2021

A sensitive method for the detection of legacy and emerging per- and polyfluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) in dairy milk

Nicholas I. Hill
University of Rhode Island

Jitka Becanova
University of Rhode Island

Rainer Lohmann
University of Rhode Island, rlohmann@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/gsofacpubs>

The University of Rhode Island Faculty have made this article openly available.
Please let us know how Open Access to this research benefits you.

This is a pre-publication author manuscript of the final, published article.

Terms of Use

This article is made available under the terms and conditions applicable towards Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth in our [Terms of Use](#).

Citation/Publisher Attribution

Hill, N.I., Becanova, J. & Lohmann, R. A sensitive method for the detection of legacy and emerging per- and polyfluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) in dairy milk. *Anal Bioanal Chem* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-021-03575-2>

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-021-03575-2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Oceanography at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate School of Oceanography Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

A sensitive method for the detection of legacy and emerging per- and polyfluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) in dairy milk

Nicholas Hill*, Jitka Becanova^{*#}, Rainer Lohmann*

*University of Rhode Island, Graduate School of Oceanography, Narragansett, Rhode Island, USA

#corresponding author: Jitka Becanova, becanova@uri.edu

Abstract

There is widespread contamination by per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) across the globe, with adverse effects on human and environmental health. For human exposure, drinking water and dietary exposure have been recognized as important PFAS exposure pathway for the general population. Several documented cases of dairy milk contamination by PFAS have raised concerns over this exposure pathway in general. A sensitive method for determination of 27 PFAS in milk was hence modified and applied on raw and processed milk samples from thirteen farms across the United States (U.S.). A combination of acid and basic extraction method and ENVI-Carb cleanup achieved recoveries of targeted PFAS between 70-141%. The method detection limits (MDL) ranged from 0.8-22 ng/L (for 26 PFAS) and 144 ng/L for perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA). The uniqueness of this method is considered in the targeted screening of a broad range of legacy PFAS, as well as perfluorinated sulfonamide species and fluorotelomer sulfonates. No legacy PFAS were detected in 13 milk samples from regions of concern given local use of biosolids or proximity to fire training areas. Overall, then, the uptake of perfluoroalkyl acids (PFAA) from dairy milk in the U.S. is considered low.

23 Graphical abstract

25 Keywords

26 AFFF, dairy milk, extraction method, FTS, PFAS

27 Introduction

28 Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) comprise a broad group of anthropogenic
29 chemicals that are widely used in industrial and commercial applications [1]. These chemicals
30 display unique qualities such as lower micellization concentrations, ability to lower surface
31 tension of aqueous phases, hydrophobicity, and are oleophobic [2]. A variety of industries and
32 manufacturers have exploited these physicochemical properties to produce water repellent and
33 stain resistant coatings on textiles, oil-resistant food contact materials, and efficient aqueous
34 film forming foams (AFFF) [3]. As a result of their extensive use and chemical stability, PFAS
35 are ubiquitous in the environment and have been detected in wildlife and humans [4–6].

Extensive PFAS contamination in the environment has been predominantly linked to applications of AFFF near airports, fire training areas, and military bases, as well as agricultural use of biosolids or sludge derived from wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) [5,7–9]. Prolonged applications of AFFF and WWTP biosolids and sludge are attributed to elevated PFAS concentrations in soil and groundwater, as well as surface and well water [10–15]. At numerous sites impacted by AFFF and biosolids, the concentrations of perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) in drinking water dramatically exceeded the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) lifetime health advisory level of 70 ng/L for the combined concentration of these two compounds [16–18].

Ingestion of such as contaminated drinking water is a significant human exposure pathway in addition to PFAS ingested through diet [19,20]. In general, human dietary PFAS exposure occurs by two main routes: i) direct exposure to PFAS present in unprocessed, raw products as a result of environmental contamination, and ii) indirect exposure to PFAS present in food contact materials used in manufacturing, packaging, and preparation of processed food [21]. Dietary PFAS exposure pathways and PFAS contribution vary for different populations [21]. For instance, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) estimated that fish and seafood are predominant pathways for chronic PFAS exposure in adults to PFOS (up to 86%). The EFSA also projected that milk and dairy products are significant PFAS chronic exposure pathways to vulnerable populations (e.g., toddlers) [20]. The PFAS contamination in milk and dairy products could originate from processing and packaging of the final products, but most likely comes from transfer of PFAS from feed to cows. This was previously demonstrated in both a dosing study [22] and a descriptive model [23] in which dairy milk became a reservoir for PFAS. With a continuous increase in annual milk production in the U.S. over the last decade [24], there is plausible concern for increased risk of dietary exposure to PFAS to the general U.S population.

While a range of retail food studies including raw milk and other dairy products have been conducted in both farm and local market products all over the world [21,25–30] a limited number of reports exists for the U.S. domestic food supply. Previous studies have demonstrated that livestock forage grown on biosolid-amended soils is an important driver of PFAS contamination of the cattle [15,31]. Similarly, the use of organic fertilizers mixed with industrial wastes on cropland has led to contamination of the cattle feedlots and subsequently to elevated PFAS concentrations in animal by-products such as meat [22]. In multiple studies, the cattle exposed to contaminated feed eliminate PFAS via lactational transfer [15,22,32]. Application of contaminated biosolids has also been documented in farms across the U.S. for which PFAS concentrations reached up to thousands of micrograms per kilogram of biosolids [15,31,33]. Therefore, agricultural application of WWTP biosolids or industrial wastes or the proximity of dairy farms to AFFF-impacted areas warrants concern for PFAA contamination in dairy production.

