Postprint of: Elik A., Haq H., Boczkaj G., Fesliyan S., Ablak Ö., Altunay N., Magnetic hydrophobic deep eutectic solvents for orbital shaker-assisted dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (MAGDES-OS-DLLME) - determination of nickel and copper in food and water samples by FAAS, JOURNAL OF FOOD COMPOSITION AND ANALYSIS, Vol. 125 (2024), 105843, DOI: 10.1016/j.jfca.2023.105843

© 2023. 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	Magnetic hydrophobic deep eutectic solvents for orbital shaker-assisted dispersive
2	liquid-liquid microextraction (MAGDES-OS-DLLME) - determination of nickel and
3	copper in food and water samples by FAAS
4	
5	Adil Elik ¹ , Hameed Ul Haq ² , Grzegorz Boczkaj ² , Seçkin Fesliyan ¹ , Özlem Ablak ¹ , and Nail
6	Altunay ^{1,*}
7	¹ Faculty of Science, Department of Chemistry, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, Türkiye
8	² Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Department of
9	Sanitary Engineering, 80 – 233 Gdansk, G. Narutowicza St. 11/12, Poland.
10	*Corresponding author: <u>naltunay@cumhuriyet.edu.tr</u>
11	

12 Abstract

In this work, a cheap and widely applicable dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (DLLME) 13 method was developed for the extraction of Ni(II) and Cu(II) from water and food samples and 14 analysis using flame atomic absorption spectrometry. DLLME was assisted by orbital shaker, 15 while ferrofluid as an extractant was based on deep eutectic solvent (DES). This ferrofluid was 16 made of hydrophobic DES (hDES), composed of lauric acid and menthol (molar ratio 1:2), and 17 toner powder@aliquat 336 magnetic particles. The extraction procedure does not require any 18 heating or centrifugation. The method limits of detection value were 0.15 μ g L⁻¹ and 0.03 μ g 19 L^{-1} for Ni(II) and Cu(II) respectively along with wide linearity range (0.4-250 µg L^{-1}). The 20 validation of the method was performed using certified reference materials (CRMs). The studies 21 revealed excellent accuracy between results obtained by the developed method and expected 22 values for all CRMs. The relative recoveries of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions ranged from 92.8% to 23 98.6%. The developed method was further used for the determination of Ni(II) and Cu(II) in 24 real water and food samples and provided quantitative recoveries. 25

Keywords: Sample preparation; microextraction; food analysis; water and wastewater analysis;
environmental analysis; miniaturization in analytical chemistry

29 <u>Highlights</u>

- 30 ✓ Magnetic DES: Toner powder@aliquat 336 / lauric acid:menthol as extractant
- **31 • • • • Robust and time saving miniaturized sample preparation method**
- **32** ✓ Validated method reliable for routine analysis of Ni and Cu in water and food
- 33 Short extraction time (8 min) and high preconcentration factor (125) were obtained
- 34 ✓ Sensitive (ppb level), selective and stable method towards complex sample matrix
- 35

36 **1. Introduction**

Copper is one of the heavy metals that has a red color and has been found in certain 37 amounts in soil, water and air. As a result, its presence was confirmed also in plants and animal's 38 bodies. Emission of this element from different industrial processes such as dyeing, oil, paper, 39 plating, copper is released in amounts that can be dangerous for aquatic and terrestrial 40 ecosystems (Seidi, & Alavi, 2019). Although copper is one of the essential elements for humans 41 in terms of providing enzymatic activity and taking part in red blood cell formation, excessive 42 copper levels can lead to diseases e.g epilepsy, dementia, depression and autistic disorder, 43 (Shrivas, & Jaiswal, 2013). For this reason, there are some restrictions on copper intake and the 44 recommended intake of copper by the World Health Organization is 0.5 mg Kg⁻¹ per day body 45 46 weight(Council, 2000, Olivares et al., 1998, Cross et al., 2005).

Nickel (Ni) is a metal used in various materials such as dental prosthesis, coatings, 47 computer components, pigments, and ceramics. Release of nickel into water occurs as a result 48 of the dissolution of soil and rocks, the biological functions of some living things and industrial 49 activities (Kravkaz Kuşçu, Bayraktar, & Tunçer, 2022). Excessive nickel levels in the living 50 system causes skin and respiratory system diseases (Elahi et al., 2022). Based on surveys 51 performed on animals, it has been suggested that the daily intake of nickel for humans should 52 be <100 µg/day (Nielsen, 2021). Considering the harmful effects of Ni and Cu and the related 53 restrictions, the necessity of determining trace amounts of these metals from foodstuffs comes 54 to the fore. 55

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

Different analytical methods are available for Cu(II) and Ni (II) determination including
flame atomic absorption spectrometry (Jalbani, & Soylak, 2015), inductively coupled plasmamass spectrometry (Wang et al., 2015), voltammetry (Primo, Buffon, & Stradiotto, 2021), UVVIS spectrophotometry (Eshaghi, Vafaeinezhad, & Hooshmand, 2016), and liquid
chromatography (De Oliveira Trinta et al., 2020) in different food and water samples. Flame

atomic absorption spectrometry is very useful for the detection and quantification of heavy 61 62 metals from various matrices such as environmental, food, and water samples because of its high sensitivity, low cost, and relative convenience compared to other methods (Tuzen et al., 63 2020). Despite of the above mentioned advantages, direct analysis of heavy metals from various 64 samples is challenging with flame atomic absorption spectrometry due to possible interference 65 of matrix, structure of the samples concerned and presence of interfering species. To overcome 66 this problem, a reliable and highly selective separation and enrichment method should be used 67 before the determination phase. Although traditional extraction techniques have an important 68 place among the sample preparation methods, the interest of researchers has recently shifted to 69 70 microextraction techniques as they offer various possibilities such as saving the time needed for effecitive extraction and minimization of organic solvents usage(Jayasinghe et al., 2022; 71 Faraz et al., 2021). 72

