



UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ARCHIVIO DELLA RICERCA

University of Parma Research Repository

Novel sample-substrates for the determination of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid by desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original

Novel sample-substrates for the determination of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid by desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry / Bianchi, Federica; Agazzi, Silvia; Riboni, Nicolo'; Erdal, Nejla; Hakkarainen, Minna; Ilag, Leopold L.; Anzillotti, Luca; Andreoli, Roberta; Marezza, Francesca; Moroni, Fabrizio; Cecchi, Rossana; Careri, Maria. - In: TALANTA. - ISSN 0039-9140. - 202:(2019), pp. 136-144. [10.1016/j.talanta.2019.04.057]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11381/2859465 since: 2022-11-14T17:43:26Z

Publisher:

Elsevier B.V.

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.talanta.2019.04.057

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

Manuscript Number:

Title: Novel sample-substrates for the determination of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid by desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry

Article Type: Research Paper

Keywords: Sample-substrates; New psychoactive substances; Desorption electrospray ionization; High resolution mass spectrometry.

Corresponding Author: Professor Federica Bianchi,

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Parma

First Author: Federica Bianchi

Order of Authors: Federica Bianchi; Silvia Agazzi; Nicolò Riboni; Nejlá Erdal; Minna Hakkarainen; Leopold L Ilag; Luca Anzillotti; Roberta Andreoli; Francesca Marezza; Fabrizio Moroni; Rossana Cecchi; Maria Careri

Abstract: A reliable screening and non invasive method based on the use of microextraction by packed sorbent coupled with desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry was developed and validated for the detection of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid. The role of different sample substrates in enhancing signal intensity and stability was evaluated by testing the performances of two polylactide-based materials, i.e. non-functionalized and functionalized with carbon nanoparticles, and a silica-based material compared to commercially available polytetrafluorethylene supports. The best results were achieved by using the non-functionalized polylactide substrates to efficiently ionize compounds in the positive ionization mode, whereas the silica coating proved to be the best choice for operating in the negative ionization mode. LLOQs in the low $\mu\text{g/L}$, a good precision with CV% always lower than 16% and RR% in the 83(\pm 4)-120(\pm 2)% proved suitability of the developed method for the determination of the analytes in oral fluid. Finally, the method was applied for screening oral fluid samples for the presence of psychoactive substances during private parties revealing the presence of mephedrone in only one sample out of 40 submitted to analysis.

Opposed Reviewers:



UNIVERSITÀ
DI PARMA

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE
CHIMICHE, DELLA VITA E DELLA
SOSTENIBILITÀ AMBIENTALE

Editorial Office,
Talanta

Parma, 12th December 2018

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the manuscript entitled “**Novel sample-substrates for the determination of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid by desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry**” by F. Bianchi*, S. Agazzi, N. Riboni*, M. Hakkereinen, L. Ilag, L. Anzillotti, R. Andreoli, F. Marezza, F. Moroni, R. Cecchi, M. Careri for publication on *Talanta*.

Being able to mimic the effects of controlled illicit drugs, new psychoactive substances are considered as a major threat to the public health by both National and International Organisms. In this context, the development of reliable screening methods for the analysis of these substances is of pivotal importance especially to monitor their consumption among young people.

The manuscript proposes advances in the desorption electrospray ionization – high resolution mass spectrometry determination of NPS with the development of new DESI substrates able to enhance signal intensity and stability. Four sample substrates i.e. non functionalized polylactate, polylactate functionalized with oxidized and reduced carbon nanoparticles and a silica-based material were synthesized, characterized and their performances compared with those of commercially available polytetrafluorethylene sampling supports.

Excellent results were obtained in terms of both sensitivity and signal stability by using both the non functionalized polylactate and the silica sample substrates. With respect to commercially available slides remarkable analytical results in terms of sensitivity and signal stability were achieved obtaining detection and quantitation limits in the low $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, thus demonstrating the reliability of the developed method for high throughput monitoring NPS in oral fluid using a non invasive approach.

Supporting material is available to provide more information about the achieved results.

The manuscript has not been published elsewhere and it is not currently under submission procedure to another Journal.

Yours sincerely

Federica Bianchi

Corresponding authors:

Federica Bianchi, e-mail: federica.bianchi@unipr.it, phone: +39 0521 905446

Nicolò Riboni, e-mail: nicolo.riboni@studenti.unipr.it or nicolo.riboni@aces.su.se, phone: +39 0521 905128/+46 07 38762154

Parco Area delle Scienze 11/A, Campus • I-43124 Parma

Sito internet: <http://www.unipr.it>

PEC DipScienzeCVSA@pec.unipr.it

Codice Fiscale e Partita IVA 00308780345


NOVELTY STATEMENT

Parma, 12th December 2018

Dear Editor,

the novelty of the work relies on the development of a reliable desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry based method for the determination of new psychoactive substances (NPSs) in oral fluid using properly developed sample-substrates able to increase signal intensity and stability of the investigated compounds. Four sample substrates i.e. non functionalized polylactate, polylactate functionalized with oxidized and reduced carbon nanoparticles and a silica-based material, were properly synthesized, characterized and their performances compared with those of commercially available polytetrafluorethylene sampling supports. Excellent results were obtained in terms of both sensitivity and signal stability by using both the non functionalized polylactate and the silica sample substrates, thus allowing to validate a non invasive screening method useful for the determination of analytes belonging to several classes of NPSs in human oral fluid. The main advantages of the developed method relies in the consumption of very low amounts of sample, a very quick and simple sample preparation and shorter analysis times compared to the commonly applied GC-MS and LC-ESI analyses.

Prof. Federica Bianchi



Highlights

Innovative sample-substrates for desorption electrospray ionization mass spectrometry

Remarkable results with the silica-based and the polylactate sample-substrates

Improved detection of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid

Reliable method for high-throughput purposes

1
2
3 **Novel sample-substrates for the determination of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid by**
4
5
6 **desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry**
7
8
9

10 Federica Bianchi^{a*}, Silvia Agazzi^a, Nicolò Riboni^{a,b*}, Nejla Erdal^c, Minna Hakkarainen^c, Leopold L.
11
12 Ilag^b, Luca Anzillotti^d, Roberta Andreoli^d, Francesca Marezza^d, Fabrizio Moroni^e, Rossana Cecchi^d,
13
14
15 Maria Careri^a
16
17
18
19

20 ^a*Dipartimento di Scienze Chimiche, della Vita e della Sostenibilità Ambientale, Università di Parma,*
21
22 *Parco Area delle Scienze 17/A, 43124 Parma, Italy*
23
24

25 ^b*Department of Environmental Science and Analytical Chemistry, Stockholm University, 10691*
26
27 *Stockholm, Sweden*
28
29

30 ^c*Department of Fibre and Polymer Technology/Division of Polymer Technology, KTH Royal Institute of*
31
32 *Technology, Teknikringen 58, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden*
33
34

35 ^d*Dipartimento di Medicina e Chirurgia, Università di Parma, Via Gramsci 14, 43126 Parma, Italy*
36

37 ^e*Dipartimento di Ingegneria e Architettura, Università di Parma, Parco Area delle Scienze 181/A,*
38
39 *43124 Parma, Italy*
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Corresponding authors:
55

56 Federica Bianchi, e-mail: federica.bianchi@unipr.it, phone: +39 0521 905446
57

58 Nicolò Riboni, e-mail: nicolo.riboni@studenti.unipr.it or nicolo.riboni@aces.su.se, phone: +39 0521 905128/+46
59
60 07 38762154
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 **Abstract**
4
5
6
7

8 A reliable screening and non invasive method based on the use of microextraction by packed sorbent
9 coupled with desorption electrospray ionization-high resolution mass spectrometry was developed and
10 validated for the detection of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid. The role of different sample
11 substrates in enhancing signal intensity and stability was evaluated by testing the performances of two
12 poly lactide-based materials, i.e. non-functionalized and functionalized with carbon nanoparticles, and a
13 silica-based material compared to commercially available polytetrafluorethylene supports. The best
14 results were achieved by using the non-functionalized poly lactide substrates to efficiently ionize
15 compounds in the positive ionization mode, whereas the silica coating proved to be the best choice for
16 operating in the negative ionization mode. LLOQs in the low $\mu\text{g/L}$, a good precision with CV% always
17 lower than 16% and RR% in the 83(± 4)-120(± 2)% proved suitability of the developed method for the
18 determination of the analytes in oral fluid. Finally, the method was applied for screening oral fluid
19 samples for the presence of psychoactive substances during private parties revealing the presence of
20 mephedrone in only one sample out of 40 submitted to analysis.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Keywords:** Sample-substrates; New psychoactive substances; Desorption electrospray ionization; High
46 resolution mass spectrometry
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

New psychoactive substances (NPSs) are a wide group of drugs of abuse not yet under international control conventions: being considered as a major threat to public health by both the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crimes and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), great interest is paid toward their monitoring [1]. These compounds are also referred to as *designer drugs*, thus highlighting their nature as synthetic drugs able to mimic the effects of controlled illicit drugs (*recreational drugs*). Most of the NPSs were synthesized and patented between the '60s and the '70s as anesthetics, antidepressants, antiparkinsonian agents or appetite suppressants [2]. NPSs are obtained through a slight modification of the chemical structure of known illicit substances, and are commonly sold as legal or herbal highs, research chemicals or bath salts. From the toxicological point of view, adverse effects usually include anxiety, paranoia, hallucinations, seizures, hyperthermia and cardiotoxicity [3]. However, these effects are much higher than those exerted by recreational drugs: as an example, the effect of synthetic cannabinoids is approximately ten times stronger than that produced by tetrahydrocannabinol (THC).