Previous research on PFAS contamination of dairy cow milk has placed a greater emphasis on limited number of legacy perfluorinated alkyl acids (PFAA) with a focus on PFOA and PFOS [21,22,25,28–30,34,35]. Elevated contamination in milk was mostly attributed to the ability of PFAA to bind to β -lactoglobulin proteins in cow milk [26,36] however limited data exists on both milk concentrations and mechanism of binding/releasing of emerging PFAS associated with AFFF and WWTP biosolids applications such as polyfluorinated fluorotelomer sulfonates, perfluoroalkyl sulfonamidoacetic acids, and perfluoroalkyl sulfonamides [17,37].

Previously developed extraction methods for PFAS analysis in milk used a small volume of the samples (1-5 mL) to minimize the lipid and protein content in the final extracts and prevent potential matrix effect during the instrumental analysis [38–40]. Additionally, up-to-date published milk extraction method targeted the legacy PFAA only, without including the novel PFAA alternatives and precursors [21,22,25,26,28–30,35]. The aim of the present study was

therefore to i) modify solvent digestion and sample cleanup method for broader group of legacy, emerging and precursor PFAS in raw dairy cow milk and ii) apply the extraction method on raw dairy milk collected from U.S. dairy farms.

Materials and methods

Standards and reagents

The 8-point calibration curve (0.004 – 100 ng/mL), QA/QC instrumental performance check, and surrogate standard were created using analytical PFAS standards purchased from Wellington Laboratories (Ontario, Canada). Individual target PFAS and corresponding isotope labelled analogues are listed in Table SI 1. Formic acid (99+%), ammonium hydroxide (28%-30%), and liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) grade methanol were purchased from Fisher Scientific (Pittsburgh, PA, USA). Oasis WAX solid-phase extraction resin (30 µm) was purchased from Waters (Milford, MA, USA) and ENVI-Carb cartridges (Supelco) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich.

Extraction Method Evaluation

To evaluate the efficiency of extraction methods, approximately 10 g of local market, whole-milk was weighed into wide-mouth polypropylene jars ($n = 9$), spiked with representative native PFAS standards (10 ng/sample) and placed overnight in a freezer at -15 °C before freeze drying at -53 °C for ~60 hours in a LABCONCO FreeZone 2.5L benchtop freeze dry system. Freeze dried milk (~2 g) was transferred to 15mL Corning® Falcon centrifuge tubes and divided into treatment groups ($n = 3$ per treatment) based on extraction solvent and clean-up procedure: i) 0.1% formic acid in methanol followed by clean-up with only ENVI-Carb cartridges, ii) 0.1% formic acid in methanol extraction followed by clean-up with Oasis WAX resin loaded atop of ENVI-Carb cartridges, and iii) 0.1% ammonium hydroxide in methanol followed by clean-up with Oasis WAX powder loaded atop of ENVI-Carb cartridges. To create the paired WAX resin with

ENVI-Carb cartridge, approximately 500 mg of WAX resin suspended in LC-MS-grade methanol was transferred onto the Envi-Carb cartridge (1 g) with a pre-cleaned disposable pipette. To extract PFAS from the milk matrix, 6 mL of solvent was added to samples according to respective treatment groups. All samples were then vortexed for ~30 s, placed in an ultrasonic bath for 20 min, and centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 min. ENVI-Carb cartridges were fixed to a CHROMABOND SPE manifold. All cartridges were pre-cleaned prior to sample loading with ~3 mL each of 0.1% formic acid in methanol, 0.1% ammonium hydroxide in methanol, and finally neutral methanol. The organic layer was then transferred with a disposable transfer pipette and loaded onto the cartridges. 15 mL Falcon centrifuge tubes were placed inside the manifold to capture milk extracts. Samples were allowed to elute under gravity. The pellet formed during centrifugation was rinsed with ~2 mL of neutral methanol and resuspended, vortexed ~30 s, placed in an ultrasonic bath for 20 min, and centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 min. The organic layer was then transferred as detailed above onto the respective ENVI-Carb cartridge after the first extract eluted. After gravity elution of the last fraction, a final wash of ~1-2 mL of neutral methanol was used to rinse the inside of the cartridge. Vacuum pressure (<15 psi) was applied to the manifold to remove residual solvent extract bound within the cartridges. Approximately 9-10 mL of extraction eluent was present after SPE clean-up procedures. This eluent was evaporated at 36 °C to ~0.5 mL under a gentle stream of nitrogen gas and spiked with mass labeled PFAS mix (2 ng/sample). 40 µL of the concentrated extract was diluted with 60 µL of 4 mM ammonium acetate in water prior to LC-MS analysis.

Sample collection and storage

Milk samples ($n = 13$) were collected from 13 individual cattle farms across The United States (Table SI 2, Figure 1). These dairy cattle farms reported use of biosolid amendments on cropland or were located within proximity to AFFF-impacted soils. Samples were shipped on ice in original storage containers. All sample storage containers, extraction vessels, and transfer

134 pipettes were pre-cleaned with ACS-grade methanol, 3% ammonium hydroxide in LC-MS-grade
135 methanol, and LC-MS-grade methanol prior to use. Thawed milk samples were partitioned into
136 pre-cleaned 1 L HDPE bottles for storage at -15 °C. Locally purchased pasteurized whole milk
137 was used for determinations of dairy matrix interference with instrument detection. Samples
138 were analyzed within their shelf lives. A representative summary of sample collection locations
139 can be found in Table SI 2.

