Postprint of: Manousi N., Ferracane A., Kabir A., Furton K. G., Tranchida P. Q., Zachariadis G. A., Płotka-Wasylka J., Mondello L., Samanidou V. F., Rosenberg E., Green capsule phase microextraction employing hydrophobic monolithic sol-gel octadecyl siloxane platforms for the monitoring of organophosphorus pesticides in environmental water samples, Sustainable Chemistry and Pharmacy, Vol. 30 (2022), 100892, DOI: 10.1016/j.scp.2022.100892

© 2022. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

1	Green capsule phase microextraction employing hydrophobic monolithic sol-gel
2	octadecyl siloxane platforms for the monitoring of organophosphorus pesticides
3	in environmental water samples
4	
5	Natalia Manousi ^{a,b} , Antonio Ferracane ^{b,c} , Abuzar Kabir ^{d,e} , Kenneth G. Furton ^d , Peter
6	Q. Tranchida ^c , George A. Zachariadis ^a , Justyna Płotka-Wasylka ^f , Luigi Mondello ^{c,g} ,
7	Victoria F. Samanidou ^{a,*} , Erwin Rosenberg ^b
8	
9	^a Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, Aristotle University of
10	Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece
11	^b Institute of Chemical Technologies and Analytics, Vienna University of Technology,
12	1060 Vienna, Austria
13	^c Department of Chemical, Biological, Pharmaceutical and Environmental Sciences,
14	University of Messina, Messina, Italy
15	^d International Forensic Research Institute, Department of Chemistry and
16	Biochemistry, Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA
17	^e Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Allied Health Science, Daffodil International
18	University, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh
19	^f Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry and BioTechMed Center,
20	Gdansk University of Technology, 1/12 G. Narutowicza St., 80-233 Gdansk, Poland
21	^g Chromaleont s.r.l., c/o Department of Chemical, Biological, Pharmaceutical and
22	Environmental Sciences, University of Messina, Messina, Italy
23	
24	*Corresponding author: samanidu@chem.auth.gr, Laboratory of Analytical
25	Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki
26	54124, Greece
27	
28	Abstract: In this study, a novel, facile and green capsule phase microextraction
29	(CPME) method is presented for the extraction and preconcentration of
30	organophosphorus pesticides (i.e., chlorpyrifos, disulfoton, ethoprophos, fenchlorphos,
31	prothiofos, and parathion-methyl) from environmental water samples. Monolithic sol-
32	gel octadecyl siloxane (sol-gel C18) sorbent encapsulated within porous polypropylene
33	capsules was synthesized, characterized, and evaluated for its efficiency towards the
34	adsorption of the target organophosphorus pesticides. CPME was combined with gas

chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) for the monitoring of the target analytes. 35 The method was optimized to ensure high method sensitivity and it was fully validated. 36 The limits of detection of the CPME-GC-MS method for the OPPs were 0.02-0.15 ng 37 mL⁻¹. The relative standard deviations were 1.5-8.7% for intra-day study and 5.4-9.6% 38 for inter-day study, demonstrating satisfactory precision. Moreover, good method 39 accuracy was obtained, since the relative recoveries were within the range 92.6-107.0% 40 41 and 90.8-107.6% for intra-day and inter-day (c=5.00 and 20.0 ng mL⁻¹), respectively. The absence of interferences in the blank samples demonstrate that the proposed 42 43 method is selective. The sol-gel C₁₈ sorbent encapsulated CPME media could be reused for at least 25 adsorption/desorption cycles. In addition, the methodology presents 44 advantageous features in comparison to existing methods. The final protocol was used 45 for analyzing four different water sample types (i.e., lake water, river water, pond water 46 47 and tap water sample).

48

49 Keywords: organophosphorus pesticides; water samples; capsule phase
50 microextraction; GC-MS

51

52 **1. Introduction**

Organophosphorus pesticides (OPPs) comprise a big and diverse class of 53 compounds used to control pests and increase the production of crops (Hu et al., 2013; 54 Mangas et al., 2017). The exposure of humans to OPPs can cause serious health 55 problems and may lead to distinct neurotoxic effects, depending on the type of 56 pesticide, the dose and the frequency of exposure (Čadež et al., 2021). The mechanism 57 of action of OPPs in the human body involves the de-activation of acetyl-cholinesterase 58 that could cause accumulation of acetylcholine and acetylcholine receptors' disorder 59 60 (Hu et al., 2013). Moreover, individual OPPs may exhibit carcinogenic, teratogenic, mutagenic and cytotoxic effects (Xie et al., 2013). These compounds are among the 61 most widely used insecticides (Singh and Walker, 2006). The occurrence of OPPs in 62 rivers, soil, air, plants and groundwater remains a concern for public health, because of 63 their toxicity and their widespread use (Čadež et al., 2021). Particularly for 64 environmental water systems, OPPs can enter to it through many sources, and serve as 65 a threat both for animals and for humans (Gao and Pan, 2020). Thus, the development 66 of sensitive and accurate methodologies for the monitoring of these pesticides in 67 68 environmental samples is of paramount importance.

69 High-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) (Harshit et al., 2017), capillary electrophoresis (Li et al., 2010), and gas chromatography (GC) (Hu et al., 70 2013; Lambropoulou et al., 2000) can be employed for monitoring the OPPs levels in 71 environmental water samples. Among these instrumental techniques, GC coupled to 72 various detection systems including nitrogen phosphorus detector (NPD) (Ballesteros 73 74 and Parrado, 2004), electron capture detector (ECD) (Oliva et al., 2000), flame ionization detector (FID) (Amiri et al., 2019), flame thermionic detector (FTD) 75 76 (Lambropoulou et al., 2000) and mass spectrometers (MS) (Lambropoulou et al., 2000) 77 comprises the main analytical strategies for the monitoring of OPPs, due to their good performance. In order to enable the chromatographic determination of OPPs, sample 78 preparation is necessary to provide sufficient clean up and preconcentration (Kaur et 79 al., 2019). Solid-phase extraction (SPE) (Brito et al., 2002; Gillespie and Walters, 1991; 80 81 Harshit et al., 2017) and liquid-liquid extraction (LLE) (Brito et al., 2002; Harshit et 82 al., 2017) are between the most common methods used for the extraction of OPPs. However, LLE is considered to be a time-consuming technique and it requires high 83 84 quantities of hazardous solvents. Similarly, SPE requires sample pretreatment and elution can be a tedious task, particularly with samples that have a high fraction of 85 86 suspended matter (Ahmadi et al., 2006).

Following the development of Green Analytical Chemistry (GAC) principles 87 that was an outcome of Green Chemistry, large efforts have been made by the scientific 88 community to develop greener sample preparation methods (Anastas, 1999; Armenta 89 90 et al., 2015). As a result, multiple miniaturized techniques have been proposed and successfully employed for the preconcentration and extraction of OPPs. Typical 91 92 paradigms of these techniques include single drop microextraction (SDME) (Pinheiro et al., 2011), dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (DLLME) (Cacho et al., 2018), 93 94 pipette-tip solid phase extraction (Esrafili et al., 2020), solid-phase microextraction (SPME)(Delińska et al., 2022), dispersive solid-phase extraction (d-SPE) (Amiri et al., 95 96 2019), stir bar sorptive extraction (SBSE) (Hu et al., 2013), QuEChERS extraction (Alcântara et al., 2019), magnetic solid-phase extraction (MSPE) (Liu et al., 2020; Xie 97 98 et al., 2013) and fabric phase sorptive extraction (FPSE) (Kaur et al., 2019). At the same time, various novel materials were introduced for the extraction of pollutants from 99 complex samples (Li et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2022). In the above-mentioned sorbent-100 based extraction techniques, extraction takes place either by directly adding the sorbent 101 in the sample (e.g., MSPE, d-SPE) or after the immobilization of the sorbent in suitable 102

substrates (e.g., FPSE). Undoubtedly, the exploration of novel extraction techniques
and materials is critical for the miniaturization of the extraction of OPPs from water
samples.

