

## Food Safety

## Authors

**Lee Davidowski, PhD****Zoe Grosser, PhD****Praveen Sarojam, PhD**PerkinElmer, Inc.  
710 Bridgeport Avenue  
Shelton, CT USA

## The Analysis of Baby Foods and Juices for Metals to Protect a Sensitive Population

### Introduction

Babies and small children are an especially sensitive population to exposure to environmental contaminants. Their small mass and developing systems, including brain development may show adverse health effects from even low levels of contamination on a chronic or single dose case. Foods, infant formula, milk, and water provide significant exposure routes for metal contaminants. The effect of lead exposure at low levels

has been well established and levels below toxic have been shown to contribute to behavioral and learning issues<sup>1</sup>. Other elements, such as arsenic and cadmium can contribute to cancer, neurological effects and diseases.

Although baby food and juice may contain metals from fruit grown in contaminated soil or introduced during the manufacturing process, there is very little guidance on levels considered to be safe. In the US, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has issued a guidance memo on lead in children's candy lollipops for import, suggesting that lead content above 0.1 ppm (mg/kg) would provide an unacceptable risk to children who regularly consume sweets.<sup>2</sup> This is extrapolated to guidance for many food items. Canada has a specific tolerance level of 0.1 mg/kg (ppm) for arsenic and of 0.2 ppm for lead in ready-to-serve fruit juices, nectars, and beverages<sup>3</sup>. Europe has examined the problem more carefully and several elements are regulated in a variety of foodstuffs through Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006.<sup>4</sup> Lead and cadmium are regulated at low levels in materials such as cereals, fruit, and vegetables, although not specifically baby food. Tin is regulated at 50 ppm specifically in canned baby food and infant formula.

This work will describe measurements of a variety of toxic metals at low concentrations in fruit juices and fruit purees. Sample preparation and the effect on detection limits will be described. Graphite furnace atomic absorption (GFAA) and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) will be compared and an overall approach to analysis described.

## Experimental

Samples of a variety of fruit juices and fruit purees of different brands were purchased from a local supermarket. Two milliliters of juice or one gram of puree were taken in duplicate for digestion. Microwave digestion was used (Multiwave™ 3000, PerkinElmer®, Inc. Shelton, CT USA) to obtain clear solutions. Six mL of nitric and 0.5 mL of hydrochloric acid (GFS Chemical™, Columbus, OH USA) were added to PTFE vessels and the digestion program shown in Table 1 applied. The digestate solutions were then transferred and diluted to 25 mL with ASTM Type I water. The samples were fairly homogeneous and in a form that allowed a representative sample to be easily taken. If the samples were solids, grinding, blending or other procedures might be necessary to ensure a more homogeneous sample to be measured. Preparing replicate samples will allow us to evaluate if our homogeneity assumption is accurate.

Minimal dilution of the sample was chosen to provide a more concentrated digestate solution so that a lower concentration can be measured in the sample. In this case dilution factors of 12.5 and 25 were used for juice and puree samples respectively. Dilution factors can be increased when a lower acid concentration in the extract is desired or a higher concentration is expected in the sample.

**Table 1. Microwave Digestion Program.**

Step	Power	Ramp	Hold	Fan
1	750	10:00	10:00	1
2	1200	10:00	10:00	1
3	0		15:00	3

The AAnalyst™ 800 atomic absorption system (PerkinElmer, Inc., Shelton, CT USA) was used for the graphite furnace measurements. The AAnalyst 800 uses a transversely heated stabilized temperature platform system and Zeeman background correction to ensure the minimum influence of matrix interferences possible. The instrumental parameters and graphite furnace heating program are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