By the end of 2016, EMCDDA monitored more than 670 NPSs on the EU market, 51 of which were detected for the first time in Europe in 2017 [4]. These substances include synthetic cannabinoids, synthetic cathinones, stimulants, opioids, benzodiazepines, ketamine and analogs. Since one of the major threats in drug abuse is driving while impaired by psychoactive substances, in 2006 the DRUID (Driving Under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines) project was carried out to estimate both the scale and impact of drug driving in Europe [5]. Given the need for a European harmonization of drug analytical protocols (e.g. analytical cut-off limits; use of standardized analytical procedures, methodologies of data collection), more insight into the effects of psychoactive drugs to ensure the development of suitable countermeasures and an improved monitoring of drug use in traffic controls

1
2
3 are some of the final outcomes of the project. Illicit substances are detected in body fluids like blood,
4
5 and urine. Recently oral fluid has been used as an alternative matrix because of its ease of sampling and
6
7 non-invasiveness. In this context, a key issue is the use of new sampling techniques to be used during
8
9 routine control activities, as well as the development of novel screening methods able to assess the
10
11 presence of the investigated compounds at trace levels. Different portable devices [6] have been
12
13 reported for the on-site screening of common psychoactive substances such as opioids, cocaine,
14
15 benzodiazepines, amphetamine, methamphetamine and cannabinoids; however, no official methods for
16
17 the detection of NPSs are available.
18
19
20
21

22
23 NPSs have been analyzed by using different analytical techniques like gas chromatography (GC) [7-10]
24
25 and liquid chromatography (LC) coupled to mass spectrometry (MS) [8, 11, 12] or capillary
26
27 electrophoresis with both UV and MS detection [13, 14]. Immunoassay tests have also been developed
28
29 to rapidly screen the presence of NPSs in urine [15] and oral fluid [16].
30
31

32
33 Owing to the demand for high-throughput analysis and identification of NPSs, fast screening methods
34
35 based on mass spectrometry including ion mobility-high resolution mass spectrometry [17], matrix
36
37 assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry [18] and direct analysis in real
38
39 time-mass spectrometry [19, 20] have been proposed for the analysis of herbal products.
40
41

42
43 More recently, the possibility of analyzing samples in their native state without or with minimal sample
44
45 pretreatment by ambient mass spectrometry (AMS) [21] has generated increasing interest. Ambient
46
47 ionization techniques are powerful analysis tools for the rapid screening of samples with minimal or
48
49 without any sample preparation or chromatographic separation prior to analysis, thus reducing analysis
50
51 time. Consequently, their combination with high resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) becomes a
52
53 necessity to solve several matrix related problems rising from the presence of isobaric interferences or
54
55 sensitivity issues [22]. Therefore, the use of AMS techniques is very attractive for scientific
56
57 laboratories in order to develop fast and reliable screening methods.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 Among the available ambient ionization sources, desorption electrospray ionization mass spectrometry
4 (DESI) has been widely used for pharmaceutical, food and forensics applications [23-25].
5

6
7
8 DESI source is a high-velocity pneumatically assisted electrospray (ESI) source, generating charged
9 micro-droplets by the application of an appropriate potential on the ESI needle. The jet is directed
10 towards the probe surface where the impact of the primary droplets leads to: i) formation of a
11 micrometer-size thin solvent film, ii) solvation of the sample by a thin layer of solvent at the liquid-
12 solid interface and iii) generation of an electrostatic field. Primary droplets splash secondary droplets
13 containing the dissolved analytes from the solvent by electrostatic repulsions [26]. The desolvated
14 analyte molecules are ionized in the gas-phase as in the traditional ESI process. Finally, ions enter the
15 MS inlet through a heated extended capillary.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Ionization efficiency of the DESI source is strongly affected by the sample substrate as well as by the
28 spray solvent system [27]. The hydrophobicity of the surface, the dielectric constant between the
29 substrate and the spray [28] and the type of interactions between the analyte molecules and the surface
30 at the liquid-solid interface [29] are the most important parameters able to influence both signal
31 intensity and stability. In particular, the latter parameter has proven to be strongly affected by both the
32 deposition of the analytes on the surface and the subsequent desorption/solvation phenomena in the
33 sprayed solvent [30]. Different materials have been tested as DESI sample substrates: slides in
34 polytetrafluorethylene (PTFE), polymethylmethacrylate and porous silica [28, 31] are commercially
35 available, but sol-gel hydrophobic materials [32], nanoporous silicon and ultra-thin layer
36 chromatography plates [33] also have been proposed.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Being part of a research program dealing with the investigation of factors affecting desorption
52 electrospray ionization of low-molecular weight compounds, this study was focused on the
53 development, optimization and validation of a microextraction by packed sorbent (MEPS)-DESI-
54 HRMS screening method for the detection of NPSs in human oral fluid. Owing to the structure of the
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 investigated compounds, acquisition was performed in both positive-ion mode and negative-ion mode.
4
5
6 The performance of both the new polylactide-based materials functionalized with carbon nanoparticles
7
8 and the new silica-based material used as sample surfaces was evaluated with the final aim of
9
10 increasing sensitivity for the detection of NPSs. To our knowledge, this is the first study in which the
11
12 performances of new sample-substrates are tested for screening the presence of NPSs in oral fluid by
13
14 DESI-HRMS. Finally, a confirmatory GC-MS Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) method was developed
15
16 to confirm the presence of the investigated compounds in positive samples.
17
18
19
20
21

22 **2. Material and Methods**

23 24 25 26 27 2.1. Chemicals and materials

28
29
30 Ketamine HCl and mephedrone HCl (each at 1000 mg/L in methanol) were purchased from Lipomed
31
32 (Arlesheim, Switzerland). UR-144 (100 mg/L in methanol), Spice Cannabinoid Mix (100 mg/L in
33
34 acetonitrile), Spice Cannabinoid Mix 2 (100 mg/L in acetonitrile), 2-propanol (99.9% purity),
35
36 acetonitrile (ACN, 99.8% purity), dichloromethane (DCM, > 99% purity), ammonium hydroxide
37
38 (NH₄OH, 33% in water), ethanol (EtOH, ≥ 99.8% purity), acetic acid (99% purity), nitric acid (HNO₃,
39
40 70%), sulphuric acid (H₂SO₄, 95-98%), sodium chloride (NaCl), α-cellulose and caffeic acid (CA, ≥
41
42 98% purity), tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS, ≥ 99% purity) and poly(dimethylsiloxane) hydroxy
43
44 terminated (PDMS) were purchased from Merk (Milan, Italy). Chloroform and ethanol (both 96%
45
46 purity) were from VWR. Ketamine d₄ HCl (100 mg/L in methanol) and (-)-11-nor-9-carboxy-Δ⁹-THC-
47
48 d₃ (1000 mg/L in methanol) were purchased from LGC (Teddington, UK), whereas methanol (MeOH,
49
50 > 99.9% purity) was from J.T. Baker (PA, U.S.A.). Deionized water (DI) was obtained by using a
51
52 MilliQ element A10 System (S. Francisco, CA, USA). MEPS BIN C₁₈ and M1 were purchased from
53
54 LabService Analytica (Bologna, Italy). Poly(L-lactide) (PLLA; 4032D) was obtained from
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 NatureWorks (Minnesota, USA), whereas Membrane spectra/Por 7 pretreated dialysis tubing (MWCO
4
5
6 1 kDa) was obtained from Spectrum Laboratories (CA, USA).
7
8
9

