-phase microextraction techniques within the framework of green chemistry, *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.*, 29 (2010) 617–628.
- [19] M. Rezaee, Y. Assadi, M.-R. Milani Hosseini, E. Aghaee, F. Ahmadi, S. Berijani, Determination of organic compounds in water using dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1116 (2006) 1–9.
- [20] J.M. Kokosa, Advances in solvent-microextraction techniques, *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.*, 43 (2013) 2–13.
- [21] H. Yan, H. Wang, Recent development and applications of dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1295 (2013) 1–15.
- [22] M.J. Trujillo-Rodríguez, P. Rocío-Bautista, V. Pino, A.M. Afonso, Ionic liquids in dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction, *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.*, 51 (2013) 87–106.
- [23] M. Baghdadi, F. Shemirani, In situ solvent formation microextraction based on ionic liquids: A novel sample preparation technique for determination of inorganic species in saline solutions, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 634 (2009) 186–191.
- [24] C. Yao, J.L. Anderson, Dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction using an in situ metathesis reaction to form an ionic liquid extraction phase for the preconcentration of aromatic compounds from water, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 395 (2009) 1491–1502.
- [25] F. Pena-Pereira, I. Lavilla, C. Bendicho, L. Vidal, A. Canals, Speciation of mercury by ionic liquid-based single-drop microextraction combined with high-performance liquid chromatography-photodiode array detection, *Talanta*, 78 (2009) 537–541.
- [26] H. Bagheri, M. Naderi, Immersed single-drop microextraction-electrothermal vaporization atomic absorption spectroscopy for the trace determination of mercury in water samples, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 165 (2009) 353–358.
- [27] J. Li, W. Lu, J. Ma, L. Chen, Determination of mercury(II) in water samples using dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction and back extraction along with capillary zone electrophoresis, *Microchim. Acta*, 175 (2011) 301–308.
- [28] X. Jia, Y. Han, X. Liu, T. Duan, H. Chen, Speciation of mercury in water samples by dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction combined with high performance liquid chromatography-inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry, *Spectrochim. Acta Part B*, 66 (2011) 88–92.

- [29] Z. Gao, X. Ma, Speciation analysis of mercury in water samples using dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction combined with high-performance liquid chromatography, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 702 (2011) 50–55.
- [30] E. Stanis, J. Werner, H. Matusiewicz, Mercury species determination by task specific ionic liquid-based ultrasound-assisted dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction combined with cold vapour generation atomic absorption spectrometry, *Microchem. J.*, 110 (2013) 28–35.
- [31] E. Fernández, L. Vidal, J. Iniesta, J.P. Metters, C.E. Banks, A. Canals, Screen-printed electrode-based electrochemical detector coupled with in-situ ionic-liquid-assisted dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction for determination of 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 406 (2014) 2197–2204.
- [32] G. Martínez-Paredes, M.B. González-García, A. Costa-García, In situ electrochemical generation of gold nanostructured screen-printed carbon electrodes. Application to the detection of lead underpotential deposition, *Electrochim. Acta*, 54 (2009) 4801–4808.
- [33] D.C. Montgomery, *Design and Analysis of Experiments*, 7th ed., Wiley, 2009.
- [34] Y.V. Heyden, C. Hartmann, D.L. Massart, L. Michel, P. Kiechle, F. Erni, Ruggedness tests for a high-performance liquid chromatographic assay: Comparison of an evaluation at two and three levels by using two-level Plackett-Burman designs, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 316 (1995) 15–26.
- [35] H. Fabre, N. Mesplet, Robustness testing for a capillary electrophoresis method using the "short-end injection" technique, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 897 (2000) 329–338.
- [36] M.D. Priego Capote, F. Luque de Castro, *Analytical Applications of Ultrasounds*, 1st ed., Elsevier B.V., 2007.

**Figure captions**

**Fig. 1** In-situ IL-DLLME and ultrasound-assisted microvolume back-extraction coupled with SPCnAuE.

**Fig. 2** Surfaces response of CCD design obtained by plotting: (a) HCl volume vs. back-extraction time (amount of [Hmim][Cl]: 40 mg); (b) HCl volume vs. amount of [Hmim][Cl] (back-extraction time: 10 min); (c) amount of [Hmim][Cl] vs. back-extraction time (HCl volume: 40  $\mu$ L).