Capsule phase microextraction (CPME) is an extraction/preconcentration 106 technique that aims to simplify the sample preparation procedure of complex food, 107 108 biological and environmental samples. CPME utilizes specially designed capsules that include three parts: (a) a permeable microporous membrane from polypropylene, (b) a 109 magnet with cylindrical shape and (c) a sol-gel sorbent (Manousi et al., 2022). Because 110 111 of the inherent porosity of the membranes, the CPME devices integrate a filtration 112 mechanism and, thus, this technique may be directly used for analyzing complex matrices without pretreatment. At the same time, the device integrates a stirring 113 mechanism, resulting in rapid extraction kinetics. As a result, CPME overcomes 114 potential losses of the target analytes during sample pretreatment as it eliminates further 115 116 external steps of sample preparation, or potential sample contamination due to the addition of external magnets (Georgiadis et al., 2019). An advantageous feature of 117 118 CPME is the utilization of a monolithic sol-gel sorbent. Sol-gel technology comprise an efficient vehicle for preparing advanced hybrid inorganic–organic polymer sorbents 119 120 that are characterized by high chemical and thermal stability, remarkably high surface 121 area as well as tunable selectivity and porosity (Lazaridou et al., 2020). Using sol-gel technology, a wide variety of sorptive phases including non-polar, polar, medium polar, 122 negatively- or positively-charged, zwitterionic multi-mode sorbents can be prepared to 123 fabricate coated microextraction capsules, resulting in increased selectivity towards a 124 wide range of target analytes with diverse chemical properties (Samanidou et al., 2018). 125 Until now, CPME has found to be a great analytical tool for the monitoring of various 126 environmental pollutants, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (N. Manousi et al., 127 2021b), basic and acidic compounds (Carles et al., 2020), and triazine herbicides in 128 129 water (N. Manousi et al., 2021a).

The purpose of this work was to develop an efficient CPME method combined with GC-MS for the simultaneous extraction and preconcentration of six representative OPPs (chlorpyrifos, disulfoton, ethoprophos, fenchlorphos, parathion-methyl and prothiofos) from environmental water. Different coated CPME devices were evaluated for their performance to find the most efficient sorptive phase in order to find the best compromise for the studied OPPs. Subsequently, the main factors (i.e., extraction time, sample volume, salt content, stirring rate, eluent, mode of elution, volume of eluent and

desorption time) were optimized. Following method optimization and validation, the
herein developed scheme was validated and used for analyzing tap, pond, lake, and
river.

140

141 **2. Experimental**

142 **2.1. Reagents, chemicals, and samples**

LC-MS grade acetonitrile and methanol were obtained from Honeywell 143 (Charlotte, North Carolina, USA), while HPLC grade acetone and GC-MS grade 144 145 toluene were obtained from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). Ultrapure water was provided by a Milli-Q system Plus purification system (Millipore, Bedford, MA, USA) 146 and it was used throughout the study. Reagent grade NaCl was also obtained from 147 Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). Chlorpyrifos (298.0%), disulfoton (298.0%), 148 ethoprophos ($\geq 95.0\%$), fenchlorphos ($\geq 98.0\%$), parathion-methyl ($\geq 98.0\%$) and 149 prothiofos (≥98.0%) were from Supelco (Bellefonte, PA, USA). The chemical 150 structures of the target analytes are shown in Figure S1. A stock solution of the each 151 analyte (1000 mg L^{-1}) was made in hexane: acetone (9:1, v/v) and were kept at 4°C. On 152 a daily basis, working standards were made through serial dilutions in acetone at a 153 154 concentration range of 0.05 and 1000 ng mL⁻¹.

Building blocks of the microextraction devices such as porous polypropylene 155 156 capillary membranes (nominal pore size is 0.2 micrometer), Accurel® was obtained from 3M Inc. (St. Paul, MN, USA). Magnets of cylindrical shape (1/4" x 1/16") were 157 obtained from K&G Magnetics Incorporated (Pipersville, PA, USA). Tetramethyl 158 orthosilicate (TMOS), poly(tetrahydrofuran) (PTHF), and poly(ethylene glycol) 300 159 (PEG 300) were obtained from Sigma Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Isopropanol, 160 methylene chloride, methanol, HCl and NH₄OH were purchased from Fisher Scientific 161 (Milwaukee, WI, USA). Poly(dimethyl siloxane) (PDMS), poly(caprolactone)-162 poly(dimethylsiloxane)-poly(caprolactone) (PCAP-PDMS-PCAP) and octadecyl 163 trimethoxysilane (C18) were from Gelest, Inc. (Morrisville, PA, USA). A tabletop 164 impulse heat sealer (Uline Corp, Pleasant Prairie, WI, USA) was used to heat seal both 165 the ends of the CPME devices. 166

The CPME-GC-MS methodology was employed for the analysis of different
water samples. All samples were collected from Vienna, Austria in amber-glass vials
with no headspace. Until their analysis, all samples were stored at 4 °C (Roldán-Pijuán

et al., 2015; Zohrabi et al., 2016). No sample pre-treatment steps (e.g., filtration) were
required prior to the microextraction procedure.

172

173 **2.2. Instrumentation**

A GC-2010 gas chromatograph and a QP2010 Plus mass spectrometer (MS) 174 175 from Shimadzu (Kyoto, Japan) equipped with a Rtx-5MS ($30 \text{ m} \times 0.25 \text{ mm}$, 0.25 µm) column (Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA) was used in this study. The mobile 176 phase used was helium (99.999%) and it was delivered at a constant gas flow rate of 177 178 1.05 mL min⁻¹. The injector was operated at 280°C. Splitless high pressure injection was performed at 300 kPa for 0.50 min using an injection volume of 3 µL. The oven 179 temperature was: 80 °C initial temperature (hold time 2 min), raised to 280 °C at a ramp 180 rate of 8 °C min⁻¹ and raised to 350 °C at a ramp rate of 50 °C min⁻¹. The analysis time 181 was 28.4 min and a solvent delay of 7 min was used. The ion source was operated at 182 220 °C and the interface was operated at 250 °C. The quantification was conducted in 183 the selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode to ensure good sensitivity and selectivity. For 184 185 this purpose, one target ion was used as quantifier and two reference ions were used as qualifiers for each analyte taking into consideration their abundance. The selected m/z186 187 values for the OPPs are presented in Table S1, along with their retention times.

A Philips XL30 Scanning Electron Microscope equipped with an EDAX detector, an Agilent Cary 670 FTIR Spectrometer, a RIGAKU diffractometer model SmartLab II, and a dynamic sorption surface area analyser Flowsorb III from Micrometrics Instrument Corporation were used for the characterization of the sol-gel C₁₈ sorbent.

193

194 2.3. Preparation of microextraction capsules

CPME devices encapsulating sol-gel sorbents were created using an in-situ 195 gelation of sol solutions where the microextraction capsules were kept submerged 196 during the phase transition, from liquid sol to solid gel. The overall CPME device 197 fabrication process involves several sequential steps: (a) preparing porous 198 199 polypropylene capillary membranes for the device fabrication; (b) preparation and design of sol solutions; (c) in-situ creation of the coating on the porous polypropylene 200 wall and the monolithic bed inside the lumen; and (d) aging/conditioning/cleaning of 201 the CPME devices. Seven sorbents were prepared to study their efficiency towards the 202 extraction of selected organophosphorus pesticides. The sol-gel sorbents include: (1) 203

sol-gel PTHF; (2) sol-gel sol-gel PDMS; (3) sol-gel poly(dimethyldiphenylsiloxane)
(sol-gel PDMDPS); (4) sol-gel poly(caprolactone)-poly(dimethylsiloxane)poly(caprolactone) (sol-gel PCAP-PDMS-PCAP); (5) sol-gel PEG 300; (6) sol-gel
Carbowax 20 M (sol-gel CW 20M); and (7) sol-gel C₁₈.