Figure 1: Map of milk samples location in selected states (Colorado, Maine, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Texas and Wisconsin) in The United States

Sample preparation

144 Frozen milk samples were allowed to thaw at room temperature and well mixed before ~25 g of
145 thawed samples were weighed into pre-cleaned 50-mL polypropylene Corning® Falcon
146 centrifuge tubes. All samples, duplicates, matrix spikes and blanks were spiked with mass
147 labeled surrogate PFAS standard mixture (4 ng/sample). Additionally, a native PFAS solution (4
148 ng/sample) was added to matrix spike milk samples. Sample aliquots were frozen overnight at -
149 15 °C, followed by -80 °C for five hours the next day, before freeze-drying in a LABCONCO®
150 FreeZone2.5 for 60 h at -54 °C. After freeze-drying, sample extraction was conducted using a
151 combined solvent digestion procedure.

152 Briefly, 12 mL of 0.1% formic acid in LC-MS-grade methanol was added to each freeze-dried
153 milk sample to denature proteins. Samples were then vortexed for ~30 s and placed in an ultra-
154 sonic bath for 25 min at room temperature before centrifugation at 4000 rpm for 10 min. The
155 organic supernatant was then transferred to a 15 mL Corning® Falcon centrifuge tube and
156 concentrated down to ~1 mL under a gentle stream of nitrogen gas to allow room for additional
157 aliquots. Following the initial concentration step, 6 mL of LC-MS-grade methanol was added to
158 the original pellet formed in the first solvent digestion step. The same vortex, sonication, and
159 centrifugation steps were repeated. After centrifugation, the organic supernatant was transferred
160 and combined with the concentrated acidic digestion extract. Lastly, a final solvent digestion
161 was performed with 6 mL of 0.1% ammonium hydroxide in methanol following the same
162 procedures as outlined in the previous solvent digestions. A final sample concentration under a
163 gentle stream of nitrogen gas down to ~4 mL was performed. The final volume extracts were
164 stored overnight at -15 °C to promote precipitation of residual matrix within extracts.

165 The sample clean-up procedure was performed with ENVI-carb (1 g, Supelco) cartridges.
166 Cartridges were affixed to a CHROMABOND® SPE manifold and precleaned with 2 mL each of
167 0.1% formic acid in methanol, 0.1% ammonium hydroxide in methanol, and lastly LC-MS-grade
168 methanol. Prior to loading, samples were taken out of freezer storage, centrifuged to remove
169 residual matrix for 1 min at 4000 rpm. The supernatant was then transferred into ENVI-carb
170 cartridges and allowed to elute under gravity (~1 drop/sec) into fresh 15 mL Corning® Falcon
171 centrifuge tubes. A 1 mL wash with LC-MS-grade methanol was performed on the original
172 storage tube and centrifugation for 1 min at 4000 rpm conducted prior to loading this extract to
173 the cartridge. Additionally, cartridges were rinsed with a final 1 mL LC-MS-grade methanol
174 aliquot. Lastly, vacuum pressure (~10 psi) was applied to elute residual solvent extract bound
175 within the cartridge. Eluents were concentrated down to ~0.5 mL under a gentle stream of
176 nitrogen gas before preparation for HPLC-MS/MS analysis.

Instrumental LC-MS analysis

The LC-MS/MS analysis of targeted PFAS (Table SI 1) was performed using a liquid chromatograph (Shimadzu Prominence UFLC) equipped with a Gemini C18 hybrid column (3 μm , 2.1 mm X 50 mm; Phenomenex) coupled to mass spectrometer (AB Sciex 4500 QTRAP) operating in negative ion mode. To reduce background contamination in the system, a delay column (Luna 5 μm C18(2) 100 Å, LC Column 30 x 2 mm) was installed to the LC system. For analysis, 20 μL of prepared extract was injected on the analytical column and PFAS were separate and determined (all analytical details are listed in SI, Table SI 3, 4 and 5 and in [41]).

QA/QC

The calculations of the PFAS concentration in samples and quality control samples was based on the isotope dilution method of quantitation. To guarantee quality control, three process blanks and two matrix spikes blanks were included within each batch of 14 samples. Blank concentrations were <10% of the measured samples, and due to this low background contamination level, sample concentrations were not blank corrected. The method detection limits (MDL, ng/L) were determined considering the following criteria: in case no analyte signal was detected in the process blanks, instrumental detection limits (IDL) were used as MDL and an appropriate dilution factor was applied. IDL represents the concentration of analyte giving the signal-to-noise ratio of 10 in presence of the matrix. In case the analytes were detected in process blanks, MDL were calculated as average value plus 3 times the standard deviation (SD) of the concentrations in all blanks. MDLs and recoveries for all targeted PFAS are listed in Table 1 (with details in SI). Additionally, recoveries of the surrogate mass labeled PFAS spiked into the real samples, blanks and quality control samples were withing 60-140%.

Results and discussion

Extraction Method Evaluation

The extraction method (solid liquid extraction, SLE) evaluation incorporated nine retail milk replicates for which two different extraction solvents and two different clean-up methods were utilized. When extracting PFAS from milk, it is common to incorporate solvents or salts to denature and precipitate proteins and other biochemical artifacts that may bind PFAS, such as β -lactoglobulin [25,26,28]. For these reasons, a similar approach was applied, relying on either 0.1% formic acid (FA) in methanol (treatment 1 and 2) or 0.1% ammonium hydroxide (AH) in methanol (treatment 3).