10 2.2. Working solutions and sample pretreatment 11 12 13 14

15 All the stock solutions were kept in the dark at -18°C. Not contaminated oral fluid taken from 10
16
17 volunteers was used as blank matrix for method optimization and validation purposes by spiking the
18
19 proper amount of NPSs. Deuterated ketamine and deuterated carboxy-THC were used as internal
20
21 standard (IS) at the concentration of 1 and 5 mg/L, respectively. The spiked oral fluid was treated and
22
23 diluted with MeOH (1:1) for protein precipitation. Then, the sample was centrifuged at 13000 rpm for
24
25 10 min. Finally, the supernatant was collected and centrifuged two more times until complete
26
27 precipitation of proteins occurred.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 2.3. Experimental Design and Optimization of the MEPS Procedure 36 37 38 39

40 A commercial e-Vol[®] device (Trajan Scientific and Medical, Victoria, Australia) equipped with a 50
41
42 μ L syringe (Trajan Scientific and Medical) and a C₁₈ BIN (Trajan Scientific and Medical) was used.
43
44 Prior to extraction, the BIN was activated by using 10 \times 50 μ L of MeOH. The experiments were
45
46 performed on blank oral fluid samples spiked with 10 mg/L of ketamine, mephedrone, UR-144, JWH-
47
48 250 and JWH-081, used as model compounds.
49
50
51

52 After protein precipitation, 50 μ L of the supernatant were loaded into the BIN. A 2² two-level full
53
54 factorial design (FFD) was carried out by investigating the effects of loading and eluting cycles. In both
55
56 cases, low and high levels were 5 and 25 cycles, respectively. A mixture of 78:20:2 of DCM:2-
57
58 propanol:NH₄OH was used as eluting solvent [34]. Four replicates at the center of the experimental
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 domain were performed in order to evaluate the experimental error. An *F*-test comparing the
4
5 experimental and calculated responses at the center of the experimental domain was used to evaluate
6
7 the existence of relevant quadratic effects.
8
9

10 The significance of the loading/eluting effects and of their interactions was evaluated by using the
11
12 statistical package SPSS Statistics v.23.0 (IBM, Milan, Italy). The best regression models were
13
14 obtained by a forward search step-wise variable algorithm. Finally, the optimal extraction conditions
15
16 were calculated by using the multi-criteria method of the desirability functions [35-37].
17
18

19 The final optimal conditions can be summarized as follows: 5 x 50 μ L loading cycles and 25 x 50 μ L
20
21 eluting cycles using DCM:2-propanol:NH₄OH as solvent. After extraction, 10 x 50 μ L washing cycles
22
23 were performed to avoid carryover effects. Both fill and injection speeds of 2 arbitrary units were used.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 2.4. GC-MS (SIM) analysis 31 32 33 34

35 GC-MS analysis was performed using an HP 6890 Series Plus gas chromatograph (Agilent
36
37 Technologies, Palo Alto, CA, USA) equipped with a MSD 5973 mass spectrometer (Agilent
38
39 Technologies). Helium was used as the carrier gas at a constant flow rate of 1 mL/min; the gas
40
41 chromatograph was operated in splitless mode for 1 min with the programmed temperature vaporizer
42
43 (PTV) injector (Agilent Technologies) maintained at the temperature of 300 °C and equipped with a
44
45 1.5 mm i.d. multi-baffled liner (Agilent Technologies).
46
47
48

49 Chromatographic separation was performed on a 30 m x 0.25 mm, df 0.25 μ m MDN-5S capillary
50
51 column (Supelco, Bellefonte, PA, USA), using the following temperature program: 120 °C for 1 min,
52
53 20 °C/min up to 310°C, 310°C for 15 min.
54
55
56

57 The transfer line and ion source were maintained at the temperatures of 280 and 150 °C, respectively.
58

59 Preliminarily, EI spectra in full scan mode were acquired to select diagnostic ions to be monitored in
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 SIM mode. Mass spectra were acquired under the following conditions: ionization energy: 70 eV; mass
4
5 range: 45-400 amu; scan time: 3 scan/s; electron multiplier voltage: 2165 V. Signal acquisition and data
6
7 handling were performed using the HP Chemstation (Agilent Technologies).
8
9

10 The m/z ratios of the fragment ions of the investigated compounds are reported in Table S1.
11
12
13
14

15 2.5. DESI-substrates 16 17 18 19

20 Different sample-substrates for DESI-HRMS analysis were tested, namely polytetrafluoroethylene
21
22 (PTFE, Prosolia, Inc., Indianapolis, IN, USA), polylactide-based materials (PLLA) and a silica-based
23
24 coating.
25
26
27
28
29

30 2.5.1. PLLA-based supporting material 31 32 33 34

35 2.5.1.1. Nanoparticle preparation 36 37 38 39

40 Two different types of nanoparticles were used: nGO (oxidized nanoparticles) and r-nGO (reduced
41
42 nanoparticles), both derived from carbon spheres obtained from the microwave assisted carbonization
43
44 of cellulose according to previously reported procedures [38, 39].
45
46

47 The carbonization process of α -cellulose was performed as follows: 2 g of α -cellulose was mixed with
48
49 H_2SO_4 (0.1 mg/mL) and processed for 2 h at 180 °C excluding the ramp time of 20 min in a Milestone
50
51 UltraWAVE (Milestone Inc.) under an external pressure of 40 bar. The solid fraction (carbon spheres)
52
53 was obtained by filtration and dried in vacuum oven at room temperature (RT). nGO nanoparticles
54
55 were produced by oxidation of the carbon spheres in HNO_3 (1:1, $w:w$) by sonication for 30 min and
56
57 subsequent heating at 90 °C for 30 min under stirring. Subsequently, the acidic mixture was diluted in
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 DI water and removed by rotary evaporation. The final product was collected by rinsing with DI water
4
5 and by freeze drying the dispersion. r-nGO were produced through a reduction process of nGO using
6
7 microwave technology. nGO and CA powder were mixed (1:3, *w:w*) in DI water and treated according
8
9 to the same microwave program used for the cellulose processing. The obtained product was dialyzed
10
11 (MWCO 1 kDa) for 24-48 h to remove excess CA by repeatedly replacing the DI water and then
12
13 collected by freeze-drying. Both nGO and r-nGO were kept in vacuum oven at RT for at least 5 days.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 2.5.1.2. Film processing by solution casting 21 22 23 24

25 PLLA (3.6 g) was dissolved in 60 mL of chloroform at 40 °C for 2 h. Four hundred mg of
26
27 nanoparticles (nGO and r-nGO, 10 % *w:w*) were dispersed in 1 mL of ethanol and sonicated using an
28
29 ultrasonic bath for 5 min. The nanoparticle dispersion was then dropped into the dissolved PLLA
30
31 solution while stirring for approximately 1 min. Thereafter, the dispersion was drop-casted into petri
32
33 dishes (d=18.5 cm) and left to dry under a fume hood. For neat PLLA, 4 g of PLLA were dissolved in
34
35 60 mL of chloroform at 40 °C for 2 h. One mL of ethanol was added dropwise into this batch before
36
37 casting into the petri dish. Films were stored in a vacuum oven at RT and named according to the
38
39 polymer and nanoparticle type i.e. PLLA, PLLA nGO and PLLA r-nGO.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 2.5.2. Silica-based supporting material 48 49 50 51

52 Two mL of TEOS were mixed with 200 µL of ethanol and sonicated for 10 min, then 400 µL of acetic
53
54 acid were added and sonicated for other 10 min; finally, 1750 µL of PDMS were added and the
55
56 solution was sonicated for 6 h. Subsequently, 160 µL of water were added and the mixture was
57
58 sonicated for 10-15 min until a slightly opaque solution was obtained. The solution was spin-coated on
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 glass microscope slides with revolving speed at 2500 rpm. The supports were dried for 8 h at room
4
5 temperature and then in an oven using the following temperature program: 40°C for 90 min, 1 °C/min
6
7 to 350°C, 350°C for 120 min.
8
9

10 11 12 13 2.6. Characterization of the DESI substrates 14

15
16
17
18 The developed sample substrates (n=3 for each analysis) were characterized by atomic force
19
20 microscopy (AFM), scanning electron microscopy (SEM), profilometric and contact angle
21
22 measurements. AFM analyses were performed on a PARK XE-100, Park Systems (Mannheim,
23
24 Germany). The images were acquired in tapping mode with a scan rate of 0.5 Hz and a 50 × 50 μm
25
26 window. SEM characterization was performed on a Leica 430i instrument (Leica, Solms, Germany)
27
28 operated at 25 kV. Profilometric analyses were carried out using a Talysurf CCI optical profiler (Taylor
29
30 Hobson, PA, U.S.A). A 50× objective was mounted on the instrument, producing an accuracy of < 1nm
31
32 in the vertical direction and a resolution of 0.4 μm in the horizontal direction. The contact-angle
33
34 measurements were performed by spotting 2 μl of deionized water (3 replicates) on the tested surfaces.
35
36 Static contact angle was measured by the sessile drop method and a properly calibrated goniometer to
37
38 be used after the acquisition of the images of each drop. Pictures processing was carried out with the
39
40 software ImageJ (National Institute of Health, USA). Finally, the dynamic contact angle was measured
41
42 using a Cahn Dynamic Contact Angle analyzer (DCA-312, Cahn Instruments Inc, Cerritos, USA).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 2.7. DESI-HRMS analysis 53