DLLME is important as it is a simple and cost-effective microextraction technique that 73 allows simultaneous analysis of multiple analytes (Elik et al., 2023b, Hag et al., 2022)). 74 75 Although deep eutectic solvents (DESs) have comparable properties with ionic liquids in terms of their stability, and tenability, they are superior to ionic liquids as they are cheaper, and easier 76 to synthesizes (Makoś et al., 2018; Mbous et al., 2017; Haq et al., 2023a). DESs provide unique 77 78 intermolecular interactions with specific analytes, thus "tuning" the selectivity of the designed separation system (Momotko et al., 2022, Momotko et al., 2021, Khajavian et al., 2022;Elik et 79 al., 2023a, Faraz et al., 2021, Haq et al., 2021). Their superior properties were proved in several 80 analytical procedures (Haq et al., 2023b, Ullah et al., 2022). Recently, researchers have 81 combined extraction solvents with magnetic materials to increase extraction efficiency 82 (Chisvert et al., 2017; An, Rahn, & Anderson, 2017). One of the important examples of 83 magnetic materials used in microextraction techniques are ferrofluids (Altunay et al., 2023). 84 85 Ferrofluids combined with the DLLME are rapidly injected into the sample, while dispersive

solvent is dissolved in the aqueous phase, resulting in the formation of small droplets of
extractant. It causes a large surface area for mass transfer between sample and extractant. In
this case, the extraction rate is accelerated and the extraction time is minimized. Another
advantage is that they are easily separated from the sample after extraction due to their magnetic
properties and there is no need to use complex devices and methods for their separation (Nayebi,
& Shemirani, 2021).

92 This study aimto prepare and test ferrofluid based on DESs for selective extraction and analysis of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions in different water and food samples. As a result of the ongoing 93 studies, a fast, simple and economical analytical method was developed. This method does not 94 95 include either a heating step or a centrifugation step. Effective separation of the extractant was achieved using a magnetic stir bar. Important microextraction parameters of the sample 96 preparation procedure were investigated and optimized in details. The method was validated by 97 using certified reference materials (CRMs) such as GBW10015 Spinach, GBW10016 Tea and 98 GBW10019 Apple. 99

100 **2. Experimental**

101 **2.1. Apparatus**

The pH of the extraction solution was measured using a Metrohm 691 pH meter (Herisau, 102 103 Switzerland). A magnetic heating plate was used for the preparation of ferrofluid based DESs. 104 An orbital shaker (Multi Bio RS-24, BioSan, Berlin, Germany) was used dispersion of the 105 ferrofluid-based DES in the sample solution. A neodymium magnet was used to accelerate the separation of magnetic DES from the aqueous solution. Ultrapure water was obtained using a 106 107 Milli-Q system (ICW-3000, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). The digestion step was carried out by microwave system (Milestone Ethos D model, Sorisole-Bg, Italy). The analysis step was 108 carried out with a flame atomic absorption spectrometry instrument (AAS-6300, Shimadzu, 109 Kyoto, Japan) with D₂ background correction. The measurements were performed at two 110

wavelengths (Ni-232nm and Cu-324.8nm). The lamp current used for these wavelengths was
10mA and 3.0mA, respectively. The spectral bandwidths for the two measurements were 0.2nm
and 0.5nm. The flow rates of acetylene and air during the experiment were set at 1.8 and 8.0
mL min⁻¹, respectively.

115 **2.1. Chemicals and reagents**

The chemicals utilized in the research were of analytical grade and were employed without any 116 additional purification procedures. Standard solutions of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions, each with a 117 concentration of 500 mg L⁻¹, were prepared by dissolving their nitrate salts in deionized water. 118 The experimental solutions and calibration standards were created by employing a sequential 119 dilution formula. Once prepared, these solutions were stored in a refrigerator at a temperature 120 of 4 °C. Acetone, tetrahydrofuran, acetonitrile, methanol, ethanol, and methyl violet were 121 obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (Barcelona, Spain). Borate, phthalate, citrate and TRIS buffer 122 solutions were used to fix the pH in the range from 3 to 9. Aliquat-336 (95.0 %, Merck, 123 Germany), butyric acid (99%, Merck), thymol, lactic acid (≥ 95.0 %, Sigma Aldrich), lauric 124 acid (\geq 98%, Sigma Aldrich), menthol (\geq 99%, Sigma Aldrich) and *o*-xylene (\geq 98, Merck) were 125 used in the preparation of ferrofluid based DESs. Toner powder was purchased from Thermo 126 Scientific (Norway). 127

128 **2.3.** Sampling

Bottled waters were bought from local markets in Sivas/Türkiye. Waste water samples were collected from the industrial zone in Sivas/Türkiye. Well water was collected from an agricultural region located in Sivas, Turkey. The river water was obtained from Kızılırmak passing through Sivas. The spring waters were collected from the hot spring area in in Sivas/Türkiye. The collected water samples were first filtered through a 0.45 µm pore size membrane filter (cellulose membrane filter, Whatman®, USA) and then stored in the refrigerator at 4 °C. All of the food samples including black tea, rice flour, wheat, green pepper, spinach, apple, eggplant, pomegranate, parsley, mint, tomato, mushroom and potato were purchased from local grocery stores and markets in Sivas/Türkiye. The collected food samples were first washed with distilled water, the edible parts were cut with the help of a knife, and then dried in the oven. The dried samples were homogenized with a laboratory blender. Then, microwave digestion method was applied to these powdered samples.

141 **2.4.** Microwave based sample digestion

Food samples were digested according to the recommended methods in the literature 142 (Abdulkhaliq et al., 2012, Elahi et al., 2022). The microwave digestion steps used for food 143 samples are summarized below. First 1 g of the food samples was transferred into Teflon tubes 144 containing concentrated HNO3 (20 mL) and concentrated H2O2 (5mL). Next, microwave 145 digestion was carried out with gradual change in temperature. For first 2 min the temperature 146 was 60 °C, with microwave power 250 W. In the second step temperature was 100 °C for 5 min 147 148 with microwave power 250 W. In third step 150 °C for 2 min with microwave power 500 W. In the fourthstep temperature was 200 °C for 3 min with microwave power 600 W. The residue 149 obtained after microwave digestion was diluted to 10 mL with the water. All samples were 150 151 prepared in triplicate with sample blanks. In case ofwater samples analysis, a 100 mL of the collected water samples were heated on heating plate. Volume of water sample was reduced to 152 a 10 mL. The remaining 10 mL sample was used for the recommended procedure. 153