A summary of 22 native PFAS recoveries from extraction is provided in Figure 2. Average recoveries for the C4-C10 PFCAs was generally over 60% between treatments (Fig. 2a). Among the C4-C11 PFCAs, incorporation of ~500 mg WAX powder loaded atop of the ENVI-Carb cartridge (1 g) did not result in significantly higher recoveries. Recoveries of the C12-C14 PFCAs were generally over 50% except for PFTeDA (treatment 2). Average recoveries of C4 and C6-C8 PFSA (Fig. 2b) ranged from 48% to 51% with basic digestion (treatment 3) extraction being most optimal for the recovery of the sulfonates. PFBS had the greatest recovery of the PFSA at 63%. Recovery of the sulfonamides (Fig. 2c): FBSA, FOSA, *n*-MeFOSA, and *n*-EtFOSA ranged from 23% to 71% across experiments with recovery of FOSA being the highest at 71% in Treatment 1. The recoveries for *n*-MeFOSA, and *n*-EtFOSA were overall low, so these compounds were excluded from further evaluations. Recoveries for the fluorotelomer sulfonates (Fig. 2d) ranged from 42% to 68%, with highest average recovery across treatment groups residing with 6:2 FTS at 68%, and lowest average recovery with 4:2 FTS at 42%. Generally, the target PFAA and polyfluorinated precursors had recoveries of ~60% on average. The WAX powder allowed for greater separation of C4-C12 PFCA, PFBS, PFHxS, PFHpS, PFOS, and other perfluorinated species from the interfering matrix. However, the

224 recoveries for longer chain PFCA which are known for their bioaccumulative properties [42]
225 were higher on average for Treatment 3 which incorporated use of 0.1% ammonium hydroxide
226 in methanol. The recoveries of PFCA were generally higher in Treatment 3 when compared to
227 Treatment 1. A similar pattern can be seen with the PFSA and 6:2 FTS. Slight differences were
228 evident in the recovery for PFOS between Treatment 1 and Treatment 3 (Fig. 2b). These
229 patterns provided justification to utilize a stepwise solvent extraction which incorporates both
230 acidic and basic organic solvents to account for the broad spectrum of predominant PFAS found
231 in WWTP wastewater and biosolids, as well as AFFF [14,37,43–45]. Therefore, the combination
232 of the treatment 1 and 3 was applied on the real milk samples to achieve maximum recoveries
233 for all targeted group of PFAS.

Figure 2: Recoveries of individual per- (1a, 1b, and 1c) poly- (1c) fluorinated compounds using three different treatment methods. 1a – PFCA (perfluorocarboxylic acids); 1b – PFSA (perfluorosulfonic acids); 1c – PASF based compounds (perfluoro sulfonamides); and 1d – FTS (fluorotelomer sulfonates). Treatments (n=3) : i) 0.1% FA in methanol + clean-up with ENVI-Carb (blue), ii) 0.1% FA in methanol + clean-up with Oasis WAX loaded atop of ENVI-Carb (orange), and iii) 0.1% AH in methanol + clean-up with Oasis WAX loaded atop of ENVI-Carb (grey)

Analysis of real milk samples

A total of thirteen raw and retail milk samples were collected from U.S. dairy farms that either had confirmed use of biosolids on cropland or were within geographic proximity to military installations with confirmed AFFF use. PFAS present in AFFF utilized at fire training areas and military bases may persist in soils and groundwater leachate [17,46,47]. PFAS recalcitrance in soils due to AFFF leachate irrigation or biosolid amendment application pose reasonable concerns for agriculture [48]. Concentration of PFOA and PFOS in plants grown in biosolid amended soils have previously been found up to 200 ng/g dw and 20 ng/g dw, respectively [49]. PFOS concentrations in biosolids from previous studies found as little as 4.3 to 89 µg/kg dw [50] to as much as 3120 µg/kg in the U.S. [31], reaching elevated concentrations that have ubiquitous concern for biosolid use in agriculture. Where WWTP biosolids have been spread on cropland, PFOS concentrations have been quantified up to 483 µg/kg dw [33,51] took into consideration WWTP biosolid amendments and the likely occurrence of biotransfer from crop to organism by providing toxicokinetic evidence of PFOA uptake and elimination in beef cattle. Following this, Kowalczyk et al. (2013) demonstrated elimination of PFAS from naturally contaminated feed, in part, through lactational transfer [22]. Accumulation of PFAS in animal by-products therefore serves as a possible endpoint for exposure to humans who incorporate dairy milk in their diet. Both the proximity of farms to AFFF-impacted soils and the presence of WWTP biosolids on croplands raises concerns for bioaccumulation in food animals whose feed is obtained from the cropland.

A targeted LC-MS analysis of 27 PFAS (Table SI 1) was conducted on the raw and retail milk samples for which a combined solvent extraction and ENVI-Carb clean-up was performed. The efficiency of the modified solvent digestion extraction and clean-up procedure is summarized in Table 1. The overall recoveries of the 27 PFAS were evaluated by using a real milk samples spiked with native PFAS solution (4ng per sample). The recoveries were calculated using the

isotope dilution method. Recoveries for the 27 targeted analytes ranged from $69 \pm 9\%$ to $141 \pm 5\%$. The average recovery amongst the PFAA (13 compounds) was 93%, similar to recoveries for PFCA with $CF_2 \leq 10$ previously determined in other studies [21,26,28], which ranged from 70 to 120% . Only Lacina et al. [26] demonstrated similar performance for longer chain PFCA using a multistep ion pair extraction and cleanup method. Within the group of PFAS (8 compounds) the method achieved an average recovery of 113%, ranging from $90 \pm 6\%$ to $141 \pm 5\%$, the lowest being PFECHS and PFNS as the highest, respectively. In above mentioned studies the smaller range of PFSA (3 to 5) was dominantly analyzed with recoveries ranging from 70 to 104%. For the 4 sulfonamides and sulfonamide acids, the average recoveries were 97%. Recovery for the only previously determined sulfonamide from this group (FOSA) was $107 \pm 1\%$ which is comparable to previously published recoveries 98% [26]. Lastly, recoveries of the fluorotelomer sulfonates (3 compounds) ranged from $98 \pm 3\%$ to $136 \pm 7\%$, with lowest recovery of 6:2 FTS and highest recovery of 8:2 FTS, respectively.

