Supplementary Material

Determination of microcystins in water samples by deep eutectic solvent-based vortex-assisted liquid-liquid microextraction coupled with ultrahighperformance liquid chromatography-high resolution mass spectrometry

Yung-Chih Chen, Yi-Ting Ao, Wang-Hsien Ding*

Department of Chemistry, National Central University, Chung-Li 320, Taiwan

Name (Abbreviation):	Structure	MW (g/mol)	pK _a	logK _{ow}
Microcystin-LR (MC-LR)	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} CO_2H \\ HN \\ O \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} O \\ O \\ HN \\ H \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} O \\ O \\ HN \\ H \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} O \\ O $	994.5488	3.3	4.2
Microcystin- YR (MC-YR)	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	1044.5280	3.9	3.4

Table S1. Name (abbreviation), chemical structure and molecular weight of MC-LR and MC-YR

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	p-value Prob > F	Coefficient ^a (estimated)
Model	6.37E+09	9	7.07E+08	15.02	0.0009*	
Intercept						1.12E+05
A-THF volume	2.61E+07	1	2.61E+07	0.55	0.481	-1806
B-DES volume	3.12E+09	1	3.12E+09	67.12	< 0.0001*	19882
C-vortex time	4.27E+07	1	4.27E+07	0.91	0.3726	2311
AB	1.81E+08	1	1.81E+08	3.85	0.09	6736
AC	7.24E+07	1	7.24E+07	1.54	0.2552	-4253
BC	2.06E+06	1	2.06E+06	0.044	0.8402	-718
A^2	6.34E+08	1	6.34E+08	13.47	0.008	-12275
B^2	1.51E+09	1	1.51E+09	32.16	0.0008	-18969
C^2	4.53E+08	1	4.53E+08	9.61	0.0173	-10371
Residual	3.30E+08	7	4.71E+07			
Lack of Fit	1.35E+08	3	4.50E+07	0.92	0.5065	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.9508					
Adjusted R ²	0.9078					
Predicted R ²	0.8852					

Table S2. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the Box-Behnken design for MC-LR peak areas

*Significant ^{*a*} The estimated coefficients for the second order polynomial equation.

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	p-value Prob > F	Coefficient ^a (estimated)
Model	6.17E+09	9	6.86E+08	15.0	0.0009*	
Intercept						1.12E+05
A-THF volume	2.87E+07	1	2.87E+07	0.63	0.4544	-1893
B-DES volume	2.99E+09	1	2.99E+09	65.40	< 0.0001*	19336
C-vortex time	5.29E+07	1	5.29E+07	1.16	0.3180	2571
AB	1.32E+08	1	1.32E+08	2.88	0.1332	5743
AC	6.07E+07	1	6.07E+07	1.33	0.2870	-3897
BC	2.48E+06	1	2.48E+06	0.054	0.8225	-788
A^2	6.37E+08	1	6.37E+08	13.92	0.0073	-12296
B^{2}	1.54E+09	1	1.54E+09	33.66	0.0007	-19122
C^2	4.50E+08	1	4.50E+08	9.85	0.0164	-10343
Residual	3.20E+08	7	4.57E+07			
Lack of Fit	1.11E+08	3	3.70E+07	0.71	0.5951	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.9507					
Adjusted R ²	0.9080					
Predicted R ²	0.8873					

Table S3. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the Box-Behnken design for MC-YR peak areas

*Significant ^{*a*} The estimated coefficients for the second order polynomial equation.

Table S4. The variation of peak abundances: (+) peak enhancement/(-) peak suppression

	(+) peak enhancement/
Analytes	(-) peak suppression (%)
MC-YR	+11*
MC-LR	+17

*The percentage of the "average peak abundances difference" (n = 3) obtained from the final extract divided by the peak abundance from the standard solution (5 ng/mL).

Table S5. Concentrations (ng/mL) of MC-YR and MC-LR detected in water samples from Shihmen Reservoir by using DES-VALLME coupled with UHPLC-qTOF-MS

Sample	MC-YR	MC-LR
Reservoir-1	n.d.	n.d.
Spiked recovery %	$105^a (3.6)^b$	$109^{a} (3.2)^{b}$
Reservoir-2	n.d.	n.d.
Spiked recovery %	106 (7.6)	98 (3.7)
Reservoir-3	n.d.	n.d.
Spiked recovery %	100 (12.2)	94.0 (10.4)
Reservoir-4	n.d.	n.d.
Spiked recovery %	98.7 (4.5)	95.6 (5.7)

n.d.: not detected.

^{*a*} Average spiked recovery (trueness, %, n = 3; spiked final concentration: 2.0 ng/mL).

^b Relative standard deviation (RSD) of spiked recovery (precision, %, n = 3).

Reagents	penalty points		
THF	1		
Acetonitrile	1		
Methanol	1		
DES	1		
Formic acid	2		
Instruments			
LC-MS	2		
Centrifuge	1		
Vortex agitator	1		
Waste	2		
Total penalty points	12		
Analytical Eco-scale total score = 88			

Table S6. The penalty points for MC-YR and MC-LR

 determination by DES-VALLME plus UHPLC-ESI(+)-qTOF-MS



Figure S1. 3D response surface plots for peak area of MC-LR estimated from the BBD on each pair of independent variables: (a) volume of THF *vs.* volume of DES; (b) volume of THF *vs.* vortex-time; (c) volume of DES *vs.* vortex-time.



Figure S2. 3D response surface plots for peak area of MC-LR estimated from the BBD on each pair of independent variables: (a) volume of THF *vs.* volume of DES; (b) volume of THF *vs.* vortex-time; (c) volume of DES *vs.* vortex-time.



Figure S3. UHPLC-ESI(+)-qTOF-MS extracted ion chromatograms for a spiked water sample from "Reservoir" (spiked at the final concentrations of 2 ng/mL for each analyte).