154 2.5. Preparation of ferrofluid based DESs

In this study, the ferrofluid based DESs were prepared using the previously reported method in literature (Mohebbi et al., 2021; Zarei, Nedaei, & Ghorbanian, 2018). Four different types of DESs were prepared. Menthol was used as the hydrogen bond acceptor (HBA), while butyric acid, thymol, lactic acid, and lauric acid served as the hydrogen bond donors (HBD). These HBA and HBD compounds were added to beakers with their respective mixed molar ratios, as specified in Table 1. The beakers were then heated on a magnetic stirrer heating plate at 80°C

until a clear liquid was formed. This resulting liquid was employed as a supporting solvent for 161 162 the production of a ferrofluid. To accomplish this, 1 g of toner powder was mixed with a 10 mL of o-xylene in a tube, followed by sonication at room temperature for 10 min. The mixture was 163 subsequently heated to approximately 70°C for 2 h. Afterward, magnets were employed to 164 separate the magnetic particles from the aqueous solution, which were then properly washed 165 with ultrapure water and ethanol. The particles were subsequently dried in an oven and heated 166 up to 80°C. To prevent the agglomeration of the magnetic particles, 1.0 mL of aliquat-336 was 167 added. Then, a 150 mg of the obtained magnetic particles were introduced into a glass vial. A 168 1.0 mL portion of the prepared DES was added to the mixture, followed by stirring at 50°C for 169 170 3 h. Finally, the resulting ferrofluid was tested as the extracting solvent for the DLLME procedure. After the ferrofluid-based DES-4 was separated from the aqueous solution, different 171 solvents such as ethanol, methanol, tetrahydrofuran, acetonitrile and acetone were investigated 172 173 to both dilute the viscous liquid formed and to strip the analytes from the magnetic phase. All solvents were tested in equal volume. 174

175 **2.6. MAGDES-OS-DLLME method**

176 The magnetic deep eutectic solvent based orbital shaker-assisted dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction (MAGDES-OS-DLLME) method was applied to the digested samples by 177 178 following the experimental steps belowInitially, a 10 mL of the digested samples were transferred to vial that already contained a solution of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions each with a 179 concentration of 25 µg L⁻¹. Secondly, a 0.1 M citrate buffer solution was added to adjust desired 180 pH (6.0). In third step, a methyl violet was added (final solution was 75 μ mol L⁻¹) to ensure the 181 complexation. Fourth, a 0.8 mL ferrofluid-based DES-4 was added to the sample solution to 182 183 separate the metal-ligand complex. In fifth step, conical tubes were shaken at 1200 rpm for 8 min on orbital shaker and for dispersion of the ferrofluid-based DES-4 in the sample solution. 184 Six, a magnetic stir bar was dipped into the tube and the ferrofluid containing the analytes was 185

transferred along with the magnetic stir bar to other tubes. Seven, tetrahydrofuran (300 µL) was
added followed by vortexing for 30 seconds. Finally, the resulting solution (approximately 1.0
mL) was analyzed by flame atomic absorption spectrometry. The experimental steps of
MAGDES-OS-DLLME are presented in Figure 1.

190 2.7. Method optimization and calculation of validation parameters

The method was optimized to obtain the highest recovery of the Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions. The main extraction factors including pH, concentration of complexing agent, ferrofluid-based DESs type and volume, mixing type, shaking time, type and volume of desorption solvent, KCl amount and volume of sample were investigated in details. The extraction recovery % of the DLLME was calculated by the following Equation.

196 Extraction recovery (%)=
$$[C_{final} V_{final} / C_o V_o] \times 100$$

197 Where C_{final} - concentration of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions determined by the developed method, C_o-198 concentration in the sample before applying the method, V_{final} - the final volume and V_o - the 199 initial volume.

Detection limit (LOD) and quantification limit (LOQ) for the method were calculated by using the formulas $[3S_{blank}/m]$ and $[10S_{blank}/m]$ respectively. Where S_{blank} is the standard deviation for the blank solution and m is the slope of the standard curve.

The precision of the method was calculated as relative standard deviation (RSD%) and calculated as [RSD%= $\frac{SD}{Mean value} \times 100$]. Where SD is the standard deviation based on three replicate determinations.

Enrichment factor (EF) was calculated as $[EF=\frac{m_f}{m_i}]$, where m_i is the slope of the calibration graph obtained before the MAGDES-OS-DLLME and m_f is the slope of the calibration graph obtained after the MAGDES-OS-DLLME. The pre-concentration factor (PF) was evaluated by using the equation $[PF=\frac{V_f}{V_i}]$, where V_f is the final volume of sample and V_i is the initial volume of the sample.

The tolerance limit for the interfering species on the extraction and determination was calculated using the formula [Matrix species amount, $\mu g L^{-1}$] / [Analyte amount, $\mu g L^{-1}$] for highest concentration of matrix species that didn't cause error at determination step.

In CRM the t_{exp} was calculated using the following formula $[t_{exp} = \frac{\mu - \bar{x}I\sqrt{N}}{s}]$. Where t_{exp}, s, N, \bar{x} and μ were statistical values, the standard deviation, the number of independent determinations, the experimental mean value, and the certified value, respectively.

217

218 **3. Results and discussion**

219 **3.1. Optimization of parameters**

A selective and sensitive microextraction step should be applied in order to quantify Ni(II) and Cu(II) in food and water samples. To increase the extraction efficiency of the MAGDES-DLLME procedure, a univariate optimization strategy was optimized. All runs were performed in triplicate and the percent relative standard deviation was calculated for each experiment run.

224 **3.1.1. Effect of pH**

In case of extraction process from aqueous solutions, it is desirable to provide selective 225 interaction of the target analytes with the extractant added to the sample. In this context, a one 226 227 of the most significant factor affecting selective interaction is the pH of the aqueous solution (Haq et al., 2021). Chemical species in aqueous solution may exist in different forms such as 228 229 neutral form or anions, cations, hydroxides, depends on the pH of sample medium. As a result, the interaction between extractant and target analytes will be strongly varied depending on pH. 230 Taking these factors into consideration, the potential impact of the pH of the aqueous medium 231 232 on the recovery percentage of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions was examined within the pH range of 210. Figure S1 illustrates that the highest extraction recovery was achieved at pH 6. The decrease
in extraction recovery, especially in the basic region, is attributed to the increased hydroxide
formation of these metals. Due to the increase in the hydroxide concentration, the complexation
of the analyte ions cannot be completed due to the attack of hydroxide ions on the cationic
region of the chelating agent (methyl violet). As a result, for subsequent microextraction
studies, the pH of the medium was adjusted to 6.0 using a 0.1 M citrate buffer solution.