281 **Table 1:** Calculated Recoveries (% $\pm$ SD) and Method Detection Limits (MDLs) for analysis of
 282 real samples

Functional group	Fluorination	n (CF ₂)	Compound	Recovery (%) $\pm$ SD	MDL (ng/L)
1 -COOH	Per-	4	PFBA	69 $\pm$ 9	144
		5	PFPeA	90 $\pm$ 0	7.6
		6	PFHxA	91 $\pm$ 3	3.9
		7	PFHpA	120 $\pm$ 0	11.0
		8	PFOA	82 $\pm$ 0	8.8
		9	PFNA	84 $\pm$ 9	2.2
		10	PFDA	86 $\pm$ 13	1.6
		11	PFUnDA	118 $\pm$ 17	3.6
		12	PFDoDA	110 $\pm$ 17	5.7
		13	PFTTrDA	91 $\pm$ 14	5.3
		14	PFTeDA	88 $\pm$ 5	2.8
2 -SO ₃ H	Per-	4	PFBS	117 $\pm$ 8	22
		5	PFPeS	94 $\pm$ 8	3.6
		6	PFHxS	106 $\pm$ 4	11
		7	PFHpS	103 $\pm$ 1	11
		8	PFOS	112 $\pm$ 6	2.9
		8	PFECHS	90 $\pm$ 6	2.3
		9	PFNS	141 $\pm$ 5	12.9
		10	PFDS	115 $\pm$ 8	2.4
3 -SO ₂ N	Per-	4	FBSA	105 $\pm$ 8	1.9
		6	FHxSA	80 $\pm$ 12	0.8
		8	FOSA	107 $\pm$ 1	5.2
		8	MeFOSAA	112 $\pm$ 8	2.1
		8	EtFOSAA	81 $\pm$ 1	1.4
4 -SO ₃ H	Poly-	4	4:2 FTS	105 $\pm$ 8	1.9
		6	6:2 FTS	98 $\pm$ 3	1.6
		8	8:2 FTS	136 $\pm$ 7	2.0

We evaluated the method performance on the real samples and calculated the method detection limits (MDLs) for the SLE-HPLC-MS/MS as described above. Generally, MDL ranged from 0.8-22 ng/L for 26 PFAS and 144 ng/L for PFBA, which is known for a strong matrix interference. Achieved MDL are far below the only established action level for PFAS (PFOS; 210 ng/L) in cow's milk developed by Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry (DACF) the Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention (MECDC) [52].

The uniqueness of this method is considered in the targeted screening of a broad range of legacy PFAS, as well as perfluorinated sulfonamide species and fluorotelomer sulfonates, for which MDL <5.2 ng/L were achieved. To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to screen such a variety of legacy and emerging PFAS in the U.S. produced milk.

The stepwise solvent digestion method incorporating the use of acidic, and basic methanolic solvents for initial extraction of PFAS in cow milk is the first of its kind in the literature together with a condensed clean-up to a single ENVI-Carb cartridge to help remove milk sample matrix. This improved clean-up and extraction method achieved recoveries that were as good as or better for target PFAS in comparison to other dairy cow milk studies where MDLs varied between hundreds pg/L to tens ng/L for limited number of PFAA [21,22,25,26,28–30,35].

301 **Table 2:** Comparison of concentration (ng/L) of various group of PFAS in dairy milk samples

Country	n	Concentration range (min-max) ng/L				Reference
		PFCA	PFSA	PASF	FTS	
The Czech Republic	12	<MDL	<MDL	<MDL	NA*	[26]
USA	61	NA	<MDL – 0.16	NA	NA	[21]
Italy	15	<MDL	<MDL	NA	NA	[30]
Germany	14	<MDL – 10.1	<MDL – 8.5	NA	NA	[28]
The Netherlands	17	<MDL	<MDL	NA	NA	[53]
Italy	67	<MDL – 32	<MDL - 97	NA	NA	[29]
China	46	<MDL – 370	<MDL – 120	NA	NA	[34]
China	115	<MDL – 151.8	<MDL – 172.9	NA	NA	[35]
Taiwan	10	30 – 1440	<MDL – 10	NA	NA	[25]
USA	13	< MDL	< MDL	< MDL	<MDL – 6.59	this study

302 * NA – not analyzed in the particular study

303 The present study included milk samples that were collected from a variety of rural dairy farms
304 that sell to local markets and larger urban areas (Table SI 1, Figure 1). The only analyte
305 detected in this study was 6:2 FTS at concentration 6.6 ng/L, for which a lack of data is
306 available from previous studies regarding contamination in dairy cow milk (Table 2). To our
307 knowledge, the only other U.S.-based study (Table 2) similarly investigated biosolid-amended
308 croplands and concerns for accumulation of PFAS in dairy milk and quantified only PFOS (0.16
309 ng/L) above its MDL (0.13 ng/L) [21]. Both 6:2 FTS and PFOS can commonly be found in both
310 AFFF leachate and WWTP biosolids [10,44]. With PFAS concentrations in most milk samples
311 being below their MDLs, and a representative number of dairy farms and locations included in
312 this study, the data suggests that consumption of dairy milk is not a prominent source of dietary
313 PFAS exposure. Similarly, proximity to military zones with historical AFFF use does not seem to

be a factor. However, as recent evidence suggests, the presence of biosolids containing PFAS may lead to contamination in soils and plants on cropland [15]. Especially short chain PFAA such as PFBA, PFPeA and PFBS are well known to be accumulated by agriculture plants [54,55] but it is unknown as to whether the cattle on these farms frequently graze on cropland associated with biosolid spreading or if these short chain PFAA which show different elimination kinetics compare to the long chain PFAA due to smaller molecular size have been excreted via urine [22].