All CPME devices were built at three-centimeter-long size. Capsule phase 208 209 microextraction devices were prepared for surface coating/creating monolithic bed, Accurel® S6/2 membranes were cut into 3-centimeter-long sections, followed by 210 211 cleaning and drying. Two capillary membranes were impulse heat sealed using the 212 tabletop impulse heat sealer. A magnet was then placed into one of the capillary membranes. Subsequently, the open ends of the two capillary membranes were 213 impulses sealed and the CPME media are ready for the creation of monolithic bed/ sol-214 215 gel sorbent coating.

Design of the sol solution for the preparation of sol-gel coating and/or 216 217 monolithic bed is the most important and challenging task in the CPME device fabrication process with a goal to have high efficiency and to minimize sample 218 219 preparation time, with least possible sample handling. As such, the sol solution preparation process was streamlined utilizing the same molar ratio between the reagents 220 221 for a different sol solutions. The molar ratio between TMOS, methyl trimethoxysilane, polymer, solvent, hydrochloric acid, and water were kept at 1:1:0.2:30:0.04:8, 222 respectively. The reagents were sequentially added to a 50-milliliter reaction vessel 223 with vortexing after adding each ingredient. Then, the sol solution remained for 12 224 225 hours at room temperature. to enable the sol-gel precursor(s)hydrolysis. Subsequently, 1 M ammonium hydroxide was added at a molar ratio at 1:0.18 (TMOS:ammonium 226 227 hydroxide) under constant stirring. Twenty capsule units were then immersed in the solution that was sonicated and transformation of the solution into solid gel occured 228 229 within an hour. During the phase transition, a solid network was formed in the pores of the walls of the capillary membrane, while a monolithic bed was created inside of the 230 231 capillary membranes' lumen. The capsules were then aged and conditioned for 24 h at 50 °C. The capsules were washed with dichloromethane:methanol (50:50 v/v) for 30 232 min under ultrasonic irradiation. During the ultrasonic irradiation process, the sol-gel 233 sorbent monolithic bed is crashed into micro particles, leading to significant expansion 234 of the overall surface area. Prior to their use for analytical experiments, all capsules 235 were dried for 2 h at 50°C. 236

238 **2.4 CPME procedure**

Prior to the microextraction procedure, sol-gel C_{18} CPME devices were placed in an Eppendorf tube that contained 2 mL of methanol for 5 min for the removal of potential residues of the sol-gel synthesis process and to activate the surface of the sorbent. Subsequently, the capsules were rinsed with H₂O for the removal of traces of organic solvents from the sorptive phase that could potentially hinder the adsorption of the OPPs.

Initially, twenty millilitres of sample was placed in a vial and extraction took place within 60 min under a stirring rate of 500 rpm. Then, the CPME device was isolated and cleaned with H₂O. Prior to the desorption of the adsorbed OPPs, the CPME device was wiped and dried thoroughly using tissue (lint free). Desorption of the target analytes took place in Eppendorf tubes by adding a volume of 250 μ L acetone. No stirring was required during this step and complete elution was achieved in 1 min. The eluent was filtered using PTFE filters (0.22 μ m) and analysed by GC-MS.

Washing of the used capsules was performed by immersion in 2 mL of methanol for 5 min. The clean sol-gel C_{18} CPME device was left to dry at room temperature, and they were placed in airtight sealed vials for storage until their next application. Figure S2 shows the main steps of the CPME-GC-MS method.

- 256
- 257

258 **3. Results and discussion**

259 **3.1. Characterization of coated CPME devices**

The sol-gel C₁₈ sorbent was characterized using scanning electron microscopy 260 (SEM), Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) adsorption isotherm, Fourier transform 261 infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR), and X-Ray diffraction analysis (XRD). The 262 characterization study was performed as a basis for understanding the composition and 263 structure of the herein used sorbent. The preparation procedures, obtained results and 264 characterization data regarding the other examined sorbents included in this study have 265 266 been previously reported elsewhere (N. Manousi et al., 2021b, 2021a; Manousi et al., 267 2022).

268

269 **3.1.1 Characterization of the sol-gel C18 by FT-IR**

The functional composition of the sorbent and their building blocks were evaluated using FT-IR Spectrometry. Figure 1 shows the FT-IR spectrum of sol-gel C_{18} (up) and C_{18} -TMOS (bottom).



273

Figure 1. FT-IR spectra of sol-gel C₁₈ (up) and C₁₈-TMOS (bottom)

275

The spectrum of C₁₈-TMOS (Figure 1, bottom) demonstrates characteristic 276 bands at 2920 cm⁻¹ and 2846 cm⁻¹ that correspond to C-H stretching (Einati et al., 2009). 277 The band at 1190 cm⁻¹ corresponds to the asymmetric bending of C-H bonds. The band 278 at 1075 cm⁻¹ corresponds to Si-O-C bonds. Similar bands are also seen in the FT-IR 279 spectrum that is shown in Supplementary Figure S3 as both C₁₈-TMOS and TMOS have 280 281 the same base unit. The spectrum of sol-gel octadecyl siloxane reveals many features presented either in the spectrum of C₁₈-TMOS or that of TMOS or common to both, 282 suggesting the integration of both the sol-gel precursors into the network of the sol-gel 283 284 sorbent.

286 3.1.2 Characterization of the sol-gel C₁₈ by SEM

The SEM images of porous polypropylene capillary membrane surface, before and after the sol-gel sorbent coating, are presented in Figure 2, both at ×1,000 magnification.

285

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl



Figure 2. Scanning electron microscope images at ×1,000 magnification of the surface
of porous polypropylene capillary membrane before coating (a) and after coating (b).

The polypropylene capillary membranes are porous with a 0.2 µm nominal pore 295 296 size. The SEM image of surface before the coating procedure shows the opening of the pores almost evenly distributed on the surface. The SEM image representing sol-gel C₁₈ 297 coated capillary membrane surface is very different from that of the uncoated one, with 298 299 a distinct layer of the sorbent coating. However, the pores on the surface remain intact, although the pore opening seems to be reduced. The polypropylene capillary membrane 300 has thick walls of 450 µm. The sol solution can permeate without any difficulty through 301 the walls during the coating process and transform into a polymeric gel within the 302 porous channels. Consequently, the thick walls of the CPME device behaves like a 303 304 solid-phase extraction disk.

305

291

306

3.1.3 X-ray diffraction analysis (XRD)

The XRD pattern of sol-gel C_{18} is presented in Figure S4. The sample was run at 40 mA, 40 KV, 2 degrees/min, 0.02 step size. A broad peak at theta ~22.5° in the diffraction pattern represents a signature marker of amorphous solid that have been reported in the XRD patterns of amorphous silica obtained from several studies (Liu et al., 2008; Tanev and Pinnavaia, 1995).

312

313 **3.1.4 Brunauer-Emmett-Teller adsorption isotherm**

The average pore width, the pore volume and the specific surface area of solgel C_{18} were carried out. For the comparison purpose, the same characterizations were performed on a commercial C_{18} sorbent. The BET nitrogen adsorption isotherm data

obtained for sol-gel C₁₈ and commercial C₁₈ are distinctly different. Sol-gel C₁₈ has a 317 specific surface area of ~650 cm^2/g , whereas the specific surface area for commercial 318 C_{18} sorbent is ~346 cm²/g. Sol-gel C_{18} sorbent was created by the polycondensation of 319 hydrolysed TMOS with hydrolysed octadecyl trimethoxysilane. The sol-gel synthesis 320 process allows changing the molar ratio between the functional precursor (C_{18} -TMS) 321 322 and the networking precursor (TMOS) that may be exploited to achieve higher carbon loading in the synthesized sorbent. As the commercial C₁₈ sorbents utilize spherical 323 silica particles as the substate to bind C₁₈ moieties on their surfaces, carbon loadings on 324 325 commercial C₁₈ sorbents are limited and primarily determined by the size of substrate silica particle. The pore volume of sol-gel C_{18} was found as 0.43 cm³/g compared to 326 $0.72 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}$ for commercial C₁₈. The average pore width for sol-gel C₁₈ was calculated 327 as 26.9 Å whereas the average pore width for the commercial C₁₈ was 83.7 Å. 328