239 **3.1.2.** Effect of concentration of complexing agent

The extraction process was facilitated when the metal ions could be complexed with a suitable 240 chelating agent. In light of these facts, methyl violet was tested for complexation of Ni(II) and 241 Cu(II) ions. Another factor affectingeffective complexation is the concentration of the 242 complexing agent. Methyl violet should be added to the aqueous solution in sufficient quantity 243 244 to quantitatively complex the metal ions in the medium. Therefore, the effect of concentration of methyl violet on the recovery of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions was investigated by changing the 245 concentration of methyl violet from 10 μ mol L⁻¹ to 150 μ mol L⁻¹. The results in Figure S2 reveal 246 that 75 µmol L⁻¹ of methyl violet was sufficient to achieve quantitative recoveries of both 247 248 analytes. It is worth to mention, that, the extraction recovery of the analytes was almost stable at higher methyl violet concentration values. Based on these considerations, a concentration of 249 250 75 μ mol L⁻¹ of methyl violet was selected as the optimal concentration for the DLLME procedure 251

252 **3.1.3. Effect of ferrofluid-based DES type and volume**

The most important parameter to achieve the desired goal in microextraction studies was the type of extraction solvent. The extraction solvent should be specific (selective) and have high extraction efficiency. Furthermore, the extraction solvent should not be miscible with the sample solution. Based on these expectations, four ferrofluid-based DESs were prepared and tested for the extraction of Ni(II) and Cu(II). The results of this part of the study were presented in Figure S3a. The maximum extraction recovery for both analytes was obtained using the ferrofluid-based DES-4 (toner powder@aliquat 336@lauric acid:menthol). Therefore, the ferrofluid-based DES-4 was selected as extraction solvent DLLME studies.

Next, the volume of ferrofluid-based DES-4 extractant was optimised.. The addition of 261 excessive extraction solvent causes an increase in the magnetic phase in the final volume and 262 263 thus decrease the concentration of the analytes. The increase in the magnetic phase volume causes excessive use of dispersive solvents. In this section, the effect of the volume of 264 ferrofluid-based DES-4 on the extraction recovery of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions was investigated in 265 266 the volume range of 0.2-1.5 mL. Analysis of the results presented on Figure S3b reveals that 267 the best extraction recovery for both analytes was obtained when 0.8 mL of ferrofluid-based DES-4 was used. Thus, this optimized value was used in the further studies.. 268

269 **3.1.4. Effect of mixing type and time**

In order to to obtain effective extraction, i.e. effectively complex the Ni(II) and Cu(II) from the 270 271 sample, the ferrofluid-based DES-4 must be completely dispersed in the medium. Therefore, after adding ferrofluid-based DES-4 to the aqueous solution, mixing steps including oribtal 272 shaking, vortexing, hand mixing and sonication were compared. According to the results in 273 Figure S4a, the maximum recovery for both analytes was achieved when orbital shaking was 274 applied. Another parameter that affects the effective distribution of the ferrofluid-based DES-4 275 276 in the aqueous solution is the shaking time. The effect of orbital shaking time on the extraction recovery of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions was studied from 1 min to 15 min. Figure S4b shows that the 277 8 min shaking time was enough for quantitative recovery of analytes. Therefore, 8 min of orbital 278 279 shaking was used in the further studies..

280 **3.1.5. Effect of desorption solvent type and volume**

After the ferrofluid-based DES-4 was separated from the aqueous solution, different solvents 281 282 such as ethanol (EtOH), methanol (MeOH), tetrahydrofuran (THF), acetonitrile (ACN) and acetone were investigated to both dilute the viscous liquid formed and to strip the analytes from 283 the magnetic phase. All solvents were tested in equal volume. Based on the results presented in 284 Figure S5a, THF was chosen as the suitable desorption solvent. Next, the THF volume was 285 optimized. While increasing the volume of solvent, firstly the desorbed amount of analyte 286 increases up to full recovery, but further excess volume of the solvent causes decrease of analyte 287 concentration. On the other side, too low volume of desorption solvent makes the analytes 288 recovery difficult. The impact of varying THF volume between 0 and 750 µL was investigated. 289 Figure S5b reveals that 300 µL of THF was sufficient to achieve maximum recoveries. Thus, 290 300 µL of THF was used in the further studies.. 291

292 **3.1.6. Effect of KCl amount**

In DES-based microextraction studies, the ionic strength of the aqueous solution can have 293 294 different effect on the recovery of analyte. The addition of salt increases the ionic strenght of 295 the aqueous phase and causes the salting effect of the extraction solvents to shift the dispersion 296 balance towards the anhydrous phases, thus maximizing the extraction recovery and phase separation. Consequently, the influence of different concentrations of KCl ranging from 0 to 15 297 298 (w/v%) on the retrieval of analytes was examined (see Figure S6). The samples spiked with KCl don't have any significant effect on the extraction efficiency of analytes. Thus, KCl 299 solution was not used in the further studies.. 300

301 3.1.7. Effect of sample volume

To maximize the PF of the method, it was necessary to optimize the volume of sample used in microextration stage. The PF was determined by comparing the initial volume of the sample with the final volume after extraction. The extraction recoveries (approximately 95%) for both analytes were stable from 25 mL to 125 mL (see Figure S7). Furthermore, it was observed that
at higher sample volumes, there was a significant decrease in the extraction recoveries for both
analytes. For 125 mL sample volume, 95% recovery was achieved so this value was used in
further studies..

309 **3.2. Validation studies**

For routine application of DLLME method for real samples, validation parameters such as
linearity range, LOD, LOQ, EF, PF, matrix effect, precision, accuracy and sensitivity of the
MAGDES-OS-DLLME method must be evaluated under optimized conditions.

313 **3.2.1.** Aspects of quantitative analysis

Different concentrations of Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions standard were added to the sample solutions and linearity studies were performed for each analyte. As a result of the study, linearity for Ni(II) and Cu(II) ions were 0.1-330 μ g L⁻¹ and 0.5-250 μ g L⁻¹, respectively. LOD and LOQ calculated were 0.03 μ g L⁻¹ and 0.10 μ g L⁻¹ for Ni(II) ions and 0.15 μ g L⁻¹ and 0.46 μ g L⁻¹ for Cu(II) ions.. In this context, the PF of the method was 125. Moreover, the EF for Ni(II) and Cu(II) were 108 and 97, respectively. Detailed information and comprehensive data can be found in Table12.