54
55
56
57 All the analyses were performed using a LTQ Orbitrap XL hybrid FTMS instrument (Thermo
58
59 Finnigan, San Jose, CA, USA), equipped with an Omni SprayTM (Prosolia, Inc., Indianapolis, IN, USA)
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 DESI source operating in positive ion mode for ketamine, mephedrone, UR-144, JWH-250, JWH-200,
4
5 JWH-122, JWH-019, AM-2201, JWH-081, and in negative ion mode for HU-211, CP,47-497 and its
6
7 C₈ homologous. A point-to-point oscillating acquisition mode was used. Data acquisition was
8
9 performed using a Xcalibur 2.0 software in automatic gain control mode. Maximum ion injection time
10
11 was 400 ms; each spectrum was recorded at 1 microscan/s. The experimental conditions are reported in
12
13 Table 1.
14
15

16
17 Different spraying solvents were tested: i) H₂O:MeOH (1:1 and 3:1) and ii) H₂O:ACN (1:1 and 3:1).
18
19 The sample plate was positioned on a movable stage with 1-D automatic control movement (x-axis),
20
21 whereas CCD cameras were mounted on the source to visually monitor the sample position and the
22
23 spray alignment.
24
25

26
27 Preliminarily, full-scan accurate mass spectra in the 150–400 amu range were acquired to determine the
28
29 appropriate masses for each analyte. Identification and quantitation of target compounds was
30
31 performed using the accurate mass of the analytes within a mass window of 5 ppm. Quantitation was
32
33 performed by using the extracted ion chromatograms of the *m/z* value corresponding to the protonated
34
35 ion for the compounds investigated in positive mode and the deprotonated ion for the analytes
36
37 investigated in negative mode (Table 2).
38
39

40
41 Signal acquisition and data processing were performed using the Xcalibur 2.0 software (Thermo
42
43 Finnigan).
44
45

46 47 48 49 50 2.8. Method Validation 51

52
53 Validation of both DESI-HRMS and GC-MS (SIM) methods was carried out under the optimized
54
55 conditions to meet the acceptance criteria for bioanalytical method validation [40]. Briefly, LLOQs
56
57 were calculated as the analyte response \geq five times the response of the zero calibrator using
58
59
60
61

1
2
3 independent measurements. In order to meet the previously cited international criteria LLOQs were
4
5 tested to ensure that accuracy and precision limits are met.
6

7
8 The calibration curves for all the investigated NPSs were constructed at six concentration levels in the
9
10 LLOQ–10 mg/L range for ketamine, mephedrone, UR-144, JWH-250, JWH-200, JWH-122, JWH-019,
11
12 AM-2201, JWH-081 and in the LLOQ-5 mg/L range for HU-211, CP47,497 and its C₈ homologous.
13
14 Lack-of-fit and Mandel’s fitting tests were performed to assess the goodness of fit and linearity,
15
16 whereas the significance of the intercept (significance level 5%) was established by running a Student
17
18 *t*-test.
19
20
21

22
23 Within-run and between-run precision were calculated in terms of CV% on 4 concentration levels, i.e.
24
25 LLOQ, 1 (low level), 5 (medium level) and 10 mg/L (high level) for all the analytes except for UR-
26
27 144, which was studied at LLOQ, 2.5 (low level), 5 (medium level) and 10 mg/L (high level), HU-211,
28
29 CP47,497 and the C₈ homologous, which were studied at LLOQ, 1 (low level), 2.5 (medium level)
30
31 and 5 (high level) mg/L. Six replicate measurements *per* level were performed. Between-run precision
32
33 was estimated over three days verifying homoscedasticity of data and performing the analysis of
34
35 variance (ANOVA) at the confidence level of 95%.
36
37
38

39
40 Accuracy was calculated in terms of recovery rate (RR%) as follows:
41

$$42 \text{RR\%} = c_1/c_2 \cdot 100$$

43

44
45 where c_1 is the measured concentration and c_2 is the concentration calculated from the amount spiked
46
47 into the sample. Recovery rate values were assessed by performing six replicated measurements per
48
49 level at the same concentration levels used for the evaluation of precision.
50

51
52 Selectivity was evaluated by analyzing blank oral fluid samples taken from 25 males and females
53
54 volunteers, testing the absence of interferences.
55

56
57 Finally, stability was evaluated in terms of bench-top, freeze-thaw, stock solution and long-term
58
59 stability by performing 3 replicates at two concentration levels, i.e. LLOQ and 5 mg/L. More precisely,
60

1
2
3 bench-top stability was studied by maintaining the samples at ambient temperature for 6 h, whereas the
4
5 long-term stability of real samples was evaluated by maintaining the spiked samples for 15 days at -
6
7 18°C. The stability of the stock solution was evaluated for 10 months at -18°C, and the freeze-thaw
8
9 stability was assessed by thawing the samples at ambient temperature for 2h over a 6h period.
10
11
12
13
14

15 2.9. Oral fluid sample analysis

16
17
18
19

20 Fourth oral fluid samples were collected anonymously during private parties from young volunteers
21
22 (19-30 years old), both males and females after having signed an informed consent. All samples were
23
24 collected anonymously, and only gender and age were recorded. Oral fluid was collected into
25
26 polypropylene vials and maintained in the dark at -18°C until analysis.
27
28
29

30 Four hundred µL of sample were transferred into 1.5 mL vials, diluted 1:1 with MeOH and centrifuged
31
32 3 times. Fifty µL of the supernatant were submitted to MEPS procedure after the addition of the ISs at
33
34 the concentration of 1 (ketamine-d₄) and 5 mg/L (carboxy-THC-d₃), respectively.
35
36

37 Finally, 2 µL of the eluate were deposited on the sample substrate for DESI-HRMS analysis. One µL
38
39 of the extract was used for confirmatory GC-MS analysis.
40
41
42
43

44 3. Results and Discussion

45
46
47
48
49

50 Surface chemistry of DESI substrates plays a significant role on ion-formation yield, since it affects the
51
52 adsorption/solubilization of the analytes, thus influencing the ionization of the investigated compounds
53
54 and the repeatability of the analytical procedure.
55
56

57 In order to develop and validate a rapid MEPS-DESI-HRMS method for the detection of new
58
59 psychoactive substances in human oral fluid, the performances of four sample substrates, i.e. silica-
60
61

1
2
3 based coating, unmodified PLLA, and PLLA substrates functionalized with 0.1% of oxidized and
4
5 reduced carbon nanoparticles, respectively were evaluated. These materials were synthesized and
6
7 characterized in terms of morphology and composition.
8
9

10 Preliminary experiments were carried out to find the best instrumental conditions for the detection of
11
12 NPSs. Owing to their molecular structure, HU-211, CP,47-497 and CP,47-497 C₈ were ionized in the
13
14 negative mode, whereas all the other NPSs were analyzed by operating in the positive mode. Additive
15
16 addition and spray composition proved to be important parameters able to affect the DESI-HRMS
17
18 responses of the investigated compounds. According to Honarvar and Venter in the case of DESI-MS
19
20 analysis of proteins [41], it was observed that the addition of NH₄OH in the working solutions (10 mM)
21
22 of HU-211, CP,47-497 and CP,47-497 C₈ was able to enhance their ionization efficiency in the
23
24 negative ion mode. Spots were examined with several desorbing spray mixtures, testing four different
25
26 solvent compositions, i.e. MeOH:H₂O 1:1 and 1:3 and ACN:H₂O 1:1 and 1:3, respectively. As shown
27
28 in Figure 1, the best results were achieved when acetonitrile:water mixture was used at a solvent ratio
29
30 of 1:1, thus obtaining a significant enhancement of the responses especially for the Spice Cannabinoid
31
32 Mix 2.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 3.1. DESI-HRMS sample substrates

43
44
45
46

47 With the aim of exploring sensitivity of DESI-MS method for the analysis of NPS compounds, the
48
49 performance of the sample substrates previously described was compared with that obtained from
50
51 commercially available PTFE supports in terms of signal stability and DESI-HRMS responses. PTFE
52
53 slides are commonly used for DESI applications due to the high chemical inertness and hydrophobicity
54
55 of the polymer. By using these substrates, weak solvent-surface and analyte-surface interactions usually
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 take place, thus allowing enhancement of the solubilization/desorption of analytes in the spray solvent
4
5
6 with the final result of increasing both the DESI-MS response and signal stability.
7