329

330 3.2 Optimization of the CPME procedure

The effect of the experimental parameters that may affect the CPME method 331 332 were thoroughly investigated and optimized. Initially, different CPME devices (i.e., different sol-gel sorbents and different dimensions) were tested for the extraction of the 333 334 OPPs from the environmental water samples. Subsequently, the adsorption and desorption steps were individually studied by means of the one-variable-at-a-time 335 (OVAT) approach. As such, all variables that could have an influence on the 336 performance of the CPME method were independently examined, and the other 337 parameters remained constant. 338

339 340

341 **3.2.1 Selection of the sol-gel coated CPME device**

Firstly, the seven sol-gel sorbent encapsulated CPME devices (see section 2.3) 342 were evaluated. The length of the capsules was 3 cm. These capsules were initially 343 tested under the following experimental conditions: salt content: 0% w/v NaCl, 344 extraction time: 30 min, sample volume: 20 mL, stirring rate: 500 rpm, eluent: acetone, 345 volume of eluent: 1 mL, desorption time: 5 min. Table S2 presents the results of the 346 investigation of the different sol-gel sorbents. Sol-gel C₁₈ exhibited the best adsorption 347 performance taking into consideration all the examined analytes. C₁₈ is a powerful 348 sorbent for the extraction of OPPs from water samples (Ballesteros and Parrado, 2004; 349 350 Harshit et al., 2017; Xie et al., 2013).

Subsequently, two different dimensions of sol-gel C_{18} encapsulated CPME devices (i.e., 1 cm and 3 cm) were evaluated (Figure S5). The 3 cm microextraction capsules showed higher extraction performance, due to the higher sorbent loading. Thus, further experiments were conducted using of sol-gel C_{18} encapsulated CPME devices of 3 cm.

356

357 3.2.2 Optimization of adsorption conditions

The parameters that can affect the adsorption step were optimized. The optimization of the adsorption conditions was conducted starting from the following experimental conditions: sol-gel sorbent: C₁₈, length of microextraction capsules: 3 cm, salt content: 0% w/v NaCl, extraction time: 30 min, sample volume: 20 mL, stirring rate: 500 rpm, eluent: acetone, volume of eluent: 1 mL, elution time: 5 min.

In equilibrium-based microextraction techniques, the implementation of 363 364 external stimuli (e.g., stirring, shaking or sonication) can enhance the diffusion of the target analytes and result in lower extraction time and enhanced recovery (N. Manousi 365 366 et al., 2021a). CPME integrates a stirring mechanism, since it contains a magnetic rod and, thus, sample stirring can be employed to assist the adsorption step. Four different 367 368 stirring rates between 0 and 1000 rpm were investigated. Figure 3 shows the effect of stirring rate on the extraction recovery. It is noteworthy that without constant stirring, 369 370 negligible extraction recoveries were obtained for all the target analytes.



Figure 3. Evaluation of the effect of different stirring rates.

373

An increase of stirring rate up to 500 rpm had a positive impact on the CPME procedure. Moreover, the extraction recoveries of all analytes remained constant up to a stirring rate of 1000 rpm. Thus, extraction was conducted using a stirring rate of 500 rpm.

Subsequently, sample volume was examined in the range of 10-50mL. Higher recoveries were obtained when 10 mL of water sample were utilized (Figure S6). However, regarding sample enrichment the operation of higher sample amount (e.g., 20 mL or 50 mL) could result in higher PFs and, thus, enhanced method sensitivity. Therefore, as a compromise between ER% and PF values, further experiments were performed using 20 mL of sample.

384 Extraction time is a factor that is important for the performance of equilibrium-385 based techniques like CPME, since it is necessary to find a time span sufficient for all analytes to reach equilibrium (N. Manousi et al., 2021a). During the investigation of 386 387 the extraction time, five different time spans between 15 and 75 min were examined. As shown in Figure S7, most analytes reached an equilibrium at 60 min. Only for 388 389 parathion-methyl the recovery was enhanced for an extraction time up to 75 min. 390 However, since adequate sensitivity was obtained for all analytes and in order to avoid 391 prolonging of the extraction time and to ensure method rapidity, an extraction time of 392 60 min was chosen.

Finally, the impact of the ionic strength of the water sample was investigated. 393 Therefore, different amounts of sodium chloride between 0 and 20% w/v) were 394 evaluated. Salt addition may have either a positive effect (i.e., by decreasing the target 395 analytes' solubility and thus favoring their interaction with the adsorbent, known as 396 397 salting-out effect) or a negative effect (i.e., by increasing the density of the aqueous 398 sample and lowering the mass transfer of the target analytes) in the microextraction 399 process (N. Manousi et al., 2021b). An increase of the ionic strength up to 5% w/v did not have an impact on the efficiency of extraction for the target analytes (Figure S8). 400 401 However, an enhancement of the NaCl content up to 10% w/v had a negative impact for chlorpyrifos, fenchlorphos and prothiophos. Moreover, at 20% w/v NaCl the 402 extraction performance for most analytes was significantly reduced. As a compromise 403 for all OPPs, further experiments were carried out with no salt addition. 404

406 **3.2.3 Optimization of desorption conditions**

Following the optimization of the adsorption step, the effect of the main parameters affecting the elution (i.e., eluent, mode of elution, eluent amount and desorption time) were studied. Adsorption optimization was conducted using the following initial experimental conditions: sol-gel sorbent: C₁₈, dimensions of microextraction capsules: 3 cm, stirring rate: 500 rpm, extraction time: 60 min, sample volume: 20 mL, salt content: 0% w/v NaCl, eluent: acetone, volume of eluent: 1 mL, desorption time: 5 min.

414 The effect of eluent was examined by evaluating the performance of four 415 different solvents, i.e., acetone, methanol, acetonitrile, and toluene for the desorption 416 of the adsorbed OPPs. An appropriate eluent must provide effective desorption of the 417 analytes with enhanced recovery (Kaur et al., 2019). As shown in Figure S9, similar results were obtained for most analytes using acetone, methanol, and acetonitrile. 418 419 However, acetone exhibited better performance compared to the other solvents for prothiophos, while it also characterized by low toxicity. Thus, acetone was chosen as 420 421 eluent.

Accordingly, the elution mode was investigated. Since the CPME device 422 423 contain a magnetic rod, the device can spin when a magnetic stirrer is employed. The 424 need for stirring during the elution process was studied to ensure sufficient desorption 425 of the analytes and two different modes of elution (i.e., with and without stirring) were evaluated. As it can be observed from Figure S10, stirring was not required during the 426 elution of the target analytes. This is probably because of the sponge-like morphology 427 and the inherent porosity and of sol-gel sorbents that enables the diffusion of the eluent 428 during the desorption process, thus overcoming the need for any external energetic 429 stimulus during this step (Kabir and Samanidou, 2021). Therefore, elution of the OPPs 430 from the sol-gel C₁₈ coated CPME device was carried out without stirring. 431

432 The desorption time is another important factor that must be investigated during 433 the optimization of the CPME protocol to find the optimum time span that is required for elution system to exhaustively scavenge the adsorbed analytes and to ensure high 434 sample throughput (Kabir and Samanidou, 2021). In this study, the desorption time was 435 investigated in the range of 1-15 min. As it can be observed in Figure S11, 1 min was 436 sufficient for the desorption of most of the adsorbed OPPs and it was chosen for further 437 experiments. Only for chlorpyrifos, a slight increase of the extraction efficiency was 438 439 observed by increasing the desorption time at 5 min. However, in order have increased sample throughput and a rapid sample preparation protocol a desorption time of 1 minwas finally chosen.

