Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Environmental Science: Nano. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2018

Supporting Information

Release of Silver Nanomaterials from Textile:

Influence of Realistic Wearing on Nanomaterial Characteristics

Vincent Gagnon^a, Mark Button^{a,c}, Hardiljeet K. Boparai^a, Michelle Nearing^a, Denis O'Carroll^b, Kela P. Weber^{a*}

- ^a Environmental Sciences Group, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario K7K 7B4, Canada
- ^b School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, UNSW Water Research Laboratory, The University of New South Wales Sydney, 110 King St, Manly Vale, NSW, 2093, Australia
- ^c Fipke Laboratory for Trace Element Research, Earth, Environmental and Geographic Sciences, University of British Columbia Okanagan, University Way, Kelowna, BC, V1V 1V7, Canada

*Corresponding author: kela.weber@rmc.ca

| Alcohol Sulfate | Dimethicone | Mannanase |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Alcoholethoxy Sulfate | Disodium Diaminostilbene | Polyethylene Glycol 4000 |
| | Disulfonate | |
| Alkyldimethylamine Oxide | DTPA | Polyethyleneimine Ethoxylate |
| Amylase | Ethanol | Propylene Glycol |
| Borax | Ethanolamine | Protease |
| Calcium Formate | Fragrance | Sodium Fatty Acids |
| Citric Acid | Laureth-9 | Sodium Formate |
| Diethylene Glycol | Linear Alkylbenzene | Sodium Hydroxide |
| | Sulfonate | |
| Diquaternium Ethoxysulfate | LiquitintTM Blue | Water |

Table S1. List of ingredients in Tide Liquid Original Detergent*.

*https://www.pg.com/productsafety/ingredients/household_care/laundary_fabric_care/Tide/Tide_Liquid_Original.pdf

Table S2. Size of the standard Ag-NMs used to calibrate the SP-ICP-MS.

| Methods | Size (nm) | Details |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| DLS | 99±1 | Z-average, $PDI = 0.15$ |
| TEM | 100±9 | Average of 50 particles |
| TEM (from manufacturer) | 100±8 | Average (stated) |

| Instrument Settings | Values |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Dwell time | 10 ms |
| Settling time | 0 ms |
| Acquisition time | 60 s |
| Scan mode | Peak hopping |
| Nebuliser | Meinhardt concentric |
| Spray chamber | cyclonic |
| Peristaltic Pump Settings | Values |
| Sample introduction rate | 0.8 ml/min |
| Pump tubing | 0.95 mm (ID) |
| Sample flush | 60s @ 24 rpm (2% HNO ₃) |
| Read delay | 30s @ 5 rpm |
| Sample read | 61s @ 10 rpm |
| Wash | 45s @ 24 rpm |

 Table S3. Relevant instrument parameters used for SP-ICP-MS analysis.

Table S4. Silver standard used in XANES measurements.

| Compound | Cat. number | Manufacturer |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Ag Glutathione [*] | PHR1359 | Sigma Aldrich |
| Ag Histidine [*] | AAA1762718 | Alfa Aesar |
| Ag Cysteine [*] | W326305 | Sigma Aldrich |
| AgNO ₃ | 209139 | Sigma Aldrich |
| Ag_2SO_4 | 3443-04 | J.T. Baker |
| Ag_2S^* | 89473 | Alfa Aesar |
| AgCl | 21127 | ACROS Organics |
| Ag ₃ PO ₄ | 11415 | Alfa Aesar |
| Ag ₂ O | 1192080025 | Millipore Sigma |
| Elemental Ag-PVP 30 nm | 0120XH | Skyspring Nanomaterials |
| Elemental Ag 30 nm | 0118XH | Skyspring Nanomaterials |