**Fig. 3** Square-wave voltammograms, after baseline correction, of a blank and mercury aqueous standards of 0.5, 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10  $\mu$ g L<sup>-1</sup> after in-situ IL-DLLME and back-extraction under optimum conditions.

Fig. 1




Fig. 2







Fig. 3



**Table 1.** Comparison of different methods using SPEs for the determination of mercury in water samples.

Electrode	Lineal range	LOD	Real water samples	Comments/Analytical technique (deposition time in parentheses)	Ref.
SPGE	5-30 ng mL <sup>-1</sup>	1.1 ng mL <sup>-1</sup>	Wastewater and rain water	SWASV (60 s)	[8]
SPE/carbon black	2.5·10 <sup>-8</sup> -1·10 <sup>-7</sup> M (5-20 µg L <sup>-1</sup> )	5·10 <sup>-9</sup> M (1 µg L <sup>-1</sup> )	Drinking water	Indirect determination by amperometric measurements of thiols	[9]
SPBE/MWCNTs	0.2-40 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	0.09 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	Tap water	SWASV (180 s)	[10]
Carbon NPs-based SPEs	1-10 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	-	Seawater	Heated electrodes/ SWASV (120 s)	[11]
SPE/gold film	2-16 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	1.5 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	Tap water	SWASV (120 s)	[12]
SPE/gold film	0.2-0.8 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	0.08 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	-	Preconcentration step using magnetic nanoparticles modified with thiols/ SWASV (120 s)	[12]
SPCE/gold film	0-100 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	0.9 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	-	SWASV (120 s)	[13]
SPGOnAuEs	2-50 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	1.9 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	-	SWASV (200 s)	[14]
SPCNTnAuEs	0.5-50 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	0.2 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	Tap and river waters	SWASV (200 s)	[14]
SPCnAuEs	5-100 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	3.3 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	-	SWASV (240 s)	[14]
SPCnAuEs	5-20 ng mL <sup>-1</sup>	0.8 ng mL <sup>-1</sup>	Rain and river waters, industrial wastewater	SWASV (120 s)	[15]
CTS-SPE	20-80 ng mL <sup>-1</sup>	2 ng mL <sup>-1</sup>	-	DPASV (30 s)	[16]

SPGE, screen-printed gold electrode; SWASV, square-wave anodic stripping voltammetry; SPBE, screen-printed bismuth electrode; MWCNTs, multi-walled carbon nanotubes; NPs, nanoparticles; SPGOnAuEs, screen-printed graphene oxide/gold nanoparticles electrodes; SPCNTnAuEs, screen-printed carbon nanotubes/gold nanoparticles electrodes; DPASV, differential-pulse anodic stripping voltammetry; CTS-SPE, chitosan-modified screen-printed electrodes.

**Table 2.** Experimental factors and levels of the Plackett-Burman design.

Factors	Level	
	Low (-1)	High (+1)
Amount of [Hmim][Cl] (mg)	20	40
Amount of chelating agent ( $\mu\text{L}$ , $2 \text{ mg mL}^{-1}$ )	20	40
Ionic strength (NaCl concentration, %, w/v)	0	10
Sample pH	5	10
HCl volume ( $\mu\text{L}$ )	20	50
Back-extraction time (min)	5	10
Ultrasounds power (%)	50	90
Ultrasounds frequency (KHz)	37	80

**Table 3.** Factors, low and high levels, central and star points used in CCD design.

Factor	Level			Star points ( $\alpha=1.682$ )	
	Low (-1)	Central (0)	High (+1)	$-\alpha$	$+\alpha$
HCl volume ( $\mu\text{L}$ )	22	40	58	10	70
Back-extraction time (min)	6	10	14	3	17
Amount of [Hmim][Cl] (mg)	28	40	52	20	60

Accepted manuscript

**Table 4.** Relative recoveries and CV values (in parentheses) for the analysis of mercury in real-world water samples.

Water sample	Relative recoveries	
	1 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	7 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$
Tap water	106 (11)	108 (7)
Bottled water	98 (11)	103 (15)
River water	97 (10)	98 (9)
Wastewater	97 (12)	95 (9)

Accepted manuscript

**Highlights**

Mercury determination in environmental and drinking waters.

DLLME and microvolume back-extraction in sample preparation.


Gold nanostructured screen-printed carbon electrode based electrochemical detector.

Electrochemical sensor as detection system for liquid-phase microextraction.

Limit of detection lower than other previous works using screen-printed electrodes.

Accepted manuscript

\*Graphical Abstract (for review)



Graphical Abstract

Accepted