



HAL
open science

Monitoring of metals in surface waters: an in situ intercomparison exercise on passive samplers

A. Dabrin, J.L. Gonzalez, J.P. Ghestem, Emmanuelle Uher, Cecile Miege, Marina Coquery, I.J. Allan, M. Schintu, J. Balaam, E. Peinerud, et al.

► To cite this version:

A. Dabrin, J.L. Gonzalez, J.P. Ghestem, Emmanuelle Uher, Cecile Miege, et al.. Monitoring of metals in surface waters: an in situ intercomparison exercise on passive samplers. 6th International Passive Sampling Workshop IPSW, Jun 2013, Bordeaux, France. pp.1, 2013. hal-02599289

HAL Id: hal-02599289

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02599289v1>

Submitted on 16 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

an in situ intercomparison exercise on passive samplers

A. Dabrin^{1*}, J-L. Gonzalez², J-P. Ghestem³, E. Uher⁴, C. Miège¹, M. Coquery¹
I.J Allan⁵, M. Schintu⁶, J. Balaam⁷, E. Peinerud⁸, N Montero⁹, N. Chhim¹⁰

¹IRSTEA, UR MALY, 5 rue de la Doua, CS700077, F-69626 Villeurbanne Cedex, France, ²Ifremer, F- 83507,La Seyne/Mer, France, ³BRGM, F-45060, Orléans, France, ⁴Irstea, UR HBAN, F-92163, Antony, France.

⁵NIVA, Oslo, Norway, ⁶Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italy, ⁷Cefas, Centre for the Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, Lowestoft, United Kingdom, ⁸ALS Scandinavia, Sweden, ⁹AZTI-Tecnalia, Marine Research Division, 20110 Pasaia, Spain, ¹⁰EDF R&D, LNHE, Moret-sur-Loing, France

*: corresponding author (aymeric.dabrin@irstea.fr)

1 Objective of the AQUAREF intercomparison passive sampling exercise

Context: In the context of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and the Water Framework Directive (WFD), monitoring of marine waters and freshwaters quality became a crucial point. Thus, there is a need to apply innovative sampling tools in surface waters such as passive samplers, taking into account temporal and spatial aspects, with a limited cost and easy to use by non-expert routine laboratories.

Aim: To assess the relevance of passive samplers for the monitoring of metals in surface freshwaters and coastal waters, an in-situ intercomparison passive sampling exercise was realised in 2010. The aim of this study was to assess interlaboratory variability, at each step of the exercise leading to a "dissolved-labile" metal Time Weighted Average Concentration (TWAC).

2 Description of the trials

2 sampling sites



Thau Lagoon (Hérault)



Rhône River: Ternay site

Common constraints

- Exposure of passive samplers

Exposure in triplicate (7 days)
Field blank

- Analytical control (QC)

Analysis of a reference solution (8 metals at 1 µg/L)

- Target metals

Priority substances (WFD): **Cd, Pb and Ni**

Other metals (including 3 of the good ecological status):
Cr, Zn, Cu, Mn and Co

10 European expert laboratories

5 FR, ES, UK, SWE, NO, IT
(10 at Ternay site, 6 at Thau site)

Lab usual tools & protocols

- 3 types of passive samplers

DGT OP: Diffusive Gradient in Thin films (Chelex-100, « open pores » gel)

DGT RP: Chelex-100, « restrictive pores » gel



Chemcatcher® (Empore chelating disc)

- Analytical procedures

Elution (HNO₃ 1M), ICP-MS or GF/AAS

- Data treatment

Diffusion coefficients from literature



3 Significant Results

Data dispersion of passive samplers


Passive sampler data

SWIFT - WFD proficiency Testing Exercise (2006)

Metals	Ternay site				Thau site				LQ Water µg/L	Robust mean			n
	Robust mean x* ± SD (µg/L)	RSD %	n		Robust mean x* ± SD (µg/L)	RSD %	n	x* ± SD (µg/L)		RSD %	n		
Cd	0.005 ± 0.003	58	12		0.027 ± 0.025	92	7	0.010	0.09 ± 0.08	89	27		
Cr	0.076 ± 0.070	93	11		0.036 ± 0.029	80	7	0.050	1.73 ± 1.57	91	36		
Cu	0.367 ± 0.153	42	13		0.233 ± 0.1089	47	7	0.050	4.15 ± 1.66	40	42		
Mn	3.47 ± 0.99	28	11		7.48 ± 2.646	35	7	0.100	154 ± 17	11	47		
Ni	0.392 ± 0.139	35	13		0.261 ± 0.1265	48	7	0.050	1.85 ± 1.40	75	32		
Pb	0.063 ± 0.070	112	12		0.021 ± 0.012	58	6	0.010	1.20 ± 0.83	69	31		
Zn	1.40 ± 1.10	79	10		3.15 ± 3.13	99	5	0.500	12.3 ± 2.8	23	39		



- PSs allow to decrease limit of quantification (LQ).
- Comparison with a classical proficiency testing exercise, only taking into account analytical procedure, show a **similar dispersion for Cd, Cr and Cu**, a **lower dispersion for Ni**, and a **higher dispersion of PSs data for Pb and Zn**.
- The reproducibility is very satisfying considering the different tools and analytical procedures. Since analytical variability was low in this exercise (from 8 to 25%), the dispersion was mainly due to PS deployment step.

Comparison of TWAC vs Spot sampling




- TWAC were systematically lower or similar to total dissolved concentrations obtained after spot sampling
- For example, dissolved Mn was totally sampled, while only 35% of dissolved Cu was sampled by PSs.


Comparison of passive sampling results from various tools and laboratories



• For Cd, results are similar except for 3 labs which showed high within-laboratory variability for PSs data. No significant differences between DGT with open or restrictive pores were found.




• Pb presents high variability with 6 labs out of 10 in where aberrant values for CQ or PSs were obtained.




• For Ni, results of PSs are homogeneous (except one outlier) and no differences between Chemcatcher, DGT OP and DGT RP results were found.

Field and lab blanks



• Mass of Co, Cu, Mn, and Ni in field blanks are relatively low compared with the mass in tools deployed in situ, which is not the case for Cd, Cr, Pb and Zn

• For example, high Cd contents in DGT field blanks seem related to a contamination from the DGT resin (DGT lab-blank)



For more information: Miège et al, Trends Anal. Chem., 2012,36, 128-143
www.aquaref.fr/reunion-de-restitution-essai-interlaboratoire-echantillonneurs-integratifs