Finally, the amount of acetone was investigated. For this purpose, aliquots (250-442 1500 μ L) were used during the elution step. The amount of the desorption solvent is 443 associated with the enriching ability of the method and thus the utilization of small 444 amounts of eluent can provide enhanced method sensitivity. Moreover, the use of low 445 solvent amount complies with GAC regarding the reduction of the consumption of 446 hazardous chemicals. In this case, sufficient recovery was obtained using small amount 447 448 of acetone (Figure S12). Only for chlorpyrifos, the ER% was improved by using a higher solvent amount (1500 µL). However, taking into consideration the requirements 449 of GAC, the elution of the OPPs was conducted using 250 µL of eluent. 450

451

452 **3.3. Figures of merit**

453 Method validation is thoroughly described in the Supplementary Material. The figures of merit of the proposed method are presented in Table 1. Good linearity was 454 achieved for the OPPs and the coefficients of determination were 0.9912-0.9996. The 455 LODs of the CPME-GC-MS methodology for the target analytes were 0.02-0.15 ng 456 mL^{-1} and the LOQs were 0.05-0.50 ng mL^{-1} . The PF of the proposed method was 80 for 457 all OPPs taking into consideration that the initial volume of sample was 20 mL and the 458 459 final volume after elution was 250 µL. Moreover, the EF values for the target analytes ranged between 15 and 47, while the ER% values were 19-59%. 460

461

Table 1. Figures of merit for the CPME-GC-MS protocol.

			Lincon rongo	LOD	LOQ			
OPP	Regression Analysis	R ²		(ng	(ng	ER%	EF	
		(ng mL ⁻		mL ⁻¹)	mL ⁻¹)			
Chlorpyrifos	y = 11696x + 5981.8	0.9982	0.20-100.0	0.06	0.20	59	47	
Disulfoton	y = 32847x - 41670	0.9912	0.05-50.0	0.02	0.05	48	39	
Fthoprophos	y = 8734.8x + 9309.8	0.9985	0.20-50.0	0.06	0.20	34	27	
enchlorphos	y = 23013x + 14285	0.9969	0.05-50.0	0.02	0.05	57	46	
Parathion- methyl	y = 5819.1x - 1159.3	0.9996	0.50-100.0	0.15	0.50	19	15	
rothiophos	y = 9119.1x + 33918	0.9982	0.20-100.0	0.06	0.20	53	42	_

The results for the evaluation of method precision and accuracy are presented 464 in Table S3. The RR% for the target analytes ranged between 92.6% and 107.0% for 465 the intra-day study and between 90.8% and 107.6% for the inter-day study, indicating 466 good method trueness. Furthermore, the RSDs were 1.5-8.7% and 5.4-9.6% for the 467 468 intra-day and inter-day study, respectively. Thus, the method exhibits good precision. At a final step, the capsule-to-capsule reproducibility was examined utilizing six (n=6) 469 different sol-gel C₁₈ encapsulated microextraction capsules. The CPME media were 470 471 used for the extraction of OPPs (c=5.00 ng mL⁻¹) from standard solutions prepared in deionized water. As shown in Table S3, the RSDs were better than 3.2%, indicating 472 good capsule-to-capsule reproducibility. 473

474

475 **3.4. Reusability of the sol-gel C18 capsules**

476 During the evaluation of the performance of the sol-gel C₁₈ encapsulated microextraction capsules, their potential reusability was examined. For this purpose, a 477 478 single CPME device was used in 25 continuous adsorption/elution cycles of the target analytes from tap water. The reusability was evaluated taking into consideration the 479 480 RR% value derived from the initial performance of the sol-gel C₁₈ coated capsule and the performance after consecutive microextraction cycles. As such, a threshold of \geq 481 10% of performance loss was set. The results are summarized in Figure S13. Since no 482 important performance's reduction was seen after continuous adsorption/elution cycles, 483 484 it can be concluded that the capsules are reusable for at least 25 times.

485

486 **3.5. Comparison with other studies**

487 A comparison of the herein proposed CPME-GC-MS method with other studies488 published in the literature is shown in Table 2.

489

OPPs	Instrumentation	Sample volume (mL)	RSD%	Relative Recoveries %	Enhancement factors	LODs (ng mL ⁻¹)	Ref.
Chlorpyrifos methyl, diazinon, malathion, parathion, parathion-methyl, pirimiphos-methyl	GC-MS	10	≤ 10.7 %.	NA ¹	NA	1.8-5.0	(Xie et al., 2013)
Parathion-methyl, phoxim	HPLC-UV	10	2.5-2.7	88.2-103.6	50	0.17-0.29	(Zhou et al., 2008)
Malathion, parathion	GC-MS	2	≤ 6.37	89.37-101.22	42.7-47.3	0.10	(Esrafili et al., 2020)
Diazinon, dimethoate, fenthion, fenthion sulfoxide, malathion, methidathion, parathion ethyl, parathion methyl	GC-NPD	10	2.9-4.3	93.8-104.5	95.0-98.6	0.05-0.13	(Ballesteros and Parrado, 2004)
Bromophos ethyl, bromophos methyl, dichlofen- thion, ethion, fenamiphos, fenitrothion,	GC-MS and GC- FTD	2-5	7-14 (for GC-MS) 3-10 (for GC-FTD)	86.2-119.7	NA	0.01-0.05 (for GC-MS)	(Lambropoulou et al., 2000)
	OPPs Chlorpyrifos methyl, diazinon, malathion, parathion, parathion-methyl, parathion-methyl, phoxim Malathion, parathion Diazinon, dimethoate, fenthion, fenthion sulfoxide, malathion, methidathion, parathion ethyl, parathion methyl Bromophos methyl, bromophos methyl, dichlofen- thion, ethion, fenamiphos, fenitrothion	OPPsInstrumentationChlorpyrifos methyl, diazinon, malathion, parathion, parathion	OPPsBarmentation charation diazinon, mathion, diazinon, mathion, parathion, parathionSample charation anathion, mathion drantParathion-methyl pirimiphos-methyl	OPPsBarmentation parathion, maldition, parathion, parathion-methylSample parathion, parathion primiphos-methylAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and brandmineAnne and and and brandmineAnne and 	OPPsInstrumentation boliveSample volume (nL)RSD%Relative Recoveries %Chlorpyrifos methyl, diazinon, malathion, parathion, parathion-methyl, pirimiphos-methylAAAParathion-methyl, phoximHPLC-UV102.5-2.788.2-103.6Malathion, parathionGC-MS2≤ 6.3789.37-101.22Diazinon, dimethoate, fenthion, fenthion sulfoxide, malathion, methyl, parathionGC-NPD102.9-4.393.8-104.5Parathion orthyl, parathionGC-NPD102.9-4.393.8-104.53.0Bromophos ethyl, bromophos methyl, dichlofen-thion, ethion, ethion, ethion, ethion fenamiphos, fenitrothionGC-MS and GC- FTD7.14 (for GC-MS 3.10 (for GC-FTD)6C-MS	OPPs Instrumentation Sample volume (m) Relative Recovering (m) Relative Recovering (m) Relative Recovering (m) Recovering (m) <td>OPPsInstrumentation instrumentationSample volume (nL)Relative Recoveries %Enhancement factorsLOBs (mg nL-1)Chlorpyrifos methyl, diazinon, malathion, parathion, parathion-methyl, pirimiphos-methylGC-MS10≤ 10.7 %NA1NA1.8-5.0Parathion, parathion-methyl, pirimiphos-methylMPLC-UV10$2.5-2.7$88.2-103.6500.17-0.29Malathion, parathionGC-MS$2$$\leq 6.37$89.37-101.2242.7-47.30.10Diazinon, dimethoate, fenthion, fenthion sulfoxide, matathion, methidathionGC-NPD10$2.9-4.3$93.8-104.595.0-98.60.05-0.13Bromophos enthyl, bromophos methyl, fendnion, ethion, ethion, ethion, methylGC-MS and GC- FTD$7-14$ (for GC-MS)$7-14$ (for S1.01 (for GC-MS)$0.01-0.05$Bromophos methyl, fenamipho, fenitrution, ethion</td>	OPPsInstrumentation instrumentationSample volume (nL)Relative Recoveries %Enhancement factorsLOBs (mg nL-1)Chlorpyrifos methyl, diazinon, malathion, parathion, parathion-methyl, pirimiphos-methylGC-MS10 ≤ 10.7 %NA1NA1.8-5.0Parathion, parathion-methyl, pirimiphos-methylMPLC-UV10 $2.5-2.7$ 88.2-103.6500.17-0.29Malathion, parathionGC-MS 2 ≤ 6.37 89.37-101.2242.7-47.30.10Diazinon, dimethoate, fenthion, fenthion sulfoxide, matathion, methidathionGC-NPD10 $2.9-4.3$ 93.8-104.595.0-98.60.05-0.13Bromophos enthyl, bromophos methyl, fendnion, ethion, ethion, ethion, methylGC-MS and GC- FTD $7-14$ (for GC-MS) $7-14$ (for S1.01 (for GC-MS) $0.01-0.05$ Bromophos methyl, fenamipho, fenitrution, ethion