8 PLLA has been recently proposed as bulk polymer for the SALDI detection of drugs [42], obtaining
9
10 enhanced signal-to-noise ratios when carbon nanoparticles were embedded in the material. Embedding
11
12 nanoparticles in a bulk polymeric matrix provides a means for preventing instrumental contamination
13
14 phenomena, making sample preparation easier while ensuring good ionization efficiency for the
15
16 analyzed drugs. In addition, embedded nanoparticles can affect the surface properties of the final
17
18 substrate mainly influencing the hydrophobicity of the system. Due to the tunable surface properties,
19
20 PLLA and carbon nanoparticles proved to be excellent candidates as DESI sample substrates for the
21
22 analysis of NPSs. Another important advantage of the proposed materials is related to their non-toxic
23
24 and environmental friendly properties, being obtained from renewable sources.
25
26
27
28
29

30 In order to compare hydrophobicity of the sample substrates tested, solid surface tension was
31
32 determined from the contact angle measurements. The achieved results showed that the developed
33
34 substrates were characterized by higher hydrophilicity compared to the PTFE slides since they
35
36 exhibited small contact angles ($< 92^\circ$), thus leading to higher wettability by both spotted solutions and
37
38 DESI spray (Table 3).
39
40
41

42 AFM analysis of PLLA-based films showed an irregular surface characterized by the presence of large
43
44 granules, whereas a regular distribution of the silica-based surface was observed with a maximum
45
46 difference in height equal to $200 (\pm 1)$ nm (Fig. 2).
47
48
49

50 SEM analysis of non-functionalized PLLA films confirmed the presence of rough surface characterized
51
52 by fused polymer grains with an average thickness of 82.4 ± 7.9 μm . By contrast, a very thin coating
53
54 (8.0 ± 0.5 μm) was observed in the case of silica-based coating (Fig. 3).
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 Profilometry data analysis evidenced a mean roughness depth of $22.8 \pm 3.8 \mu\text{m}$ in the case of non-
4
5 functionalized PLLA, whereas a lower value of $291.3 \pm 45.3 \text{ nm}$ was obtained for the silica-based
6
7 coating, thus confirming the results achieved by AFM analysis (Fig. S1).
8
9

10 Finally, in order to select the most appropriate substrate for NPSs determination, preliminary
11
12 experiments were carried out by spotting on each surface $2 \mu\text{l}$ of a standard solution containing the
13
14 investigated analytes with concentration of 1 mg/L (Fig. 4).
15
16

17
18 As shown in the figure, non-functionalized PLLA showed the best performance in terms of both signal
19
20 intensity and repeatability for ketamine, mephedrone, UR-144, JWH-019, JWH-122, AM-2201 and
21
22 JWH-081, whereas HU-211, CP,47-497 and CP,47-497 C_8 could be detected only at higher
23
24 concentration levels. In order to increase ionization efficiency, HU-211, CP,47-497 and CP,47-497 C_8
25
26 were detected in negative ion mode by applying the source ion fragmentation: under these conditions
27
28 the best performance was obtained using the silica sample substrate.
29
30
31

32 33 34 3.2. Optimization of the MEPS Procedure 35 36 37

38 Taking into account that oral fluid is a complex matrix composed of electrolytes, blood, epithelial cells
39
40 and proteins, a sample pretreatment step prior to DESI-HRMS analysis was devised in order to enhance
41
42 detectability of the investigated compounds. In fact, the direct deposition of oral fluid onto the HTC
43
44 slide was not feasible since the presence of a strong matrix effect did not allow the detection of the
45
46 analytes.
47
48

49
50 Since the amount of oral fluid collected during controls could be very low, the MEPS technique was
51
52 selected for sample clean-up and analyte enrichment using reduced sample amount. According to
53
54 previous studies [34, 43], preliminary experiments were carried out to evaluate the effects of both
55
56 sorbent material and eluting solvent on the MEPS extraction of five analytes belonging to different
57
58 NPS classes, used as model compounds i.e. ketamine, mephedrone, UR-144, JWH-250 and JWH-081.
59
60
61

1
2
3 After extraction, the investigated compounds were analyzed by GC-MS. The achieved results
4 demonstrate that between the two different sorbent materials tested, i.e. C₁₈ and M1, the C₁₈ sorbent
5 was characterized by the highest extraction capabilities except for mephedrone and to a lesser extent
6 for ketamine (Fig. S2).
7
8
9

10 Unlike literature studies, no washing step was performed between loading and eluting cycles, since a
11 noteworthy decrease in the responses of the investigated compounds occurred due to the elution of the
12 analytes from the MEPS BIN. Regarding the choice of the eluting solvents, both MeOH containing 50
13 mM NH₄OH (eluent A) and a mixture 78:20:2 of DCM:2-propanol:NH₄OH (eluent B) were evaluated,
14 obtaining the highest extraction capabilities when using eluent B (Fig. S3).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Optimization of the MEPS conditions in terms of both loading and eluting cycles was carried out by
26 running the experiments of a 2² FFD. The experimental domain was defined taking into account that a
27 minimum number of both loading and eluting cycles is required to promote interactions among the
28 analytes, the sorbent material and the eluting solvent. The minimum value of these cycles was set to 5,
29 whereas a value of 25 was selected as maximum level for both sampling and eluting steps, thus
30 ensuring the feasibility of the extraction for screening purposes. As for the fill/injection speed, a value
31 of 2 arbitrary unit was used to avoid the presence of bubbles in both the filled and in the eluted
32 solutions. The experimental error was assessed by performing 4 replicates at the center of the
33 experimental domain. The model obtained for the investigated compounds and single desirability
34 values are reported in Table S2. Finally, the models were used to search for the highest MEPS-GC-MS
35 response by means of the multi-criteria method of desirability functions. The optimal experimental
36 conditions were found in correspondence to a number of loading and eluting cycles equal to 5 and 25,
37 respectively. Since a global desirability D=0.85 and excellent single desirability values were obtained,
38 the developed procedure proved to be suitable for the simultaneous extraction of the investigated NPSs.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 These findings demonstrate that a low number of loading cycles were sufficient to promote the
4 adsorption of the analytes on the MEPS sorbent, whereas a greater number of eluting cycles were
5
6 required to assess the complete recovery of the extracted compounds, highly retained on the C₁₈ resin.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 3.3. Validation of the MEPS-DESI-HRMS Method 14 15 16

17 The validation of the MEPS-DESI-HRMS method was performed by operating under the optimized
18 extraction conditions. LLOQ values in the 0.05-0.25 mg/L range were obtained, thus demonstrating
19
20 that the developed MEPS-DESI-HRMS method can be proposed for screening NPSs at low
21
22 concentration levels in oral fluid. Good linearity was proved by applying the Mandel's fitting test over
23
24 one or two order of magnitude for all the investigated compounds (Table 4).
25
26
27
28

29 As for method precision (Table 5) satisfactory results were obtained both in terms of within-run and
30
31 between-run precision with CV always lower than 20%, thus meeting the criteria as described in the
32
33 guidelines for the validation of bioanalytical methods [40].
34
35
36

37 According to the requirements of the guidelines for bioanalytical methods validation, accuracy
38
39 calculated in terms of recovery rate provided the results reported in Table 6. RR% in the 89(±6)-
40
41 115(±5)% range at the LLOQs and in the 83(±8)-120(±2)% range at the other concentration levels were
42
43 obtained, thus proving extraction efficiency and accuracy of the developed method.
44
45
46

47 Good selectivity was also observed, since the analysis of blank saliva samples taken from more than 20
48
49 volunteers did not show the presence of interferences.
50

51 As for stability, long-term stability of the stock solutions was demonstrated, since ANOVA performed
52
53 on data obtained by the analysis of standard solutions daily prepared from the stock solutions did not
54
55 show significant differences ($p>0.05$) up to 10 months when the stock solutions were stored at -18°C.
56
57
58

59 A similar behavior was observed for the long-term stability of the oral fluid samples: no significant
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 differences in the responses were obtained for all the investigated NPSs when the spiked samples were
4 maintained for 15 days at -18°C.
5

6
7
8 Bench-top stability was also proved by analyzing standard solutions maintained at room temperature up
9 to 6 h. By applying the student *t*-test, no significant differences ($p>0.05$) were observed between the
10 mean responses. Finally, as for the freeze-thaw stability, ANOVA did not show significant differences
11 among the calculated mean values ($p>0.05$) by thawing the samples at ambient temperature for 2 h over
12 a 6h period.
13
14
15