Conclusion

The method presented in this study demonstrated enhanced capacity to quantitatively analyzed a broad range of PFAS in dairy milk in sub ng/L using a combined solvent extraction and single step clean-up procedure. Using this method, we screened raw and processed milk samples from dairy cattle farms which reported use of biosolid amendments on cropland or were located within proximity to AFFF-impacted soils. While levels of legacy PFAS formerly known to accumulate in a variety of dairy products were below detection limits, the fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2 FTS) was detected in one sample. These findings might reflect shifts in the AFFF compositions thus the further exploration of PFAS contamination of dairy products using non-targeted screening or total extractable fluorine approach might be essential.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge funding from the US National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (grant P42ES027706); and Richard J. Valdmanis and Joshua S. Schneyer (Reuters journalists) for collecting milk samples at local markets in six states.

335 **Author information**

336 **Affiliations**

337 University of Rhode Island, Graduate School of Oceanography, Narragansett, Rhode Island,
338 USA

339 Nicholas Hill, Jitka Becanova, Rainer Lohmann

340 **Corresponding author**

341 Correspondence to Jitka Becanova, becanova@uri.edu

342

343 **Ethics declarations**

344 **Conflict of interest**

345 The authors declare no competing interests.

346

References

- [1] Kissa E. Fluorinated surfactants and repellents. vol. 607. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.; 2001.
- [2] Moody CA, Field JA. Perfluorinated Surfactants and the Environmental Implications of Their Use in Fire-Fighting Foams. *Environ Sci Technol* 2000;34:3864. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es991359u>.
- [3] Glüge J, Scheringer M, Cousins IT, DeWitt JC, Goldenman G, Herzke D, et al. An overview of the uses of per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). *EngrXiv* 2020;8:Web.
- [4] Lau C, Anitole K, Hodes C, Lai D, Pfahles-Hutchens A, Seed J. Perfluoroalkyl acids: a review of monitoring and toxicological findings. *Toxicol Sci* 2007;99:366–94.
- [5] Schulz K, Silva MR, Klaper R. Distribution and effects of branched versus linear isomers of PFOA, PFOS, and PFHxS: A review of recent literature. *Sci Total Environ* 2020;733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139186>.
- [6] De Silva AO, Armitage JM, Bruton TA, Dassuncao C, Heiger-Bernays W, Hu XC, et al. PFAS Exposure Pathways for Humans and Wildlife: A Synthesis of Current Knowledge and Key Gaps in Understanding. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 2021;40:631–57. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4935>.
- [7] Filipovic M, Woldegiorgis A, Norström K, Bibi M, Lindberg M, Österås AH. Historical usage of aqueous film forming foam: A case study of the widespread distribution of perfluoroalkyl acids from a military airport to groundwater, lakes, soils and fish. *Chemosphere* 2015;129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.09.005>.
- [8] Hu XDC, Andrews DQ, Lindstrom AB, Bruton TA, Schaider LA, Grandjean P, et al. Detection of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in US Drinking Water Linked to Industrial Sites, Military Fire Training Areas, and Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* 2016;3:344–50.

- [9] Semerád J, Hatasová N, Grasserová A, Černá T, Filipová A, Hanč A, et al. Screening for 32 per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) including GenX in sludges from 43 WWTPs located in the Czech Republic - Evaluation of potential accumulation in vegetables after application of biosolids. *Chemosphere* 2020;261:128018. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.128018>.
- [10] Schultz MM, Barofsky DF, Field JA. Quantitative determination of fluorotelomer sulfonates in groundwater by LC MS/MS. *Environ Sci Technol* 2004;38:1828–35.
- [11] Kärrman A, Elgh-Dalgren K, Lafossas C, Møskeland T. Environmental levels and distribution of structural isomers of perfluoroalkyl acids after aqueous fire-fighting foam (AFFF) contamination. *Environ Chem* 2011;8:372–80.
- [12] F. Houtz E, P. Higgins C, A. Field J, L. Sedlak D. Persistence of Perfluoroalkyl Acid Precursors in AFFF-Impacted Groundwater and Soil. *Environ Sci & Technol* 2013;47:8187–95. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es4018877>.
- [13] Houtz EF, Sutton R, Park JS, Sedlak M. Poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances in wastewater: Significance of unknown precursors, manufacturing shifts, and likely AFFF impacts. *Water Res* 2016;95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.02.055>.
- [14] Clarke BO, Smith SR. Review of ‘emerging’ organic contaminants in biosolids and assessment of international research priorities for the agricultural use of biosolids. *Environ Int* 2011;37:226–47. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2010.06.004>.
- [15] Death C, Bell C, Champness D, Milne C, Reichman S, Hagen T. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in livestock and game species: A review. *Sci Total Environ* 2021;774:144795. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144795>.
- [16] Filipovic M, Berger U. Are perfluoroalkyl acids in waste water treatment plant effluents the result of primary emissions from the technosphere or of environmental recirculation? *Chemosphere* 2015;129:74–80. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.07.082>.