491 **Table 2**. Comparison with other studies

<

 $\langle |$

1	Extraction	OPPs	Instrumentation	Sample volume (mL)	RSD%	Relative Recoveries %	Enhancement factors	LODs (ng mL ⁻¹)	Ref.
		fenthion, malathion,						0.01-0.02	
		parathion-ethyl, parathion-						(for GC-	
		methyl						FTD)	
ld. yzł	d-SPE	Diazinon, fenitrothion, fenthion, phosalone, profenofos	GC-FID	20	4.9-8.5 (intra-day) 5.9-8.8 (inter-day)	91.9-99.5	803-914	0.03-0.21	(Amiri et al., 2019)
ded from mostwied	СРМЕ	Chlorpyrifos, disulfoton, ethoprophos, fenchlorphos, parathion-methyl and prothiofos	GC-MS	20	1.5-8.7 (intra-day) 5.4-9.6 (inter-day)	92.6-107.0 (intra-day) 90.8-107.6 (inter-day)	15-47	0.02-0.15	This study
03	492								

¹ N.A.: Not available

As it can be observed, the developed approach permitted the utilization of higher 494 amount of sample compared to those in literature (Ballesteros and Parrado, 2004; 495 Esrafili et al., 2020; Lambropoulou et al., 2000; Xie et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2008). In 496 addition, the accuracy (in terms of RR% values) and the precision (in terms of RSD% 497 values) of the proposed method is satisfactory, compared to other studies. The 498 enhancement factors of the proposed method were similar to those of ref. (Esrafili et 499 500 al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2008) but lower to those of ref. (Amiri et al., 2019; Ballesteros and Parrado, 2004). The LODs for the OPPs were better than those reported in ref. 501 502 (Esrafili et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2008) and comparable to those in refs. (Amiri et al., 2019; Ballesteros and Parrado, 2004; Lambropoulou et al., 2000). In case 503 that further enhancement of method sensitivity is required, the herein developed 504 microextraction protocol can be combined with more sensitive systems (e.g., GC-505 MS/MS instruments). 506

507 Besides the analytical performance parameters, the green nature of the selected procedures was also compared by application of ComplexGAPI (Płotka-Wasylka and 508 Wojnowski, 2021). This tool enables the evaluation of the different analytical methods 509 according to the principles of GAC. ComplexGAPI index takes into consideration the 510 511 procedures, reagents, and instrumentation that are employed in an analytical method, while it also considers all the processes before the analysis (Płotka-Wasylka and 512 Wojnowski, 2021). A green colour indicates the compliance with the respective 513 requirements. From the GAPI pictogram in Figure 4, it can be concluded that the 514 synthesis of the capsules shows high process yield and reduced waste generation, while 515 it also shows a low E-factor, supporting green economy. Moreover, reduced 516 consumption of chemicals and reduced waste generation can be also considered among 517 the benefits of the technique since microextraction is used. As it can be seen, the 518 proposed CPME-GC-MS method shows a greener character compared to previously 519 520 reported protocols.



521

Figure 4. ComplexGAPI pictograms obtained for procedures based on DLLMEHPLC-UV (Zhou et al., 2008), MSPE-GC-MS (Xie et al., 2013), and CPME-GC-MS
(this study)

525

Considering other advantages, CPME offers the benefits of fast and easy 526 isolation of the sorptive phase, since the CPME device can be easily handled by using 527 tweezers resulting in ease in isolation from the sample solution. On the contrary, the 528 separation of the adsorbent in d-SPE (or MSPE) processes can be a time-consuming 529 530 and it may require additional instrumentation (e.g., centrifugation). step Additionally, in comparison with conventional SPE and LLE approaches, 531 CPME offers the ability to use reduced amount of organic solvents and to simplify the 532 overall procedure. When compared to a procedure based on HPLC-UV (Zhou et al., 533 2008), the same conclusion can be made, meaning, reduction of the solvent 534 535 consumption and production of waste. Considering MSPE-GC-MS method (Xie et al., 2013) in which also additional processes are required prior to analysis, it is visible at 536 first glance that the CPME-GC-MS method is greener, mainly in terms of the conditions 537 used for the synthesis of required elements (sorbents, devices). 538

All features considered, CPME is a powerful technique for the monitoring ofOPPs in environmental water samples.

542

- 543
- 544
- 545

546 **3.6. Analysis of real samples**

547 The CPME-GC-MS protocol was finally employed for the determination of
548 OPPs in real water samples. Chromatograms of a spiked and a blank water sample are
549 shown in Figure 5.

550



Figure 5. Chromatograms of (a) spiked river water sample (c=2.00 ng mL⁻¹) and (b)
blank river water.

554

551

For the assessment of the potential method applicability in different types of water samples, spiked sample solutions (c=5.00 and 20.0 ng mL⁻¹) were prepared and analysed. Table 3 presents the obtained results for the real samples.

		Lake	water	Pond	water	River	water	Тару	water
Analyte	Added (ng mL ⁻¹)	Found (ng mL ⁻¹)	Relative Recovery (%)	Found (ng mL ⁻¹)	Relative Recovery (%)	Found (ng mL ⁻¹)	Relative Recovery (%)	Found (ng mL ⁻¹)	Relative Recovery (%)
	0	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<>	-
Chlorpyrifos	5.00	5.58±0.49	111.6	5.73±0.40	114.6	5.18±0.39	103.6	4.77±0.20	95.4
	20.0	18.2±1.2	91.0	20.4±1.2	102.0	17.6±1.4	88.0	20.4±0.1	102.0
	0	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<>	-
Disulfoton	5.00	5.18±0.34	103.6	5.34±0.30	106.8	5.32±0.45	106.4	5.20±0.29	104.0
	20.0	20.4±0.9	102.0	19.0±0.1	95.0	19.0±0.8	95.0	18.0±1.6	90.0
	0	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<>	-
Ethoprophos	5.00	4.87±0.33	97.4	5.05±0.36	101.0	5.32±0.45	106.4	5.71±0.31	114.2
	20.0	20.5±1.5	102.5	19.3±0.2	96.5	18.9±0.4	94.5	18.5±1.3	92.5
	0	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<>	-
Fenchlorphos	5.00	4.54±0.19	90.8	5.02±0.18	100.4	5.71±0.21	114.2	4.32±0.15	86.4
	20.0	21.3±0.3	106.5	20.6±1.0	103.0	20.5±0.7	102.5	18.1 ± 0.2	90.5
Parathion-	0	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<>	-
methyl	5.00	4.27±0.15	85.4	4.49±0.34	89.8	5.11±0.08	102.2	4.08±0.09	81.6

Table 3. Determination of OPPs by CPME-GC-MS in real water samples (n=2)

		Lake	water	Pond	water	River	water	Тар	water
Analyte	Added (ng mL ⁻¹)	Found	Relative Recovery	Found	Relative Recovery	Found	Relative Recovery	Found	Relative Recovery
		(ing int)	(%)	(ing int)	(%)	(ing int)	(%)	(ing int)	(%)
	20.0	21.8±1.0	109.0	21.4±1.4	107.0	19.8±0.2	99.0	20.9±0.4	104.5
	0	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td><td><lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<></td></lod<>	-	<lod< td=""><td>-</td></lod<>	-
Prothiophos	5.00	5.27±0.51	105.4	4.69±0.37	93.8	4.75±0.41	95.0	4.82±0.25	96.4
	20.0	19.3±0.9	96.5	17.6±1.5	88.0	19.2±1.4	96.0	18.8±1.0	94.0

The OPPs were not detected in the real samples. Thus, either there were no residues of these compounds in the samples, or their concentrations were lower compared to their respective LOD values. The RR% values for all analytes were found to be 81.6-114.6%. The average value 99.0% demonstrates that no significant matrix effect exists between the examined matrices. Thus, the proposed analytical scheme can be used for the analysis of lake, river, pond and tap water samples with good accuracy. Finally, the absence of interferences in the real samples confirm method selectivity.