16
17
18 In order to investigate reliability of the developed method, 40 oral fluid samples collected during
19 private parties were analyzed. Only in one sample out of 40 the presence of mephedrone was detected
20 at the concentration of 5.81 ± 0.33 mg/L (n=3).
21
22

23
24
25 The results achieved were further verified by analyzing the same samples with a MEPS-GC-MS (SIM)
26 method developed and validated (Tables S2-S4) for confirmatory purposes.
27
28

29
30
31 Good agreement among the results achieved using the MEPS-DESI-HRMS screening method and the
32 confirmatory method was observed. In the case of the positive sample containing mephedrone, no
33 significance differences between the mean results were obtained ($p>0.05$), thus proving reliability of
34 the devised method for screening and quantification of NPSs in oral fluid.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Conclusions**

45
46
47
48
49
50 Advances in the determination of new psychoactive substances in oral fluid are proposed in terms of
51 new sample substrates for DESI-HRMS. The best performances were obtained when using both the
52 silica-based coating and the non-functionalized PLLA, thus allowing the rapid screening of the
53 investigated analytes in few minutes. Being a valid alternative to more laborious approaches commonly
54 used in forensic labs, the devised method proved to be suitable for high-throughput qualitative and
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 quantitative purposes. The combination of MEPS as a miniaturized sample treatment technique with
4
5
6 DESI-HRMS proved useful for the rapid screening of NPSs in oral fluid. On the other hand, since
7
8 isomers cannot be resolved by operating under the developed conditions, a further improvement could
9
10 be represented by the use of mass spectrometers able to combine ion mobility separations with high
11
12 resolution MS, providing a valuable tool to distinguish overlapped isobaric compounds, thus enhancing
13
14
15 method selectivity.
16
17
18
19

20 **Declaration of interest:** none
21
22
23
24

25 **Funding:** This work was supported by “FONDAZIONE CARIPARMA” bando “Salute pubblica, medicina
26
27 preventiva e riabilitativa 2017” within the Project “Parma contro le nuove droghe: conoscere per prevenire. Il
28
29 laboratorio a servizio del cittadino”.
30
31
32
33

34 **Supplementary data** 35 36 37 38

39 Information regarding the operating conditions, the characterization of the proposed sample surfaces
40
41 and validation data of the GC-MS (SIM) method are provided in the supporting material.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 **References**
4

- 5
6 [1] UNODC, The challenge of new psychoactive substances: Global SMART Programme, 2014.
7
8 https://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/NPS_Report.pdf (accessed December 10, 2018).
9
- 10 [2] P. Jacob, A.T. Shulgin, Patent WO9639133 1996, 19 CA 126:117961, Neurobiological
11
12 Technologies Inc, USA
13
- 14 [3] C.R. Harris, A. Brown, Synthetic cannabinoid intoxication: A case series and review, *J. Emerg.*
15
16 *Med.* 44 (2013) 360–366. doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2012.07.061.
17
18
- 19 [4] European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, European Drug Report 2018:
20
21 Trends and Developments, 2018. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
22
23 doi:10.2810/88175.
24
25
26 http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/8585/20181816_TDAT18001ENN_PDF.pdf
27
28 (accessed December 10, 2018)
29
- 30 [5] I.M. Bernhoft, C. Engblom, K. Langel, S. Houwing, B. Smink, R. Mathijssen, K. Pil, T. Vander
31
32 Linden, A.-S. Goessaert, J. Veramme, S. Van Stechelma, S.-A. Legrand, A. Verstraete, D 3.2.2
33
34 Analytical evaluation of oral fluid screening devices and preceding selection procedures in: T.
35
36 Blencowe, A. Pehrsson, P. Lillsunde, (Eds.) Project No. TREN-05-FP6TR-S07.61320-518404-DRUID
37
38 DRUID Driving under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines
39
40 <http://orbit.dtu.dk/files/137484912/druid1.pdf> (accessed December 10, 2018).
41
42
43
44
- 45 [6] S. Strano-Rossi, E. Castrignanò, L. Anzillotti, G. Serpelloni, R. Mollica, F. Tagliaro, J.P.
46
47 Pascali, D. Di Stefano, R. Sgalla, M. Chiarotti, Evaluation of four oral fluid devices (DDS®, Drugtest
48
49 5000®, Drugwipe 5+® and RapidSTAT®) for on-site monitoring drugged driving in comparison with
50
51 UHPLC-MS/MS analysis, *Forensic Sci. Int.* 221 (2012) 70–76. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2012.04.003.
52
53
54
- 55 [7] V. Gambaro, S. Arnoldi, S. Bellucci, E. Casagni, L. Dell’Acqua, L. Fumagalli, M. Pallavicini,
56
57 G. Roda, C. Rusconi, E. Valoti, Characterization of in vitro metabolites of JWH-018, JWH-073 and
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 their 4-methyl derivatives, markers of the abuse of these synthetic cannabinoids, *J. Chromatogr. B* 957
4
5 (2014) 68–76. doi:10.1016/j.jchromb.2014.03.001.
6

7
8 [8] A. Grigoryev, A. Melnik, S. Savchuk, A. Simonov, V. Rozhanets, Gas and liquid
9
10 chromatography–mass spectrometry studies on the metabolism of the synthetic phenylacetylindole
11
12 cannabimimetic JWH-250, the psychoactive component of smoking mixtures, *J. Chromatogr. B.* 879
13
14 (2011) 2519–2526. doi:10.1016/j.jchromb.2011.07.004.
15
16

17
18 [9] B.F. Thomas, B.R. Martin, In vitro metabolism of (-)-cis-3-[2-hydroxy-4-(1,1-dimethylheptyl)
19
20 phenyl]-trans-4-(3-hydroxypropyl) cyclohexanol, a synthetic bicyclic cannabinoid analog, *Drug Metab.*
21
22 *Dispos.* 18 (1990) 1046–1054.
23
24

25
26 [10] B. Moosmann, S. Kneisel, U. Girreser, V. Brecht, F. Westphal, V. Auwärter, Separation and
27
28 structural characterization of the synthetic cannabinoids JWH-412 and 1-[(5-fluoropentyl)-1H-indol-
29
30 3yl]-[4-methylnaphthalen-1-yl)methanone using GC-MS, NMR analysis and a flash chromatography
31
32 system, *Forensic Sci. Int.* 220 (2012) e17–e22. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2011.12.010.
33
34

35
36 [11] S. Kneisel, P. Bisel, V. Brecht, S. Broecker, M. Müller, V. Auwärter, Identification of the
37
38 cannabimimetic AM-1220 and its azepane isomer (N-methylazepan-3-yl)-3-(1-naphthoyl)indole in a
39
40 research chemical and several herbal mixtures, *Forensic Toxicol.* 30 (2012) 126–134.
41
42 doi:10.1007/s11419-012-0137-6.
43
44

45
46 [12] S. Dresen, S. Kneisel, W. Weinmann, R. Zimmermann, V. Auwärter, Development and
47
48 validation of a liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry method for the quantitation of
49
50 synthetic cannabinoids of the aminoalkylindole type and methanandamide in serum and its application
51
52 to forensic samples, *J. Mass Spectrom.* 46 (2011) 163–171. doi:10.1002/jms.1877.
53
54

55
56 [13] R. Gottardo, A. Bertaso, J. Pascali, D. Sorio, G. Musile, E. Trapani, C. Seri, G. Serpelloni, F.
57
58 Tagliaro, Micellar electrokinetic chromatography: A new simple tool for the analysis of synthetic
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 cannabinoids in herbal blends and for the rapid estimation of their logP values, *J. Chromatogr. A.* 1267
4
5 (2012) 198–205. doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2012.08.085.
6

7
8 [14] S. Akamatsu, T. Mitsuhashi, MEKC-MS/MS method using a volatile surfactant for the
9 simultaneous determination of 12 synthetic cannabinoids, *J. Sep. Sci.* 37 (2014) 304–307.
10
11 doi:10.1002/jssc.201301132.
12
13

14
15 [15] O. Beck, L. Rausberg, Y. Al-Saffar, T. Villen, L. Karlsson, T. Hansson, A. Helander,
16 Detectability of new psychoactive substances, “legal highs”, in CEDIA, EMIT, and KIMS
17 immunochemical screening assays for drugs of abuse, *Drug Test. Anal.* 6 (2014) 492–499.
18
19 doi:10.1002/dta.1641.
20
21
22

23
24 [16] W.C. Rodrigues, P. Catbagan, S. Rana, G. Wang, C. Moore, Detection of synthetic
25 cannabinoids in oral fluid using ELISA and LC-MS-MS, *J. Anal. Toxicol.* 37 (2013) 526–533.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

[17] A. Yanini, F.A. Esteve-Turrillas, M. de la Guardia, S. Armenta, Ion mobility spectrometry and
high resolution mass-spectrometry as methodologies for rapid identification of the last generation of
new psychoactive substances, *J. Chromatogr. A.* 1574 (2018) 91–100.
doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2018.09.006.