The method was validated using CRM. GBW10015-Spinach, GBW10016-Tea, and 321 GBW10019-Apple were analyzed for Ni (II) and Cu (II). In GBW10015 Spinach (Ni), the 322 calculated Ni concentration in Spinach was 0.86 mg kg⁻¹, and the reference value was 0.92 mg 323 kg⁻¹. The calculated percent recovery was 93.4%, indicating that the method was quite accurate 324 for this element in this reference material. The t-exp value was 0.84, which suggests a good 325 agreement between the experimental mean and the certified value. In GBW10015 Spinach (Cu), 326 for Cu in Spinach, the calculated value was 8.5 mg kg⁻¹, while the reference value was 8.9 mg 327 kg⁻¹. Thus, the percent recovery was 95.0%, indicating a high level of accuracy. The t-exp value 328

was 1.12, which confirms good agreement. The results of GBW10016 Tea and GBW10019
Apple for both Ni and Cu gave high percent recovery% and t-exp values close to 1 indicate that
the method was providing accurate results, confirming high applicability of the method in
routine analysis of real samples..

333 **3.2.2. Precision**

The MAGDES-OS-DLLME method was examined for both intraday and inter-day variations 334 335 at different concentrations of analytes within the specified working range. The concentrations tested included low (5 μ g L⁻¹), medium (100 μ g L⁻¹), and high (200 μ g L⁻¹) levels. In the 336 intraday study, the added concentrations of analyte ions were investigated with five repetitive 337 extractions on the single day. In the interday study, the same concentrations were studied with 338 five repetitive extractions on three consecutive days. In addition, the accuracy of the MAGDES-339 340 OS-DLLME method was tested by performing a recovery study for the concentrations added in these studies. The RSD% for Ni (II) ion in the intraday and interday study were in the range 341 of 2.8-3.3% and 3.1-3.6%, respectively. In addition, the RSD for Cu (II) ion in the intraday and 342 343 interday study were in the range of 2.4-3.5% and 2.9-3.9%, respectively. Furthermore, it provided quantitative recoveries (see Table 1) for both analytes. 344

345 **3.2.3.** Accuracy

Some certified reference materials (GBW10015 spinach, GBW10016 tea and GBW10019 apple) were analyzed in this study with the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method. Five replicates of each reference material were analyzed and the results averaged. Experimental results from analysis of GBW10015 spinach, GBW10016 tea and GBW10019 apple were 0.86 ± 0.16 mg Kg⁻¹ for Ni/8.9 ±0.4 mg Kg⁻¹ for Cu, 3.3 ± 0.18 mg Kg⁻¹ for Ni/18.6 ±0.7 mg Kg⁻¹ for Cu and 0.13 ± 0.04 mg Kg⁻¹ for Ni/2.5 ±0.2 mg Kg⁻¹ for Cu, respectively. At a 95% confidence level, the obtained results were in good agreement with the reference values. Also, the t-exp (0.56-1.24) of all studies was smaller than the t-tabulate (2.31). These findings suggest that the observed
results exhibit no statistically significant difference when compared to the expected values. In
this particular aspect of the research, the recovery rates for Ni (II) ranged from 92.9% to 97.1%,
while the recovery rates for Cu (II) ranged from 95.0% to 97.8%. Detailed results were given
in Table 2.

358

359 **3.2.4. Matrix effect**

The matrix effect on the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method under optimized conditions was 360 investigated in the following part of the study. This study was carried out on the food samples 361 because it can create stronger matrix effects comparing to relatively simple water samples. On 362 the other hand, the mineralization step of the procedure, significantly simplifies the matrix 363 proceeded to extraction. First, the anions and cations listed in Table S2 were added to the food 364 sample in different proportions. Then, the recovery, RSD% and tolerance limit of the related 365 species were estimated for the target analytes. According to Table S2, the RSD% for both 366 367 analytes was lower than 2.6%. Quantitative recoveries (92-99%) were also obtained for both analytes. High tolerable limits (up to 10000) were obtained in the presence of studied anions 368 and cations. Results shows that the MAGDES-OS-DLLME is highly selective and stable for 369 matrix interferences for both analytes. 370

371 3.3. Application of method- real samples analysis

The MAGDES-OS-DLLME method was employed to determine the targeted analytes in water and food samples. To assess the method's accuracy in analyzing water samples, a two-level standard addition approach was employed, involving additions of 10 and 100 μ g L⁻¹ concentrations. Both Ni and Cu were not detected in bottled water, spring water-1 and mineral water. The highest Ni (14.2±1.6 μ g L⁻¹) and Cu (9.2±0.2 μ g L⁻¹) contents were detected in spring water-2 and well-water, respectively. Furthermore, recoveries for both analytes were in the range of 92.5-98.3% and 93.0-98.6%, respectively (Table 5a). Using the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method, the Ni could not be detected in food samples including rice flour, wheat and, and pomegranate. In addition, the highest Ni content $(5.12 \pm 0.09 \ \mu g \ g^{-1})$ was detected in spinach. The Cu was detected in all food samples. In addition, the highest Cu content (44.2 ± $0.8 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$) was detected in green pepper. Finally, all results were within WHO's acceptable limits.

384 **3.4.** Comparative study

The important analytical parameters of the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method were compared 385 with different micro-extraction studies using a similar technique for quantitative analysis. In 386 terms of linearity, LOD, RSD%, EF/PF, and estimated extraction procedure time, the developed 387 388 method underwent assessment and was compared to other reported methods. A detailed comparison of the data can be found in Table S3. The extraction time of the developed method 389 390 (only 8 mins) was lower than all the compared methods. Also, the linearity of the method was 391 comparable to other methods. In addition, the LOD of the method was lower than other procedures. The PF obtained for both analytes was higher in most microextraction methods. 392

393 4. Conclusions.

The MAGDES-OS-DLLME method was employed for extraction of Ni(II) and Cu(II) from water and food samples. Among the studied ferrofluid-based DESs, the one made of toner powder@aliquat 336 andlauric acid:menthol (molar ratio 1:2) was selected as extraction solvent. The obtained magnetic DES extract is collected by magnetic stir bar, followed by analytes desorption by 300µL of THF. Final determination step is performed by means of FAAS. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first ferrofluid DES-based analytical method reported so far for the simultaneous determination of Ni(II) and Cu(II). In addition, 401 negligible matrix effect and short extraction time were obtained with the developed method.