568

569 4. Conclusions

A simple and efficient CPME-GC-MS protocol was developed for the monitoring of 570 OPPs in environmental water samples. Sol-gel C₁₈ encapsulated microextraction media 571 were proved to be the most efficient CPME device for extracting and preconcentrating 572 the target analytes. The analytical scheme exhibited good linearity, accuracy, 573 574 sensitivity, and precision. The sol-gel C_{18} coated CPME devices were able to extract the target analytes from water samples for at least 25 continuous adsorption/desorption 575 576 cycles. Moreover, the proposed method showed a greener character compared to previously reported protocols. A disadvantage of this methodology is that extraction 577 578 was not *in situ* performed. However, by utilizing CPME and portable magnetic stirring, 579 extraction can be carried out directly in the field aiming to reduce sample 580 transport/storage costs. All features considered, CPME is an efficient and simple novel sample preparation which can be utilized for monitoring pollutants in environmental 581 water. Future directions towards the utilization of CPME for OPPs extraction include 582 its application for the sample preparation of other complex samples (e.g., food samples) 583 and the expansion of its application for the extraction of multi-class of pesticides. 584

585

588

586 Decla

Declaration of Competing Interest

587 The authors declare no conflict of interest

589 **References**

Ahmadi, F., Assadi, Y., Hosseini, S.M.R.M., Rezaee, M., 2006. Determination of
organophosphorus pesticides in water samples by single drop microextraction
and gas chromatography-flame photometric detector. J. Chromatogr. A 1101,
307–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2005.11.017

594 Alcântara, D.B., Fernandes, T.S.M., Nascimento, H.O., Lopes, A.F., Menezes,

595	M.G.G., Lima, A.C.A., Carvalho, T. V., Grinberg, P., Milhome, M.A.L.,
596	Oliveira, A.H.B., Becker, H., Zocolo, G.J., Nascimento, R.F., 2019. Diagnostic
597	detection systems and QuEChERS methods for multiclass pesticide analyses in
598	different types of fruits: An overview from the last decade. Food Chem. 298,
599	124958. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2019.124958
600	Amiri, A., Tayebee, R., Abdar, A., Narenji Sani, F., 2019. Synthesis of a zinc-based
601	metal-organic framework with histamine as an organic linker for the dispersive
602	solid-phase extraction of organophosphorus pesticides in water and fruit juice
603	samples. J. Chromatogr. A 1597, 39–45.
604	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2019.03.039
605	Anastas, P.T., 1999. Green Chemistry and the role of analytical methodology
606	development. Crit. Rev. Anal. Chem. 29, 167–175.
607	https://doi.org/10.1080/10408349891199356
608	Armenta, S., Garrigues, S., de la Guardia, M., 2015. The role of green extraction
609	techniques in Green Analytical Chemistry. TrAC - Trends Anal. Chem.
610	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2014.12.011
611	Ballesteros, E., Parrado, M.J., 2004. Continuous solid-phase extraction and gas
612	chromatographic determination of organophosphorus pesticides in natural and
613	drinking waters. J. Chromatogr. A 1029, 267–273.
614	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2003.12.009
615	Brito, N.M., Navickiene, S., Polese, L., Jardim, E.F.G., Abakerli, R.B., Ribeiro, M.L.,
616	2002. Determination of pesticide residues in coconut water by liquid - Liquid
617	extraction and gas chromatography with electron-capture plus thermionic
618	specific detection and solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid
619	chromatography with ultraviolet detec. J. Chromatogr. A 957, 201-209.
620	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(02)00351-5
621	Cacho, J.I., Campillo, N., Viñas, P., Hernández-Córdoba, M., 2018. In situ ionic
622	liquid dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction coupled to gas chromatography-
623	mass spectrometry for the determination of organophosphorus pesticides. J.
624	Chromatogr. A 1559, 95-101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2017.12.059
625	Čadež, T., Kolić, D., Šinko, G., Kovarik, Z., 2021. Assessment of four
626	organophosphorus pesticides as inhibitors of human acetylcholinesterase and
627	butyrylcholinesterase. Sci. Rep. 11, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-
628	00953-9

629	Carles, J., Borrull, F., Furton, K.G., Kabir, A., Fontanals, N., Maria, R., 2020.
630	Selective monitoring of acidic and basic compounds in environmental water by
631	capsule phase microextraction using sol-gel mixed-mode sorbents followed by
632	liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry in tandem. J. Chromatogr. A 1625,
633	461295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2020.461295
634	Delińska, K., Yavir, K., Kloskowski, A., 2022. Head-Space SPME for the Analysis of
635	Organophosphorus Insecticides by Novel Silica IL-Based Fibers in Real
636	Samples. Molecules 27, 4688. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules27154688
637	Einati, E., Mottel, A., Inberg, A., Shacham-Diamand, A., 2009. Electrochemical
638	studies of self-assembled monolayers using impedance spectroscopy.
639	Electrochim. Acta 54, 6063–6069.
640	Esrafili, A., Ghambarian, M., Tajik, M., Baharfar, M., Tabibpour, M., 2020.
641	Polydopamine-Functionalized Carbon Nanotubes for Pipette-Tip Micro-Solid
642	Phase Extraction of Malathion and Parathion from Environmental Samples.
643	ChemistrySelect 5, 2966–2971. https://doi.org/10.1002/slct.201904468
644	Gao, Y., Pan, Q., 2020. Analysis of Organophosphorus Pesticides by HPLC Using
645	Magnetic SPE with Nitrogen-Doped Reduced Graphene Oxide/Fe3O4
646	Nanocomposite as the Adsorbent. LCGC Eur. 33, 438–447.
647	Georgiadis, D.E., Tsalbouris, A., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., Samanidou, V., 2019.
648	Novel capsule phase microextraction in combination with high performance
649	liquid chromatography with diode array detection for rapid monitoring of
650	sulfonamide drugs in milk. J. Sep. Sci. 42, 1440–1450.
651	https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.201801283
652	Gillespie, A.M., Walters, S.M., 1991. Rapid clean-up of fat extracts for
653	organophosphorus pesticide residue determination using C18 solid-phase
654	extraction cartridges. Anal. Chim. Acta 245, 259–265.
655	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-2670(00)80230-5
656	Harshit, D., Charmy, K., Nrupesh, P., 2017. Organophosphorus pesticides
657	determination by novel HPLC and spectrophotometric method. Food Chem. 230,
658	448-453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.03.083
659	Hu, C., He, M., Chen, B., Hu, B., 2013. A sol-gel
660	polydimethylsiloxane/polythiophene coated stir bar sorptive extraction combined
661	with gas chromatography-flame photometric detection for the determination of
662	organophosphorus pesticides in environmental water samples. J. Chromatogr. A