[18] R. Gottardo, A. Chiarini, I. Dal Prà, C. Seri, C. Rimondo, G. Serpelloni, U. Armato, F.
Tagliaro, Direct screening of herbal blends for new synthetic cannabinoids by MALDI-TOF MS, *J.*
Mass Spectrom. 47 (2012) 141–146. doi:10.1002/jms.2036.

[19] R.A. Musah, M.A. Domin, R.B. Cody, A.D. Lesiak, A. John Dane, J.R.E. Shepard, Direct
analysis in real time mass spectrometry with collision-induced dissociation for structural analysis of
synthetic cannabinoids, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 26 (2012) 2335–2342. doi:10.1002/rcm.6354.

- 1
2
3 [20] A.D. Lesiak, R.A. Musah, M.A. Domin, J.R.E. Shepard, DART-MS as a Preliminary Screening
4 Method for “Herbal Incense”: Chemical Analysis of Synthetic Cannabinoids, *J. Forensic Sci.* 59 (2014)
5 337–343. doi:10.1111/1556-4029.12354.
6
7
8
9
10 [21] R.G. Cooks, Z. Ouyang, Z. Takáts, M.W. Wiseman, *Ambient Mass Spectrometry*, *Science* 311
11 (2006) 1566–1570. doi:10.1126/science.1119426.
12
13 [22] F. Bianchi, N. Riboni, V. Termopoli, L. Mendez, I. Medina, L. Ilag, A. Cappiello, M. Careri,
14 MS-Based Analytical Techniques: Advances in Spray-Based Methods and EI-LC-MS Applications, *J.*
15 *Anal. Methods Chem.* 2018 (2018) 1–24. doi:10.1155/2018/1308167.
16
17 [23] Y. Yang, J. Deng, Analysis of pharmaceutical products and herbal medicines using ambient
18 mass spectrometry, *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.* 82 (2016) 68–88. doi:10.1016/J.TRAC.2016.04.011.
19
20 [24] M. Mattarozzi, F. Bianchi, M. Milioli, A. Cavazza, M. Careri, An innovative method based on
21 quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged, and safe extraction coupled to desorption electrospray ionization-
22 high resolution mass spectrometry for screening the presence of paralytic shellfish toxins in clams,
23 *Talanta.* 147 (2016) 416–421. doi:10.1016/j.talanta.2015.10.016.
24
25 [25] F. Bianchi, A. Gregori, G. Braun, C. Crescenzi, M. Careri, Micro-solid-phase extraction
26 coupled to desorption electrospray ionization-high-resolution mass spectrometry for the analysis of
27 explosives in soil, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 407 (2015) 931–938. doi:10.1007/s00216-014-8208-7.
28
29 [26] F. Zivolic, F. Zancanaro, D. Favretto, S. Davide Ferrara, R. Seraglia, P. Traldi, Pneumatically
30 assisted desorption/ionization: 1. Some thoughts on the possible ionization mechanism(s), *J. Mass*
31 *Spectrom.* 45 (2010) 411–420. doi:10.1002/jms.1727.
32
33 [27] A. Penna, M. Careri, N.D. Spencer, A. Rossi, Effects of Tailored Surface Chemistry on
34 Desorption Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry: A Surface-Analytical Study by XPS and AFM,
35 *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* 26 (2015) 1311–1319. doi:10.1007/s13361-015-1135-9.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3 [28] Z. Takáts, J.M. Wiseman, R.G. Cooks, Ambient mass spectrometry using desorption
4 electrospray ionization (DESI): Instrumentation, mechanisms and applications in forensics, chemistry,
5 and biology, *J. Mass Spectrom.* 40 (2005) 1261–1275. doi:10.1002/jms.922.
6
7
8
9
10 [29] A. Venter, P.E. Sojka, R.G. Cooks, Droplet dynamics and ionization mechanisms in desorption
11 electrospray ionization mass spectrometry, *Anal. Chem.* 78 (2006) 8549–8555.
12 doi:10.1021/ac0615807.
13
14
15 [30] A.U. Jackson, N. Talaty, R.G. Cooks, G.J. Van Berkel, Salt Tolerance of Desorption
16 Electrospray Ionization (DESI), *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* 18 (2007) 2218–2225.
17 doi:10.1016/j.jasms.2007.09.018.
18
19
20 [31] L. Elviri, R. Foresti, A. Bianchera, M. Silvestri, R. Bettini, 3D-printed polylactic acid supports
21 for enhanced ionization efficiency in desorption electrospray mass spectrometry analysis of liquid and
22 gel samples, *Talanta.* 155 (2016) 321–328. doi:10.1016/j.talanta.2016.05.010.
23
24
25 [32] A. Penna, L. Elviri, M. Careri, A. Mangia, G. Predieri, Investigation of novel sol–gel
26 hydrophobic surfaces for desorption electrospray ionization-mass spectrometry analysis, *Anal. Bioanal.*
27 *Chem.* 400 (2011) 1515–1523. doi:10.1007/s00216-011-4867-9.
28
29
30 [33] T.J. Kauppila, N. Talaty, P.K. Salo, T. Kotiaho, R. Kostianen, R.G. Cooks, New surfaces for
31 desorption electrospray ionization mass spectrometry: Porous silicon and ultra-thin layer
32 chromatography plates, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 20 (2006) 2143–2150. doi:10.1002/rcm.2566.
33
34
35 [34] A.M. Ares, P. Fernández, M. Regenjo, A.M. Fernández, A.M. Carro, R.A. Lorenzo, A fast
36 bioanalytical method based on microextraction by packed sorbent and UPLC–MS/MS for determining
37 new psychoactive substances in oral fluid, *Talanta.* 174 (2017) 454–461.
38 doi:10.1016/j.talanta.2017.06.022.
39
40
41 [35] F. Bianchi, M. Mattarozzi, N. Riboni, P. Mora, S.A. Gandolfi, M. Careri, A rapid
42 microextraction by packed sorbent – liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry method for the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 determination of dexamethasone disodium phosphate and dexamethasone in aqueous humor of patients
4
5
6 with uveitis, *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.* 142 (2017) 343–347. doi:10.1016/j.jpba.2017.05.025.

7
8 [36] F. Bianchi, M. Careri, A. Mangia, M. Mattarozzi, M. Musci, Experimental design for the
9
10 optimization of the extraction conditions of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in milk with a novel
11
12 diethoxydiphenylsilane solid-phase microextraction fiber, *J. Chromatogr. A.* 1196–1197 (2008) 41–45.
13
14
15 doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2008.04.018.

16
17
18 [37] R. Carlson, *Design and optimization in organic synthesis*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1992.

19
20 [38] K.H. Adolfsson, S. Hassanzadeh, M. Hakkarainen, Valorization of cellulose and waste paper to
21
22 graphene oxide quantum dots, *RSC Adv.* 5 (2015) 26550–26558. doi:10.1039/c5ra01805f.

23
24
25 [39] N.B. Erdal, K.H. Adolfsson, T. Pettersson, M. Hakkarainen, Green Strategy to Reduced
26
27 Nanographene Oxide through Microwave Assisted Transformation of Cellulose, *ACS Sustain. Chem.*
28
29 *Eng.* 6 (2018) 1245–1255. doi:10.1021/acssuschemeng.7b03566.

30
31
32 [40] Guidance for Industry, Bioanalytical Method Validation, US Department of Health and Human
33
34 Services, Food and Drug Administration, 2018.
35
36
37 <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/drugs/guidances/ucm070107.pdf>

38
39
40 [41] E. Honarvar, A.R. Venter, Comparing the Effects of Additives on Protein Analysis Between
41
42 Desorption Electrospray (DESI) and Electrospray Ionization (ESI), *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* 29
43
44 (2018) 2443–2455. doi:10.1007/s13361-018-2058-z.

45
46
47 [42] N. Aminlashgari, M. Shariatgorji, L.L. Ilag, M. Hakkarainen, Nanocomposites as novel surfaces
48
49 for laser desorption ionization mass spectrometry, *Anal. Methods.* 3 (2011) 192–197.
50
51
52 doi:10.1039/c0ay00531b.