*Compounds were synthesised according to methods described in Wang et al., (2015)

| | . 0 | 4 | 1 0 | D (|
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Sock Sample ^a | Ago | AgCl | Ag_2O | R-factor |
| Unworn Control 1(BG) - Unwashed | 100.0 ± 0.0 | 0.0 ± 0.0 | 0.0 ± 0.0 | 0.0141 |
| Unworn Control 1(W) - Unwashed | 88.9±1.2 | 7.8 ± 1.1 | 3.3±1.6 | 0.0017 |
| Unworn Control 2 (BG) - Unwashed | 98.0±0.9 | 2.0±0.9 | 0.0±1.3 | 0.0009 |
| Unworn Control 2 (W) - Unwashed | 83.0±1.7 | 13.8±1.7 | 3.2±2.4 | 0.0038 |
| Unworn Control 3 (BG) – Wash Cycle 3 | 94.7±0.6 | 2.2±0.6 | 3.1±0.9 | 0.0005 |
| Unworn Control 3 (W) – Wash Cycle 3 | 84.5 ± 1.6 | 12.2±1.6 | 3.3±2.3 | 0.0032 |
| Unworn Control 4 (BG) – Wash Cycle 3 | 79.5±2.7 | 17.0±2.5 | 3.5±3.7 | 0.0071 |
| Walking 1 (BG) – Wash Cycle 3 | 97.4±1.3 | 2.5±1.2 | 0.1 ± 1.7 | 0.0021 |
| Walking 1 (W) – Wash Cycle 3 | 91.4 ± 1.0 | 7.0±0.9 | 1.6±1.4 | 0.0011 |
| Walking 2 (BG) – Wash Cycle 3 | 86.5±1.6 | 11.9±1.5 | 1.6±2.2 | 0.0027 |
| Running 1(BG) – Wash Cycle 3 | 95.8±0.6 | 2.0±0.5 | 2.1 ± 0.8 | 0.0003 |
| Running 2(BG) – Wash Cycle 3 | 100.0±0.3 | 0.0±0.0 | 0.0±0.0 | 0.0033 |

Table S5. Proportion of of Ag⁰, AgCl and Ag₂O in socks samples determined by LCF of XANES spectra.

^a For some sock samples, two different sections were analyzed, as shown in Figure S3, where BG stands for "Black /Grey strip" and W for "White".

| | Minimum (nm) | Maximum (nm) | Mean (nm) |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Thickness | 9 | 308 | 67 ± 56 |
| Length | 228 | 10898 | 2249 ± 611 |
| Width | 125 | 3031 | 1085 ± 1963 |

| Location | | Right | t Foot | Left Foot | | |
|-----------|------|-------|--------|-----------|------|--|
| LUCA | | Тор | Sole | Тор | Sole | |
| | Heel | -7% | -8% | 15% | -34% | |
| Subject 1 | Arch | 7% | 17% | -3% | -12% | |
| Subject I | Pads | -9% | 6% | 10% | -4% | |
| | Toes | -10% | 6% | -3% | -3% | |
| | Heel | 20% | -1% | 21% | -3% | |
| Subject 2 | Arch | -8% | -3% | -1% | -2% | |
| Subject 2 | Pads | 11% | -8% | 3% | 5% | |
| | Toes | -14% | -11% | 4% | 5% | |
| | Heel | -2% | 17% | 13% | -3% | |
| Subject 3 | Arch | 9% | -3% | 2% | -36% | |
| | Pads | -3% | -15% | 5% | 0% | |
| | Toes | 0% | -4% | -11% | -38% | |

Table S7. Silver variation at 8 locations on the socks used for running after the 3rd cycle.

Pink - Ag loss; Blue - Ag gain; calculated for each location following this formula: (Initial Ag – Final Ag)/Initial Ag. Root mean square error (precision) of XRF measurements was 2.9%. The coefficient of variation between measurement after unfolding, shaking and refolding the sock was 3.3% (n = 10)

Table S8. Silver variation at 8 locations on the socks used for controls after the 3rd cycle.

| Location | | Right | t Foot | Left Foot | | |
|-----------|------|-------|--------|-----------|------|--|
| LUCA | | Тор | Sole | Тор | Sole | |
| | Heel | 21% | 0% | 10% | -7% | |
| Control 1 | Arch | 14% | -5% | -1% | -14% | |
| Control 1 | Pads | -6% | -3% | 7% | 2% | |
| | Toes | -11% | -13% | -3% | -3% | |
| | Heel | -13% | 14% | 7% | -3% | |
| Control 2 | Arch | -1% | 10% | 11% | -2% | |
| | Pads | 6% | -8% | -1% | -7% | |
| | Toes | -16% | 5% | 2% | -11% | |
| | Heel | 9% | -3% | 16% | -9% | |
| Control 3 | Arch | 15% | 1% | 3% | -16% | |
| | Pads | 7% | -9% | 6% | -8% | |
| | Toes | -7% | -6% | 0% | -8% | |