**Table 2. Atomic Absorption Instrumental Conditions for Arsenic Determinations.**

Element	Arsenic (As)
Wavelength	193.7 nm
Slit width	0.7 nm
Signal mode	AA-BG Peak Area, 3 replicates
Read time	5 sec
Delay time	0 sec
BOC	2 sec
Lamp and current	Electrodeless Discharge Lamp, 380 mA
Autosampler	AS800
Sample volume	24 µL
Matrix modifier volume	6 µL
Matrix modifier	0.018 mg Pd + 0.012 mg Mg(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub>
Calibration	2.5, 5.0, and 10.0 µg/L

**Table 3. Graphite Furnace Temperature Program.**

Step	Temperature (°C)	Ramp Time (sec)	Hold Time (mL/min)	Argon Gas
1*	120	1	30	250
2	140	5	15	250
3	1100	10	15	250
4**	1900	0	5	0
5	2450	1	3	250

\* = Injection Temperature = 100 °C

\*\* = Atomization Step

Additional information on the GFAA methodology can be found in reference 5.

The ELAN® DRC-e ICP-MS (PerkinElmer, Shelton, CT USA) was also used for measurement. The instrumental conditions are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4. ICP-MS Instrumental Conditions.**

Nebulizer	Quartz Concentric
Spray chamber	Quartz Cyclonic
RF power	1500 W
Integration time	1000 ms (per analyte)
Replicates	3
Reaction gas for arsenic	O <sub>2</sub> = 0.6 mL/min
RPq for arsenic as <sup>91</sup> AsO	0.5
Internal standard	<sup>103</sup> Rh
Calibration	1.0 and 2.0 µg/L

The arsenic analysis employed dynamic reaction cell (DRC) technology to move the arsenic ions using oxygen to mass 91, away from chloride interference at mass 75. Chloride may be in the sample arising from natural chlorine content, salt added to a food material or hydrochloric acid used in sample preparation, and can degrade the detection limit for arsenic. The DRC is an active additional quadrupole in the ion path with a rejection parameter q (RPq) of 0.5 for this work. Detection limits are improved compared to other approaches and the precision in varying matrices is more consistent. An instrument detection limit for arsenic measured in 1000 mg/L NaCl was shown to be 2.3 ng/L, comparing favorably to detection limits of 0.6-1.8 ng/L, measured in 1% nitric acid solution, using this technique.<sup>6</sup>




Figure 1. The Dynamic Reaction Cell (DRC™) operates in the PerkinElmer ELAN ICP-MS to react and avoid interferences without allowing competing reactions to add other interferences. Red = As<sup>+</sup> signal at mass 75 with no oxygen in reaction cell. Blue =As<sup>+</sup> signal with oxygen in reaction cell showing formation of AsO<sup>+</sup> at mass 91.

## Results and Discussion

A variety of samples from two manufacturers were prepared in duplicate. Table 5 shows the results obtained using graphite furnace atomic absorption (GFAA) analysis for a single element, arsenic. RPD is relative percent difference.

The results show very low levels of arsenic measured in the baby food and juice matrices. The standard deviations are very low showing good agreement between the three replicates measured on each sample. The relative percent differences (RPD) between the duplicate sample preparations show the material is homogeneous. Good agreement is generally considered to be less than 20% RPD, so the measurement in pear puree is likely due to the increase in variation generally seen when measuring close to the detection limit.

The results using ICP-MS for measurement of the same samples is shown in Table 6.

**Table 5. GFAA Arsenic Results.**

Mean Sample ID	SD (mg/kg)	(mg/kg)	%RSD	% RPD	Recovery
B Pear Juice	0.010	0.001	12	9.9	93.9
G Pear Juice	0.015	0.0006	4.3	3.3	90.0
B Grape Juice	0.027	0.002	8.2	0.7	85.0
B Apple Juice	0.012	0.001	7.8	3.4	92.6
G Apple Juice	0.018	0.0003	1.6	4.7	
B Apple/Cherry Juice	0.010	0.0008	7.5	23	
B Pear Puree	0.005	0.002	35	55	95.7
G Pear Puree	< 0.003				
B Apple Sauce	< 0.003				
HP QC TM-A* (µg/L)	9.995 (µg/L)	0.051 (µg/L)			99.9