53
54
55 [43] M. Sergi, C. Montesano, S. Odoardi, L. Mainero Rocca, G. Fabrizi, D. Compagnone, R. Curini,
56
57 Micro extraction by packed sorbent coupled to liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry for
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the rapid and sensitive determination of cannabinoids in oral fluids, *J. Chromatogr. A.* 1301 (2013)
139–146. doi:10.1016/j.chroma.2013.05.072.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure captions

Fig. 1. Effect of the spray composition on the DESI-HRMS responses of the investigated NPSs

Fig. 2. AFM images of the non functionalized PLLA (top) and silica-based coating (bottom): optical microscopy view (left) and error-signal images of surface morphology (right)

Fig. 3. SEM micrographs of the non-functionalized PLLA (left) and silica-based coating (right)

Fig. 4. DESI-HRMS responses of NPSs (1 mg/L) spotted on different sample substrates. Positive ionization mode for ketamine, mephedrone, UR-144, JWH-250, JWH-200, JWH-019, JWH-122, AM-2201, JWH-081; negative ionization mode for HU-211, CP,47-497 and CP,47-497 C₈

Table 1

DESI operating conditions

	Positive ion mode	Negative ion mode
solvent flow ($\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$)	1	2
spray voltage (kV)	4	-3.5
tube lens voltage (V)	100	100
capillary voltage (V)	15	15
capillary temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	250	250
nitrogen pressure (bar)	8.5	8.5
incident angle ($^{\circ}$)	50	50
collection angle ($^{\circ}$)	40	40
tip-to-surface distance (mm)	1.7	1.7
inlet-to-surface distance (mm)	0.5	0.5
tip-to-inlet distance (mm)	3.6	3.6
spray tip length (mm)	1	1
source ion fragmentation (V)	-	35
sampling substrate	PLA	TEOS
additive	-	NH_4OH

Table 2Monitored ions for quantitative analysis and corresponding exact m/z ratio values

Compound	Ion	Theoretical m/z	Measured m/z	Δm (ppm)
Ketamine	[M+H] ⁺	238.09959	238.09921	0.62
Ketamine d ₄	[M+H] ⁺	242.12443	242.1483	0.66
Mephedrone	[M+H] ⁺	178.12267	178.12267	0.12
UR-144	[M+H] ⁺	312.23257	312.23199	0.23
JWH-250	[M+H] ⁺	336.19666	336.19666	0.25
JWH-200	[M+H] ⁺	385.19073	385.19073	0.28
JWH-122 and JWH-019	[M+H] ⁺	356.20157	356.20157	0.27
AM-2211	[M+H] ⁺	360.17566	360.17566	0.26
JWH-081	[M+H] ⁺	372.19556	372.19556	0.28
HU-211	[M] ⁻	385.28155	385.27451	0.79
CP,47-497	[M] ⁻	317.24751	317.24829	0.78
CP,47-497 C ₈	[M] ⁻	331.26316	331.26385	0.69
THC-COOH d ₃	[M] ⁻	346.20922	346.20975	0.53

Table 3

Contact angle values (standard deviation in parenthesis)

Material	Contact angle \pm st.dev. ($^{\circ}$)
PTFE	131 (\pm 1)
PLLA	72 (\pm 1)
PLLA nGO	70 (\pm 1)
PLLA r-nGO	83 (\pm 4)
Silica-based coating	92 (\pm 1)

Table 4

LLOQs, linearity and regression coefficients of the MEPS-DESI-HRMS method

Compound	LLOQ (mg/L)	Range (mg/L)	a (\pm st.dev. _a)*
Ketamine	0.05	LLOQ - 10	0.860 (\pm 0.013)
Mephedrone	0.05	LLOQ - 10	0.819 (\pm 0.010)
UR-144	0.5	LLOQ - 10	1.562 (\pm 0.014)
JWH-250	0.25	LLOQ - 10	2.560 (\pm 0.044)
JWH-200	0.25	LLOQ - 10	0.303 (\pm 0.006)
JWH-019 and JWH-122	0.25	LLOQ - 10	2.612 (\pm 0.055)
AM-2201	0.25	LLOQ - 10	0.709 (\pm 0.015)
JWH-081	0.25	LLOQ - 10	1.724 (\pm 0.022)
CP,47-497	0.25	LLOQ - 5	2.923 (\pm 0.075)
CP,47-497 C ₈	0.25	LLOQ - 5	2.723 (\pm 0.055)
HU-211	0.25	LLOQ- 5	1.174 (\pm 0.023)

*Regression equation: $y=ax$

Table 5

Within-run and between run precision (CV%) of the MEPS-DESI-HRMS method

Compound	Within-run*				Between run*			
		(CV%)				(CV%)		
	LLOQ	Low level	Medium level	High level	LLOQ	Low level	Medium level	High level
Ketamine	3.2	3.0	4.2	3.0	9.6	8.2	9.0	7.3
Mephedrone	10.4	7.2	6.3	4.9	19.0	12.3	7.1	5.1
UR-144	15.9	12.8	10.6	1.5	18.8	15.0	13.2	9.4
JWH-250	5.0	4.1	6.1	1.7	15.6	12.9	10.7	9.3
JWH-200	9.1	11.3	10.7	12	19.4	14.8	12.9	14.5
JWH-019/JWH-122	11.2	6.7	5.3	2.2	19.0	11.8	10.1	9.6
AM-2201	11.3	8.4	6.6	1.2	18.7	10.0	8.4	6.2
JWH-081	1.4	2.8	2.9	3.2	19.0	13.6	10.5	9.4
CP,47-497	8.1	9.4	10.5	9.9	8.8	12.8	9.6	12.3
CP,47-497 C ₈	5.5	10.4	6.1	7.3	16.3	10.3	9.9	11.9
HU-211	6.7	9.8	8.3	6.1	19.9	14.7	14.2	13.7

*low level: 1 mg/L, medium level: 5 mg/L, high level: 10 mg/L for all the analytes except for UR-144 (low level: 2.5 mg/L; medium level: 5 mg/L and high level: 10 mg/L), HU-211, CP47,497 and the C8 homologous (low level: 1 mg/L; medium level: 2.5 mg/L; and high level: 5 mg/L).

Table 6

RR% (n=6) of the MEPS-DESI-HRMS method

Compound	Recovery Rate% (\pm s.d.)			
	LLOQ	Low level	Medium level	High level
Ketamine	108 (\pm 2)	120 (\pm 2)	105 (\pm 4)	99 (\pm 3)
Mephedrone	96 (\pm 3)	102 (\pm 1)	100 (\pm 2)	100 (\pm 5)
UR-144	102 (\pm 2)	101 (\pm 2)	101 (\pm 6)	100 (\pm 1)
JWH-250	95 (\pm 1)	85 (\pm 4)	88 (\pm 2)	100 (\pm 2)
JWH-200	90 (\pm 3)	87 (\pm 2)	91 (\pm 8)	100 (\pm 1)
JWH-019/JWH-122	96 (\pm 2)	101 (\pm 2)	100 (\pm 3)	100 (\pm 2)
AM-2201	89 (\pm 6)	83 (\pm 8)	88 (\pm 3)	100 (\pm 1)
JWH-081	90 (\pm 3)	86 (\pm 1)	93 (\pm 4)	100 (\pm 1)
CP,47-497	107 (\pm 6)	115 (\pm 1)	114 (\pm 2)	105 (\pm 12)
CP,47-497 C ₈	115 (\pm 5)	113 (\pm 4)	111 (\pm 3)	99 (\pm 7)
HU-211	94 (\pm 4)	87 (\pm 6)	103 (\pm 8)	100 (\pm 6)

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)







Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)






Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



CHECKLIST

- Cover letter
- Novelty statement
- Highlights
- Manuscript
- Table 1
- Table 2
- Table 3
- Table 4
- Table 5
- Table 6
- Figure 1
- Figure 2
- Figure 3
- Figure 4
- List of Potential Reviewers
- Supplementary material
- Graphical abstract

Suggested Reviewers

Dr. Valentina Pirro
Department of Chemistry
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA
e-mail: vpirro@purdue.edu

Prof. Ingela Lanekoff
Department of Chemistry
Uppsala University, 75124 Uppsala, Sweden
phone +4618-471 3673
e-mail: ingela.lanekoff@kemi.uu.se

Dr. Giovanni Serpelloni
Dipartimento Dipendenze e Centro di Medicina Comunitaria
Azienda ULSS 20 di Verona
Tel. 045 8622235 Fax 045 8622239
e-mail: giovanni.serpelloni@aulss9.veneto.it

Dr. Carlo Locatelli
IRCCS Fondazione Salvatore Maugeri
Via Salvatore Maugeri, 10
27100 Pavia
Tel: 0382.26261
Fax: 0382.24605
e-mail: carlo.locatelli@icsmaugeri.it

Prof. Achille Cappiello
Department of Pure and Applied Sciences, University of Urbino Carlo Bo, Urbino, Italy
phone: +39 3397993531
e-mail: achille.cappiello@uniurb.it

Supplementary Material

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: Supplementary material.docx](#)