1275, 25-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2012.12.036 663 Kabir, A., Samanidou, V., 2021. Fabric Phase Sorptive Extraction: A Paradigm Shift 664 Approach in Analytical and Bioanalytical Sample Preparation. Molecules 26, 665 865. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules26040865 666 Kalogiouri, N.P., Kabir, A., Olayanju, B., Furton, K.G., Samanidou, V.F., 2021. 667 668 Development of highly hydrophobic fabric phase sorptive extraction membranes and exploring their applications for the rapid determination of tocopherols in 669 670 edible oils analyzed by high pressure liquid chromatography-diode array 671 detection. J. Chromatogr. A 1664, 462785. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2021.462785 672 Kaur, R., Kaur, R., Rani, S., Malik, A.K., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., 2019. Application 673 of fabric phase sorptive extraction with gas chromatography and mass 674 spectrometry for the determination of organophosphorus pesticides in selected 675 676 vegetable samples. J. Sep. Sci. 42, 862-870. https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.201800854 677 678 Lambropoulou, D., Sakellarides, T., Albanis, T., 2000. Determination of organophosphorus insecticides in natural waters using SPE-disks and SPME 679 680 followed by GC/FTD and GC/MS. Fresenius. J. Anal. Chem. 368, 616-623. https://doi.org/10.1007/s002160000542 681 Lazaridou, E., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., Anthemidis, A., 2020. A Novel Glass Fiber 682 Coated with Sol-Gel Poly-Diphenylsiloxane Sorbent for the On-Line 683 Determination of Toxic Metals Using Flow Injection Column Preconcentration 684 Platform Coupled with Flame Atomic Absorption Spectrometry. Molecules 26, 685 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules26010009 686 Li, J., Wang, Zhuo, Wang, Q., Guo, L., Wang, C., Wang, Zhi, Zhang, S., Wu, Q., 687 2021. Construction of hypercrosslinked polymers for high-performance solid 688 689 phase microextraction of phthalate esters from water samples. J. Chromatogr. A 1641, 461972. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2021.461972 690 Li, L., Zhou, S., Jin, L., Zhang, C., Liu, W., 2010. Enantiomeric separation of 691 692 organophosphorus pesticides by high-performance liquid chromatography, gas chromatography and capillary electrophoresis and their applications to 693 environmental fate and toxicity assays. J. Chromatogr. B Anal. Technol. Biomed. 694 Life Sci. 878, 1264–1276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchromb.2009.10.031 695 Liu, L., Yang, M., He, M., Liu, T., Chen, F., Li, Y., Feng, X., Zhang, Y., Zhang, F., 696

697	2020. Magnetic solid phase extraction sorbents using methyl-parathion and
698	quinalphos dual-template imprinted polymers coupled with GC-MS for class-
699	selective extraction of twelve organophosphorus pesticides. Microchim. Acta
700	187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00604-020-04465-7
701	Liu, S., Rao, J., Sui, X., Cool, P., Vansant, E.F., Tendeloo, G. Van, Cheng, X., 2008.
702	Preparation of hollow silica spheres with different mesostructures. J. Non. Cryst.
703	Solids 354, 826-830. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnoncrysol.2007.08.026
704	Mangas, I., Estevez, J., Vilanova, E., França, T.C.C., 2017. New insights on
705	molecular interactions of organophosphorus pesticides with esterases.
706	Toxicology 376, 30-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2016.06.006
707	Manousi, N., Alampanos, V., Priovolos, I., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., Rosenberg, E.,
708	Zachariadis, G.A., Samanidou, V.F., 2021a. Designing a moderately
709	hydrophobic sol-gel monolithic Carbowax 20 M sorbent for the capsule phase
710	microextraction of triazine herbicides from water samples prior to HPLC
711	analysis. Talanta 234, 122710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2021.122710
712	Manousi, N., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., Rosenberg, E., Zachariadis, G.A., 2021b.
713	Capsule phase microextraction of selected polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
714	from water samples prior to their determination by gas chromatography-mass
715	spectrometry. Microchem. J. 106210.
716	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2021.106210
717	Manousi, N., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., Samanidou, V.F., Zacharis, C.K., 2022.
718	Exploiting the capsule phase microextraction features in bioanalysis: Extraction
719	of ibuprofen from urine samples. Microchem. J. 172, 106934.
720	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2021.106934
721	Oliva, J., Barba, A., Vela, N., Melendreras, F., Navarro, S., 2000. Multiresidue
722	method for the rapid determination of organophosphorus insecticides in grapes,
723	must and wine. J. Chromatogr. A 882, 213-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-
724	9673(00)00216-8
725	Pinheiro, A. de S., da Rocha, G.O., De Andrade, J.B., 2011. A SDME/GC-MS
726	methodology for determination of organophosphate and pyrethroid pesticides in
727	water. Microchem. J. 99, 303-308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2011.05.019
728	Płotka-Wasylka, J., Wojnowski, W., 2021. Complementary green analytical procedure
729	index (ComplexGAPI) and software. Green Chem. 23, 8657-8665.
730	https://doi.org/10.1039/d1gc02318g

731	Rigkos, G., Alampanos, V., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., Roje, Ž., Vrček, I.V., Panderi, I.,
732	Samanidou, V., 2020. An improved fabric-phase sorptive extraction protocol for
733	the determination of seven parabens in human urine by HPLC–DAD. Biomed.
734	Chromatogr. 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1002/bmc.4974
735	Roldán-Pijuán, M., Lucena, R., Cárdenas, S., Valcárcel, M., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G.,
736	2015. Stir fabric phase sorptive extraction for the determination of triazine
737	herbicides in environmental waters by liquid chromatography. J. Chromatogr. A
738	1376, 35-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2014.12.027
739	Samanidou, V., Georgiadis, D.E., Kabir, A., Furton, K.G., 2018. Capsule Phase
740	Microextraction: The Total and Ultimate Sample Preparation Approach. J.
741	Chromatogr. Sep. Tech. 09. https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-7064.1000395
742	Singh, B.K., Walker, A., 2006. Microbial degradation of organophosphorus
743	compounds. FEMS Microbiol. Rev. 30, 428-471. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-
744	6976.2006.00018.x
745	Tanev, P.T., Pinnavaia, T.J., 1995. A Neutral Templating Route to Mesoporous
746	Molecular Sieves. Science (80). 267, 865–867.
747	Uhrovčík, J., 2014. Strategy for determination of LOD and LOQ values - Some basic
748	aspects. Talanta 119, 178–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2013.10.061
749	Ulusoy, H.İ., Köseoğlu, K., Kabir, A., Ulusoy, S., Locatelli, M., 2020. Fabric phase
750	sorptive extraction followed by HPLC-PDA detection for the monitoring of
751	pirimicarb and fenitrothion pesticide residues. Microchim. Acta 187, 337.
752	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00604-020-04306-7
753	Xie, J., Liu, T., Song, G., Hu, Y., Deng, C., 2013. Simultaneous analysis of
754	organophosphorus pesticides in water by magnetic solid-phase extraction
755	coupled with GC-MS. Chromatographia 76, 535–540.
756	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10337-013-2408-8
757	Xu, M., Wang, J., Zhang, L., Wang, Q., Liu, W., An, Y., Hao, L., Wang, C., Wang,
758	Z., Wu, Q., 2022. Construction of hydrophilic hypercrosslinked polymer based
759	on natural kaempferol for highly effective extraction of 5-nitroimidazoles in
760	environmental water, honey and fish samples. J. Hazard. Mater. 429, 128288.
761	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2022.128288
762	Zhou, Q., Bai, H., Xie, G., Xiao, J., 2008. Trace determination of organophosphorus
763	pesticides in environmental samples by temperature-controlled ionic liquid
764	dispersive liquid-phase microextraction. J. Chromatogr. A 1188, 148-153.

- 765 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2008.02.094
- 766 Zohrabi, P., Shamsipur, M., Hashemi, M., Hashemi, B., 2016. Liquid-phase
- 767 microextraction of organophosphorus pesticides using supramolecular solvent as
- a carrier for ferrofluid. Talanta 160, 340–346.
- 769 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2016.07.036
- 770