High Purity Water Quality Control Standard = 10 µg/L As.  
Spike 2.5 ppb

**Table 6. ICP-MS Results (mg/kg)\*.**

	AsO91	Cd111	Sn118	Sb121	Pb	
					Tl205	(sum)
B Pear Juice	0.009	0.002	0.064	0.001	0.001	0.014
G Pear Juice	0.014	0.001	< DL	0.001	0.0009	0.009
B Grape Juice	0.031	0.001	0.005	0.099	0.0004	0.016
B Apple Juice	0.010	0.0003	0.069	0.001	0.0005	0.016
G Apple Juice	0.018	0.0004	< DL	< DL	0.0006	0.018
B Apple/Cherry Juice	0.008	< DL	0.058	0.0004	0.0006	0.006
B Pear Puree	0.002	0.001	0.33	0.0001	0.001	0.003
G Pear Puree	0.001	0.003	< DL	< DL	0.001	0.003
B Apple Sauce	< DL	< DL	0.067	< DL	0.0004	0.003

\* < DL means the result was less than the detection limit, listed in Table 8.

A variety of elements are measured in the ICP-MS analysis, including toxic elements as well as tin, which might be introduced through packaging. Comparison with the graphite furnace determination for arsenic is compared in the next table.

**Table 7. Comparison of Arsenic Measurement by ICP-MS and GFAA (mg/kg).**

	ICP-MS	GFAA
B Pear Juice	0.009	0.010
G Pear Juice	0.014	0.015
B Grape Juice	0.031	0.027
B Apple Juice	0.010	0.012
G Apple Juice	0.018	0.018
B Apple/Cherry Juice	0.008	0.010
B Pear Puree	0.002	0.005
G Pear Puree	0.001	< 0.003
B Apple Sauce	< 0.001	< 0.003



**Table 8. Detection Limits for ICP-MS and GFAA for this Method (mg/kg).**

	ICP-MS	GFAA
As	0.001	0.003
Cd111	0.0002	
Sn118	0.006	
Sb121	0.0008	
Tl205	0.0001	
Pb(sum)	0.003	

Agreement between measurements obtained on the two techniques is excellent at these low concentrations.

Detection limits were estimated for the two methods using the calculation 3 times the standard deviation of the blank, which was carried through the sample preparation procedure.

The detection limits measured are well below the Canadian limits set for As (0.1 mg/kg) and Pb (0.2 mg/kg), ensuring confidence of measurements made near the compliance concentration.

A variety of quality control checks, including spiking, analysis of a reference material and comparison of duplicate sample preparations were done to ensure that the developed ICP-MS method was adequate and under control during measurement of the samples. Table 9 shows agreement between duplicate samples for two juice types and a puree.

The results are shown in mg/kg and show good agreement in most cases. As the results approach the detection limit it is more difficult to show good agreement.

**Table 9. Duplicate Agreement ICP-MS (mg/kg).**

	Pear-1	Pear-2	RPD	Grape-1	Grape-2	RPD	Pear Puree-1	Pear Puree-2	RPD
AsO91	0.011	0.0085	21%	0.031	0.031	2%	0.0017	0.0015	14%
Cd111	0.0016	0.0016	1%	0.00068	0.00069	1%	0.0014	0.0013	2%
Sn118	0.067	0.061	10%	0.051	0.049	4%	0.35	0.31	10%
Sb121	0.0014	0.00095	41%	99.9	97.7	2%	< DL	< DL	-
Tl205	0.0010	0.0010	1%	0.0004	0.0004	6%	0.0014	0.0013	6%
Pb(sum)	0.016	0.012	27%	0.016	0.015	6%	0.004	< DL	-

Table 10 shows post-digestion spike recoveries at 2 ppb in solution. This represents a spike of 50 ppb in the original juices.