402 Extensive validation studies, proved the usefulness of the MAGDES-DLLME-FAAS method

403 in routine analysis of water and food samples.. Based on the obtained results, it has been shown

404 that the MAGDES-DLLME-FAAS provide high reproducibility, low LODs, high PF and low

405 matrix effect. Analysis of real samples revealed presence of controlled metals, but in all cases

406 reported values were below WHO limits.

407 Acknowledgements

408 Grzegorz Boczkaj and Hameed Haq acknowledge the financial support from National Science

409 Centre, Warsaw, Poland; grant number UMO-2018/30/E/ST8/00642.

410 **References**

Abdulkhaliq, A., Swaileh, K., Hussein, R. M. Matani, M. 2012. Levels of metals (Cd,
Pb, Cu and Fe) in cow's milk, dairy products and hen's eggs from the West Bank, Palestine.
International Food Research Journal 19 (3), 1089-1094.

Altunay, N., Elik, A., Gürkan, R. 2019. Vortex assisted-ionic liquid based dispersive
liquid liquid microextraction of low levels of nickel and cobalt in chocolate-based samples and
their determination by FAAS. *Microchemical Journal*, *147*, 277-285.

Altunay, N., Haq, H. U., Castro-muñoz, R. 2023. Optimization of vortex-assisted
hydrophobic magnetic deep eutectic solvent-based dispersive liquid phase microextraction for
quantification of niclosamide in real samples. *Food Chemistry*, 136646.

Altunay, N., Tuzen, M., Hazer, B., Elik, A. 2022. Synthesized of a novel xanthate
functionalized polypropylene as adsorbent for dispersive solid phase microextraction of
caffeine using orbital shaker in mixed beverage matrices. *Food Chemistry*, 393, 133464.

An, J., Rahn, K. L., Anderson, J. L. 2017. Headspace single drop microextraction versus
dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction using magnetic ionic liquid extraction
solvents. *Talanta*, *167*, 268-278.

Arain, M. B., Yilmaz, E., Soylak, M. 2016. Deep eutectic solvent based ultrasonic
assisted liquid phase microextraction for the FAAS determination of cobalt. *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, 224, 538-543.

Arain, S. A., Kazi, T. G., Afridi, H. I., Arain, M. S., Panhwar, A. H., Khan, N., Shah, F.
2016. A new dispersive liquid–liquid microextraction using ionic liquid based microemulsion
coupled with cloud point extraction for determination of copper in serum and water
samples. *Ecotoxicology and environmental safety*, *126*, 186-192.

- Chisvert, A., Benedé, J. L., Anderson, J. L., Pierson, S. A., Salvador, A. 2017.
 Introducing a new and rapid microextraction approach based on magnetic ionic liquids: Stir bar
 dispersive liquid microextraction. *Analytica chimica acta*, 983, 130-140.
- 436 Council, N. R. 2000. Copper in drinking water. (Washington DC: National Academy437 Press).
- 438 Cross, H., Wheatley, A., Sadhra, S., Schoeters, I., Delbeke, K., Gaunt, R. 2005.
 439 Voluntary Risk Assessment of Copper, Copper II Sulpohate Pentahydrate, Copper (I) Oxide,
 440 Copper (II) Oxide, Dicopper Chloride Trihydroxide.
- De Oliveira Trinta, V., de Carvalho Padilha, P., Petronilho, S., Santelli, R. E., Braz, B.
 F., Freire, A. S., Fernández-Sánchez, M. L. 2020. Total metal content and chemical speciation
 analysis of iron, copper, zinc and iodine in human breast milk using high-performance liquid
 chromatography separation and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry detection. *Food chemistry*, *326*, 126978.
- 446 De Souza, R. M., Toloza, C. A., Aucélio, R. Q. 2022. Fast determination of trace metals
 447 in edible oils and fats by inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry and ultrasonic acidic
 448 extraction. *Journal of Trace Elements and Minerals*, *1*, 100003.
- Elahi, F., Arain, M. B., Khan, W. A., Haq, H. U., Khan, A., Jan, F., Boczkaj, G. 2022.
 Ultrasound-assisted deep eutectic solvent-based liquid–liquid microextraction for simultaneous
 determination of Ni (II) and Zn (II) in food samples. *Food Chemistry*, *393*, 133384.
- Elik, A., Ablak, Ö., Haq, H. U., Boczkaj, G., Altunay, N. 2023a. Combination of homogeneous liquid–liquid extraction and vortex assisted dispersive liquid–liquid microextraction for the extraction and analysis of ochratoxin A in dried fruit samples: Central composite design optimization. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, 124, 105656.
- Elik, A., Fesliyan, S., Gürsoy, N., Haq, H. U., Castro-muñoz, R., Altunay, N. 2023b. An
 air-assisted dispersive liquid phase microextraction method based on a hydrophobic magnetic
 deep eutectic solvent for the extraction and preconcentration of melamine from milk and milkbased products. *Food Chemistry*, 136573.
- Es'haghi, Z., Vafaeinezhad, F., Hooshmand, S. 2016. Green synthesis of magnetic iron
 nanoparticles coated by olive oil and verifying its efficiency in extraction of nickel from
 environmental samples via UV-vis spectrophotometry. *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, 102, 403-409.
- Faraz, N., Haq, H. U., Arain, M. B., Castro-muñoz, R., Boczkaj, G., Khan, A. 2021.
 Deep eutectic solvent based method for analysis of Niclosamide in pharmaceutical and
 wastewater samples–A green analytical chemistry approach. *Journal of Molecular Liquids*,
 335, 116142.
- Haq, H. U., Balal, M., Castro-muñoz, R., Hussain, Z., Safi, F., Ullah, S., Boczkaj, G.
 2021. Deep eutectic solvents based assay for extraction and determination of zinc in fish and
 eel samples using FAAS. *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, 333, 115930.
 - Haq, H. U., Bibi, R., Arain, M. B., Safi, F., Ullah, S., Castro-muñoz, R., Boczkaj, G. 2022. Deep eutectic solvent (DES) with silver nanoparticles (Ag-NPs) based assay for analysis of lead (II) in edible oils. *Food Chemistry*, 379, 132085.