- 398 [17] Weber AK, Barber LB, LeBlanc DR, Sunderland EM, Vecitis CD. Geochemical and
399 Hydrologic Factors Controlling Subsurface Transport of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl
400 Substances, Cape Cod, Massachusetts. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017;51:4269–79.
401 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b05573>.
- 402 [18] Lindstrom AB, Strynar MJ, Delinsky AD, Nakayama SF, McMillan L, Libelo EL, et al.
403 Application of WWTP Biosolids and Resulting Perfluorinated Compound Contamination of
404 Surface and Well Water in Decatur, Alabama, USA. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011;45:8015–
405 21. <https://doi.org/Doi.10.1021/Es1039425>.
- 406 [19] Domingo JL. Health risks of dietary exposure to perfluorinated compounds. *Environ Int*
407 2012;40:187–95.
- 408 [20] Sunderland EM, Hu XC, Dassuncao C, Tokranov AK, Wagner CC, Allen JG. A review of
409 the pathways of human exposure to poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs) and
410 present understanding of health effects. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 2019;29:131–47.
411 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-018-0094-1>.
- 412 [21] Young WM, South P, Begley TH, Diachenko GW, Noonan GO. Determination of
413 Perfluorochemicals in Cow's Milk Using Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass
414 Spectrometry. *J Agric Food Chem* 2012;60:1652–8. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf204565x>.
- 415 [22] Kowalczyk J, Ehlers S, Oberhausen A, Tischler M, Fürst P, Schafft H, et al. Absorption,
416 Distribution, and Milk Secretion of the Perfluoroalkyl Acids PFBS, PFHxS, PFOS, and
417 PFOA by Dairy Cows Fed Naturally Contaminated Feed. *J Agric Food Chem*
418 2013;61:2903–12. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf304680j>.
- 419 [23] van Asselt ED, Kowalczyk J, van Eijkeren JCH, Zeilmaker MJ, Ehlers S, Fürst P, et al.
420 Transfer of perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) from contaminated feed to dairy milk.
421 *Food Chem* 2013;141:1489–95.
422 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.04.035>.
- 423 [24] USDA. Milk production. *Natl Agric Stat Serv* n.d. <https://doi.org/ISSN:1949-1557>.

- 424 [25] Chen W-L, Bai F-Y, Chang Y-C, Chen P-C, Chen C-Y. Concentrations of perfluoroalkyl
425 substances in foods and the dietary exposure among Taiwan general population and
426 pregnant women. *J Food Drug Anal* 2018;26:994–1004.
427 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfda.2017.12.011>.
- 428 [26] Lacina O, Hradkova P, Pulkrabova J, Hajslova J. Simple, high throughput ultra-high
429 performance liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry trace analysis of
430 perfluorinated alkylated substances in food of animal origin: Milk and fish. *J Chromatogr*
431 *A* 2011;1218:4312–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2011.04.061>.
- 432 [27] Domingo JL, Jogsten IE, Eriksson U, Martorell I, Perelló G, Nadal M, et al. Human dietary
433 exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances in Catalonia, Spain. Temporal trend. *Food Chem*
434 2012;135:1575–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2012.06.054>.
- 435 [28] Still M, Schlummer M, Gruber L, Fiedler D, Wolz G. Impact of Industrial Production and
436 Packaging Processes on the Concentration of Per- and Polyfluorinated Compounds in
437 Milk and Dairy Products. *J Agric Food Chem* 2013;61:9052–62.
438 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf4020137>.
- 439 [29] Barbarossa A, Gazzotti T, Zironi E, Serraino A, pagliuca G. Short
440 communication: Monitoring the presence of perfluoroalkyl substances in Italian cow
441 milk. *J Dairy Sci* 2014;97:3339–43. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8005>.
- 442 [30] Capriotti AL, Cavaliere C, Cavazzini A, Foglia P, Laganà A, Piovesana S, et al. High
443 performance liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry determination of
444 perfluorinated acids in cow milk. *J Chromatogr A* 2013;1319:72–9.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2013.10.029>.
- 446 [31] Lupton SJ, Huwe JK, Smith DJ, Dearfield KL, Johnston JJ. Distribution and Excretion of
447 Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) in Beef Cattle (*Bos taurus*). *J Agric Food Chem*
448 2014;62:1167–73. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf404355b>.
- 449 [32] Kowalczyk J, Ehlers S, Fürst P, Schafft H, Lahrssen-Wiederholt M. Transfer of

450 Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) From
 451 Contaminated Feed Into Milk and Meat of Sheep: Pilot Study. *Arch Env Contam Toxicol*
 452 2012;63:288–98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-012-9759-2>.

453 [33] Lupton SJ, Huwe JK, Smith DJ, Dearfield KL, Johnston JJ. Absorption and Excretion of
 454 ¹⁴C-Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) in Angus Cattle (*Bos taurus*). *J Agric Food Chem*
 455 2012;60:1128–34. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf2042505>.

456 [34] Yu Y, Xu D, Lu M, Zhou S, Peng T, Yue Z, et al. QuEChERS Combined with Online
 457 Interference Trapping LC-MS/MS Method for the Simultaneous Determination of 20
 458 Polyfluoroalkane Substances in Dietary Milk. *J Agric Food Chem* 2015;63:4087–95.
 459 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.5b00068>.