**Table 10. ICP-MS % Spike Recoveries.**

	AsO91	Cd111	Sn118	Sb121	Tl205	Pb(sum)
B Pear Juice	104	90.3	97.7	83.4	103	103
B Grape Juice	104	84.4	99.6	104	119	108
B Apple Juice	110	83.0	120	119	120	115
G Apple Juice	110	86.4	97.5	81.1	115	110
B Apple/ Cherry Juice	100	83.4	101	80.1	118	113
B Pear Puree	95.8	82.1	106	79.2	102	106
G Pear Puree	95.3	87.1	99.8	81.1	100	101
B Apple Sauce	90.1	83.5	98.7	80.5	101	102

The spikes were recovered within 20% of the spiked value, showing excellent recovery.

A suitable mixed diet food reference material (CRM, High Purity, USA) was measured using the same ICP-MS method. The results are shown in Table 11. Unfortunately the suite of certified metals only included two of the metals of interest here.

**Table 11. Mixed Diet Reference Material (mg/kg).**

	Concentration	SD	Certified Value	%Recovery
AsO91	0.019	0.0002	0.020	96.7
Cd111	0.0084	0.0001	0.008	105
Sn118	-	-	-	-
Sb121	-	-	-	-
Tl205	-	-	-	-
Pb(sum)	0.0001	0.0000	NV	-

The certified values for arsenic and cadmium showed excellent recovery, further validating the developed methodology was operating properly for this matrix and representative concentrations.



## Conclusions

Metals, including arsenic can be hazardous to health, especially that of a sensitive population, such as children. Therefore materials that provide significant exposure, such as food, should be closely monitored to ensure that concentrations of elements that might be hazardous should be very low.

The results measured in this set of samples were very low and did not violate any of the current standards. Additional method quality checks were done to ensure both the GFAA and ICP-MS methods were capable at the concentration levels of interest and under control during sample measurement.

Sample preparation should be matched to the analytical requirements and laboratory workload needs. A variety of techniques can be used, but the measurement of lower concentrations requires that a clean digestion be used so that additional contamination is not introduced during this step in the analysis process. The amount taken for digestion and the dilution can be varied to accommodate sample homogeneity and concentration requirements.

GFAA has detection limit capability well below the level of concern and provides an economical choice for smaller laboratories or those with a smaller workload. ICP-MS provides excellent detection limits and offers efficient multielement capability for the detection of other hazardous elements in the same run, such as lead. As many countries move toward the regulation of additional elements in food materials the list of elements to be measured may increase.

Based on the requirements of the laboratory, an appropriate technique can be chosen for regulations of today and to meet lower limits or additional elements that may be required in the future

## References

1. H.L. Needleman, A. Schell, D. Bellinger, A. Levinton, and E.N.Allred, *N. England J. Med.*, 322, 83 (1990).
2. Guidance for lead in candy,  
<http://www.cfsan.fda.gov/~dms/fsdup126.html>
3. Department of Justice Canada,  
<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showdoc/cr/C.R.C.-c.870>
4. Metals in foodstuffs,  
[http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/cadmium\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/cadmium_en.htm)
5. Lee Davidowski and Praveen Sarojam, PerkinElmer Application Note, As in Baby Food and Juice by GFAA (2009).
6. Ruth E. Wolf and Kenneth R Neubauer, Determination of Arsenic in Chloride Matrices, PerkinElmer Application Note D6357A, 2002.

PerkinElmer, Inc.  
940 Winter Street  
Waltham, MA 02451 USA  
P: (800) 762-4000 or  
(+1) 203-925-4602  
[www.perkinelmer.com](http://www.perkinelmer.com)



---

For a complete listing of our global offices, visit [www.perkinelmer.com/ContactUs](http://www.perkinelmer.com/ContactUs)

Copyright © 2009-2012, PerkinElmer, Inc. All rights reserved. PerkinElmer® is a registered trademark of PerkinElmer, Inc. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

008708B\_01