471

Haq, H. U., Elik, A., Durukan, H., Sarac, H., Demirbas, A., Boczkaj, G., Gürsoy, N., 474 Altunay, N. 2023a. Application of chemometric modeling for ionic liquid-based ultrasonic-475 assisted dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction: Analysis of fosetyl-aluminum in fruit and 476 vegetable samples. Journal of Food Composition and Analysis, 105725. 477

Haq, H. U., Wali, A., Safi, F., Arain, M. B., Kong, L., Boczkaj, G. 2023b. Natural deep 478 eutectic solvent based ultrasound assisted liquid-liquid micro-extraction method for methyl 479 violet dye determination in contaminated river water. Water Resources and Industry, 29, 480 100210. 481

Heydari, F., Ramezani, M. 2019. Application of response surface methodology for 482 optimization of conditions for nickel determination in water and vegetables by switchable 483 solvent based liquid phase microextraction. Journal of Analytical Chemistry, 74, 1081-1088. 484

Jalbani, N., Soylak, M. 2015. Ligandless ultrasonic-assisted and ionic liquid-based 485 dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction of copper, nickel and lead in different food 486 samples. Food chemistry, 167, 433-437. 487

Jayasinghe, G. D. T. M., Jinadasa, B. K. K. K., Pohl, P., Abdelkarim, A. 2022. Critical 488 review on microextraction techniques used in determination of histamine in food 489 samples. Discover Food, 2(1), 8. 490

491 Kartoğlu, B., Tezgit, E., Yiğit, A., Zaman, B. T., Bakırdere, E. G., Bakırdere, S. 2022. 492 Determination of trace nickel after complexation with a schiff base by switchable solvent-liquid flame microextraction (SS-LPME) atomic absorption 493 phase and spectrometry (FAAS). Analytical Letters, 55(7), 1017-1026. 494

Khajavian, M., Vatanpour, V., Castro-Muñoz, R., Boczkaj, G. 2022. Chitin and 495 derivative chitosan-based structures-Preparation strategies aided by deep eutectic solvents: A 496 review. Carbohydrate Polymers, 275, 118702. 497

498 Kravkaz Kuşçu, İ. S., Kılıç Bayraktar, M., Tunçer, B. 2022. Determination of heavy 499 metal (Cr, Co, and Ni) accumulation in selected vegetables depending on traffic density. Water, Air, & Soil Pollution, 233(6), 224. 500

501 Makoś, P., Przyjazny, A., Boczkaj, G. 2018. Hydrophobic deep eutectic solvents as 502 "green" extraction media for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in aqueous samples. Journal of 503 *Chromatography A*, 1570, 28-37.

504 Maslov, M. M., Elik, A., Demirbas, A., Katin, K. P., Altunay, N. 2020. Theoretical and experimental studies aimed at the development of vortex-assisted supramolecular solvent microextraction for determination of nickel in plant samples by FAAS. Microchemical 506 Journal, 159, 105491. 507

Mbous, Y. P., Hayyan, M., Hayyan, A., Wong, W. F., Hashim, M. A., Looi, C. Y. 2017. Applications of deep eutectic solvents in biotechnology and bioengineering-Promises and challenges. Biotechnology advances, 35(2), 105-134.

Mohebbi, A., Farajzadeh, M. A., Nemati, M., Mogaddam, M. R. A. 2022. Development 512 of a stirring-assisted ferrofluid-based liquid phase microextraction method coupled with dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction for the extraction of some widely used pesticides from 513

505

508

509 510

herbal distillates. International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry, 102(19), 7419-514 515 7432.

Momotko, M., Łuczak, J., Przyjazny, A., Boczkaj, G. 2021. First deep eutectic solvent-516 based (DES) stationary phase for gas chromatography and future perspectives for DES 517 application in separation techniques. Journal of Chromatography A, 1635, 461701. 518

Momotko, M., Łuczak, J., Przyjazny, A., Boczkaj, G. 2022. A natural deep eutectic 519 solvent-protonated L-proline-xylitol-based stationary phase for gas chromatography. Journal 520 of Chromatography A, 1676, 463238. 521

522 Nayebi, R., Shemirani, F. 2021. Ferrofluids-based microextraction systems to process organic and inorganic targets: The state-of-the-art advances and applications. TrAC Trends in 523 Analytical Chemistry, 138, 116232. 524

525 Nielsen, F. 2021. Nickel. Advances in Nutrition, 12(1), 281.

Olivares, M., Pizarro, F., Speisky, H., Lönnerdal, B., Uauy, R. 1998. Copper in infant 526 527 nutrition: safety of World Health Organization provisional guideline value for copper content 528 of drinking water. Journal of pediatric gastroenterology and nutrition, 26, 251-257.

529 Primo, C. M., Buffon, E., Stradiotto, N. R. 2021. A carbon nanotubes-pectin composite for electrochemical determination of copper in aviation biokerosene by anodic stripping 530 531 voltammetry. Fuel, 302, 121180.

Seidi, S., Alavi, L. 2019. Novel and rapid deep eutectic solvent (DES) homogeneous 532 liquid-liquid microextraction (HLLME) with flame atomic absorption spectrometry (FAAS) 533 534 detection for the determination of copper in vegetables. Analytical Letters, 52(13), 2092-2106.

Shrivas, K., Jaiswal, N. K. 2013. Dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction for the 535 determination of copper in cereals and vegetable food samples using flame atomic absorption 536 spectrometry. Food chemistry, 141(3), 2263-2268. 537

Soylak, M., Koksal, M. 2019. Deep eutectic solvent microextraction of lead (II), cobalt 538 (II), nickel (II) and manganese (II) ions for the separation and preconcentration in some oil 539 samples from Turkey prior to their microsampling flame atomic absorption spectrometric 540 541 determination. Microchemical Journal, 147, 832-837.

Ullah, S., Haq, H. U., Salman, M., Jan, F., Safi, F., Arain, M. B., Khan, M. S., Castro-542 muñoz, R., Boczkaj, G. 2022. Ultrasound-Assisted Dispersive Liquid-Liquid Microextraction Using Deep Eutectic Solvents (DESs) for Neutral Red Dye Spectrophotometric Determination. 544 Molecules, 27, 6112. 545

Wang, H., Wu, Z., Chen, B., He, M., Hu, B. 2015. Chip-based array magnetic solid phase microextraction on-line coupled with inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry for the determination of trace heavy metals in cells. Analyst, 140, 5619-5626.

543

546

547

548



551 Figure 1. Schematic diagram for the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method

552

Table 1. Analytical characteristics of the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method.