Pink - Ag loss; Blue - Ag gain; calculated for each location following this formula: (Initial Ag – Final Ag)/Initial Ag. Root mean square error (precision) of XRF measurements was 2.9%. The coefficient of variation between measurement after unfolding, shaking and refolding the sock was 3.3% (n = 10)

| Location | | Right | t Foot | Left Foot | | |
|-----------|------|-------|--------|-----------|------|--|
| | | Тор | Sole | Top Sole | | |
| | Heel | -28% | -22% | -24% | -24% | |
| Subject 1 | Arch | -12% | -16% | -30% | -30% | |
| | Pads | -30% | -44% | -19% | -19% | |
| | Toes | -31% | -34% | -33% | -33% | |
| Subject 2 | Heel | -32% | -6% | -33% | -33% | |
| | Arch | -21% | -25% | -47% | -47% | |
| | Pads | -30% | -34% | -23% | -23% | |
| | Toes | -28% | -31% | -30% | -30% | |

| Table S9. Silver var | riation at 8 locations | on the socks used | for walking a | after the 3 rd cycle | e. |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----|
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----|

Pink - Ag loss; Blue - Ag gain; calculated for each location following this formula: (Initial Ag – Final Ag)/Initial Ag. No measurements were completed for subject 3. Root mean square error (precision) of XRF measurements was 2.9%. The coefficient of variation between measurement after unfolding, shaking and refolding the sock was 3.3% (n = 10)



Figure S1. Locations of XRF measurements on the top and sole of the sock. Black rectangular marking represent the alignment of the XRF analyser on the socks. The letters and numbers represent the 8 positions of the XRF measurement which had an area of 1.5 x 1.5 cm.



Figure S2. Calibration curve for the XRF according to mass of Ag per mass of sock.



Figure S3. Imaging of the standard engineered nanomaterials used to calibrate the SP-ICP-MS (a) TEM image of the standard Ag ENMs, (b) a higher magnification, and (c) TEM image supplied by the manufacturer. The average of at least 50 particles was sized using the line tool in the free software ImageJ.



Figure S4. Normalized frequency of particle sizes in A) 100 nm Ag-NM standard and B) Ag-NM from the wash water of the walking sock experiment. Higher particle size cut-off in the wash water is cause by the ionic Ag background.

| | 6 | 4 × 1 1 | | Counts | $ \begin{array}{r} 1200 \\ 1000 \\ 800 \\ 600 \\ 400 \\ 200 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{array} $ | Ag 3 KeV | 4 |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|---|----------------|---|
| Dimensions | Size (nm) | Thickness | Size (nm) | | | | |
| Lenght | 840 | 1 | 59 | | | | |
| Width | 608 | 2 | 66 | | | | |
| | | 3 | 77 | | | | |
| | | 4 | 70 | | | | |
| | | 5 | 61 | | | | |
| | | 6 | 53 | | | | |
| | | 7 | 48 | | | | |

Figure S5. Estimation of the nanoplate size using SEM image



206

Figure S6. Estimation of nanoplate size using SEM image

6



Figure S7. Estimation of nanoplate size using SEM image



Figure S8. Normalized Ag K-edge XANES spectra of various Ag standards.



Figure S9. Sock sample showing the two sections that were analysed by XAS.



Figure S10. Normalized Ag K-edge XANES spectra of sock samples and selected Ag standards. For clarity, the spectra are plotted with an offset of 0.3. BG : black/grey striped section of the sock; W: white fabric sections of the sock



Figure S11. Elemental images by XAS of (A) Ag and (B) Cl and (C) XANES spectra of selected spots for an unwashed sock.



Figure S12. Elemental images by XAS of (A) Ag and (B) Cl and (C) XANES spectra of selected spots for a sock used for running.



Figure S13. A) Number of Ag particles and B) Mass of total silver according to the particle size distribution in the wash (W) and rinse (R) water of unworn control and worn socks (walking and running). All values are from the average of three cycles.



Figure S14. EDX spectra of incidental nanomaterial of A) Ag sheet, B) Ag sphere and C) other shape present in the wash water of an unworn sock

References

Wang P, Menzies NW, Lombi E, Sekine R, Blamey FPC, Hernandez-Soriano MC, et al. Silver sulfide nanoparticles (Ag₂S-NPs) are taken up by plants and are phytotoxic. Nanotoxicology 2015; 9: 1041-1049.