460 [35] Xing Z, Lu J, Liu Z, Li S, Wang G, Wang X. Occurrence of Perfluorooctanoic Acid and
 461 Perfluorooctane Sulfonate in Milk and Yogurt and Their Risk Assessment. *Int J Environ*
 462 *Res Public Heal* 2016;13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13101037>.

463 [36] Macheka LR, Olowoyo JO, Mugivhisa LL, Abafe OA. Determination and assessment of
 464 human dietary intake of per and polyfluoroalkyl substances in retail dairy milk and infant
 465 formula from South Africa. *Sci Total Env* 2021;755:142697.
 466 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142697>.

467 [37] Moodie D, Coggan T, Berry K, Kolobaric A, Fernandes M, Lee E, et al. Legacy and
 468 emerging per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs) in Australian biosolids.
 469 *Chemosphere* 2021;270:129143.
 470 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.129143>.

471 [38] Keller JM, Calafat AM, Kato K, Ellefson ME, Reagen WK, Strynar M, et al. Determination
 472 of perfluorinated alkyl acid concentrations in human serum and milk standard reference
 473 materials. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 2010;397:439–51. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-009-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-009-3222-x)
 474 [3222-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-009-3222-x).

475 [39] Tittlemier SA, Braekevelt E. Analysis of polyfluorinated compounds in foods. *Anal Bioanal*

Chem 2011;399:221–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-010-4112-y>.

[40] Li F, Zhao Z, Shen C, Zeng Q, Liu S. Elimination of matrix effects during analysis of perfluorinated acids in solid samples by liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry. *J Cent South Univ* 2012;19:2886–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11771-012-1355-0>.

[41] Becanova J, Saleeba Z, Stone A, Hurt RH, Robuck AR, Lohmann R. A graphene-based hydrogel monolith with tailored surface chemistry for PFAS passive sampling. *Environ Sci Nano* 2021; In press.

[42] Ng CA, Hungerbuhler K, Hungerbühler K. Bioaccumulation of Perfluorinated Alkyl Acids: Observations and Models. *Environ Sci Technol* 2014;48:4637–48. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es404008g>.

[43] Oono S, Harada KH, Mahmoud MAM, Inoue K, Koizumi A. Current levels of airborne polyfluorinated telomers in Japan. *Chemosphere* 2008;73:932–7.

[44] Coggan TL, Moodie D, Kolobaric A, Szabo D, Shimeta J, Crosbie ND, et al. An investigation into per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in nineteen Australian wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). *Heliyon* 2019;5:e02316. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02316>.

[45] Alder AC, van der Voet J. Occurrence and point source characterization of perfluoroalkyl acids in sewage sludge. *Chemosphere* 2015;129:62–73. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.07.045>.

[46] Anderson RH, Long GC, Porter RC, Anderson JK. Occurrence of select perfluoroalkyl substances at U.S. Air Force aqueous film-forming foam release sites other than fire-training areas: Field-validation of critical fate and transport properties. *Chemosphere* 2016;150:678–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2016.01.014>.

[47] Nickerson A, Rodowa AE, Adamson DT, Field JA, Kulkarni PR, Kornuc JJ, et al. Spatial Trends of Anionic, Zwitterionic, and Cationic PFASs at an AFFF-Impacted Site. *Environ*

502 Sci Technol 2021;55:313–23. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c04473>.

503 [48] Costello MCS, Lee LS. Sources, Fate, and Plant Uptake in Agricultural Systems of Per-
 504 and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances. Curr Pollut Reports 2020.
 505 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40726-020-00168-y>.

506 [49] Yoo H, Washington JW, Jenkins TM, Ellington JJ. Quantitative determination of
 507 perfluorochemicals and fluorotelomer alcohols in plants from biosolid-amended fields
 508 using LC/MS/MS and GC/MS. Environ Sci Technol 2011;45:7985–90.
 509 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es102972m>.

510 [50] Brambilla G, Abate V, Battacone G, De Filippis SP, Esposito M, Esposito V, et al.
 511 Potential impact on food safety and food security from persistent organic pollutants in top
 512 soil improvers on Mediterranean pasture. Sci Total Environ 2016;543:581–90.
 513 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.10.159>.

514 [51] Sepulvado JG, Blaine AC, Hundal LS, Higgins CP. Occurrence and Fate of
 515 Perfluorochemicals in Soil Following the Land Application of Municipal Biosolids. Environ
 516 Sci Technol 2011;45:8106–12. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es103903d>.

517 [52] MECDC. Action levels for PFOS in cow's milk. Memorandum to the Department of
 518 Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry from the Maine CDC 2017.

519 [53] Berendsen BJA, Lakraoui F, Leenders L, van Leeuwen SPJ. The analysis of
 520 perfluoroalkyl substances at ppt level in milk and egg using UHPLC-MS/MS. Food Addit
 521 Contam Part A 2020;37:1707–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2020.1794053>.

522 [54] Blaine AC, Rich CD, Hundal LS, Lau C, Mills MA, Harris KM, et al. Uptake of
 523 Perfluoroalkyl Acids into Edible Crops via Land Applied Biosolids: Field and Greenhouse
 524 Studies. Environ Sci Technol 2013;47:14062–9. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es403094q>.

525 [55] Krippner J, Falk S, Brunn H, Georgii S, Schubert S, Stahl T. Accumulation Potentials of
 526 Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylic Acids (PFCAs) and Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonic Acids (PFSA) in
 527 Maize (Zea mays). J Agric Food Chem 2015;63:3646–53.

528 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.5b00012>.

529