Analyte	Linearit	LO	LO	EF	PF	^{a,b} Recovery (%)		^{a,b} RSD (%)			
S	У	D	Q			5 µg	100 µg	200	5 µg	100	200
	$(\mu g L^{-1})$	(µg	(µg			L^{-1}	L^{-1}	μg	L^{-1}	μg	μg
		L^{-1})	L^{-1})					L^{-1}		L^{-1}	L^{-1}
Ni(II)	0.1-330	0.03	0.1	135.	12	96.4ª	97.3(95.2	97.8	3.1ª	2.8	3.3
				9	5	(93.1))	(96.1	(3.4)	(3.1	(3.6
						b)	b))
Cu(II)	0.5-250	0.15	0.46	112.	12	94.1	95.4	97.2	2.4	2.8	3.5
				5	5	(94.8)	(95.5)	(96.7	(2.9)	(3.3	(3.9
)

555 a: intraday studies (N=5) b: interday studies (N=5x3)

556 LOD: limit of detection

557 LOQ: Limit of quantification

558 EF: Enrichment factor

559 PF: Preconcentration factor

560 RSD: Relative standard deviations

561

562 563

564

Table 2. Analysis of reference materials using the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method (N=5).

	Ni				Cu		
Referenc	Calculate	Recover	*t-	Referenc	Calculate	Recover	*t-
e value	d	У	exp	e value	d	У	exp
(mg kg ⁻¹)	(mg kg ⁻¹)	(%)		(mg kg ⁻¹)	(mg kg ⁻¹)	(%)	
0.92 ± 0.1	0.86±0.16	93.4	0.8	8.9±0.4	8.5±0.8	95.0	1.1
2			4				2
3.4 ± 0.30	3.3±0.18	97.1	1.2	18.6±0.7	18.2 ± 1.2	97.8	0.7
			4				4
0.14 ± 0.0	0.13 ± 0.04	92.9	0.5	2.5 ± 0.2	2.4 ± 0.2	96.2	1.1
5			6				5
	Referenc e value $(mg kg^{-1})$ 0.92 ± 0.1 2 3.4 ± 0.30 0.14 ± 0.0 5	$\begin{array}{c c} & Ni \\ \hline Referenc & Calculate \\ e value & d \\ (mg kg^{-1}) & (mg kg^{-1}) \\ \hline 0.92\pm0.1 & 0.86\pm0.16 \\ 2 \\ 3.4\pm0.30 & 3.3\pm0.18 \\ \hline 0.14\pm0.0 & 0.13\pm0.04 \\ 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Ni \\ \hline Referenc & Calculate & Recover \\ e value & d & y \\ (mg kg^{-1}) & (mg kg^{-1}) & (\%) \\ \hline 0.92\pm0.1 & 0.86\pm0.16 & 93.4 \\ 2 & & & \\ 3.4\pm0.30 & 3.3\pm0.18 & 97.1 \\ \hline 0.14\pm0.0 & 0.13\pm0.04 & 92.9 \\ 5 & & 5 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

565 $*t_{exp} = \frac{I\mu - \bar{x}I\sqrt{N}}{s}$, where t_{exp} , s, N, \bar{x} and μ were statistical value, the standard deviation, number of independent 566 determinations, the experimental mean value, and the certified value, respectively.

Water	Spiked,	Ni		С	u
samples	Spiked, Ni(II),	Calculated,	Recovery,	Calculated,	Recovery,
	Cu(II), µg L ⁻¹	μg L ⁻¹	%	μg L ⁻¹	%
Bottled water	-	≤LOD	-	≤LOD	-
	10	9.7±0.5*	97.0	9.5±0.5	95.0
	100	98.3±3.4	98.3	97.2±4.1	97.2
Wastewater	-	5.4±0.2	-	2.6 ± 0.2	-
	10	15.0±1.1	96.1	12.0±0.9	94.0
	100	102.9±4.8	97.6	99.3±4.4	96.7
River water	-	11.8±1.6	-	3.3±0.8	-
	10	21.5±2.3	96.7	12.6 ± 1.2	93.0
	100	107.7±5.2	95.9	100.2 ± 3.6	96.9
Spring water-	-	≤LOD	-	≤LOD	-
1	10	9.7±0.8	97.0	9.6±0.7	96.0
	100	96.3±4.1	96.3	98.5±4.2	98.5
Spring water-	-	14.2 ± 1.6	-	4.7±0.3	-
2	10	23.7±2.8	95.0	14.4 ± 0.8	97.0
	100	11.9±4.9	97.7	103.1±5.2	98.4
Mineral	-	≤LOD	-	≤LOD	-
water	10	9.6±0.4	96.0	9.3±0.1	93.0
	100	98.1±3.7	98.1	95.7±3.8	95.7
Well-water	-	8.2±0.9	-	9.2±0.2	-
	10	17.5±1.3	93.0	18.8 ± 1.1	96.0
	100	103.8±4.6	95.6	107.4±4.6	98.2

Table 3. Results from the analysis of the water samples using the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method (N=3)

*Mean value ± standard deviation based on three replicate determinations

1 Table 4. Results from the analysis of the food samples using the MAGDES-OS-DLLME method

1 Table 2 (N=3)

Food samples	Ni		Cu		
	Calculated, µg g ⁻¹	RSD, %	Calculated, $\mu g g^{-1}$	RSD, %	
Black tea	$0.75 \pm 0.01*$	1.3	24.4 ± 0.6	2.5	
Rice flour	≤LOD	-	28.7 ± 0.9	3.1	
Wheat	≤LOD	-	5.9 ± 0.2	3.4	
Green pepper	2.26 ± 0.03	1.3	44.2 ± 0.8	1.8	
Spinach	5.12 ± 0.09	1.8	10.3 ± 0.3	2.9	
Apple	0.26 ± 0.01	3.8	3.9 ± 0.1	2.6	
Eggplant	0.38 ± 0.01	2.6	6.2 ± 0.2	3.2	
Pomegranate	≤LOD	-	11.3 ± 0.5	4.4	
Parsley	1.95 ± 0.05	2.7	26.5 ± 0.6	2.2	
Mint	2.04 ± 0.01	2.6	11.6 ± 0.4	3.5	
Tomato	0.33 ± 0.01	3.0	6.9 ± 0.1	1.5	
Mushroom	1.58 ± 0.03	2.2	2.3 ± 0.1	4.3	
Potato	1.92 ± 0.04	2.1	81.3 ± 2.9	3.6	

3 *Mean value ± standard deviation based on three replicate determination