

Use of passive sampling and high resolution mass spectrometry using a suspect screening approach to characterise emerging pollutants in contaminated groundwater and runoff

Lucie Pinasseau, Laure Wiest, Aurélie Fildier, Laurence Volatier, Gary Fones, Graham Mills, Florian Mermillod-Blondin, Emmanuelle Vulliet

To cite this version:

Lucie Pinasseau, Laure Wiest, Aurélie Fildier, Laurence Volatier, Gary Fones, et al.. Use of passive sampling and high resolution mass spectrometry using a suspect screening approach to characterise emerging pollutants in contaminated groundwater and runoff. Science of the Total Environment, 2019, 672, pp.253-263. $10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.489$. hal-02137023

HAL Id: hal-02137023 <https://univ-lyon1.hal.science/hal-02137023>

Submitted on 22 Oct 2021

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.

[Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Version of Record: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969719315050> Manuscript_2d76c06362cae876edbc0c7f63056ddb

- 1 **Use of passive sampling and high resolution mass spectrometry using a suspect screening**
- 2 **approach to characterise emerging pollutants in contaminated groundwater and runoff**
- 3 Lucie Pinasseau^a, Laure Wiest^a, Aurélie Fildier^a, Laurence Volatier^b, Gary R. Fones^c, Graham
- A. Mills^d, Florian Mermillod-Blondin^b, Emmanuelle Vulliet^a 4
- 5
- 6 ^aUniv Lyon, CNRS, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Institut des Sciences Analytiques,
- 7 UMR 5280, 5 Rue de la Doua, F-69100, Villeurbanne, France
- 8 bUniv Lyon, CNRS, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, ENTPE, Ecologie des Hydrosystèmes
- 9 Naturels et Anthropisés, UMR 5023, 6 Rue Raphaël Dubois, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France
- 10 ^cSchool of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Portsmouth, Burnaby Road, 11 Portsmouth, PO1 3QL, UK
- ^dSchool of Pharmacy and Biomedical Sciences, University of Portsmouth, White Swan Road,
- 13 Portsmouth, PO1 2DT, UK
- 14 ***Corresponding author:** emmanuelle.vulliet@isa-lyon.fr
- 15
- 16 Declarations of interest: none.

Abstract

Groundwater systems are being increasingly used to provide potable and other water supplies. Due to human activities, a range of organic pollutants is often detected in groundwater. One source of groundwater contamination is via stormwater infiltration basins, however, there is little information on the types of compounds present in these collection systems and their influence on the underlying groundwater. We developed an analytical strategy based on the use of passive sampling combined with liquid chromatography/high resolution quadrupole-time-of-flight mass spectrometry for screening for the presence of pesticide and pharmaceutical 25 compounds in groundwater and stormwater runoff. Empore™ disk-based passive samplers (SDB-RPS and SDB-XC sorbents) were exposed, using for the first time a new specially designed deployment rig, for 10 days during a rainfall event in five different stormwater infiltration systems around Lyon, France. Stormwater runoff and groundwater (via a well, upstream and downstream of each basin) was sampled. Exposed Empore™ disks were solvent extracted (acetone and methanol) and the extracts analysed using a specific suspect compound screening workflow. High resolution mass spectrometry coupled with a suspect screening approach was found to be a useful tool as it allows a more comprehensive analysis than with targeted screening whilst being less time consuming than non-targeted screening. Using this analytical approach, 101 suspect compounds were tentatively identified, with 40 of this set being subsequently confirmed. The chemicals detected included fungicides, herbicides, insecticides, indicators of human activity, antibiotics, antiepileptics, antihypertensive and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs as well as their metabolites. Polar pesticides were mainly detected in groundwater and pharmaceuticals were more frequently found in runoff. In terms of detection frequency of the pollutants, groundwater impacted by infiltration was found not to be significantly more contaminated than non-impacted groundwater.

(Highlights

resolution mass spectrometry, polar pharmaceuticals and pesticides, suspect screening

1. Introduction

Groundwater and associated aquatic systems are used extensively for the supply of potable water and for agricultural and industrial uses. Urbanisation and a growing global population have resulted in over-exploitation of this resource, particularly for drinking water supplies (Danielopol et al., 2004). Although groundwater is a vital and strategic resource, such aquatic systems are facing a decrease in their quality due to increased anthropogenic activities. Over the last decade, a wide range of contaminants have been detected in various groundwater sources (Lapworth et al., 2012; Stuart et al., 2012; Vulliet et al., 2014; Postigo and Barceló, 2015; Kurwadkar, 2017; Mali et al., 2017). Some of the pharmaceutical and pesticide 62 compounds typically found can be present at concentrations of up to hundreds of ng L^{-1} . Some 63 of their transformation products and metabolites were found from sub-ng L^{-1} to tens of μ g L^{-1} . Atrazine, carbamazepine, desethyl atrazine, DEET (*N,N*-diethyl-meta-toluamide) and sulfamethoxazole were among the most frequently detected compounds in groundwater (Vulliet and Cren-Olivé, 2011; Stuart et al., 2014; Lopez et al., 2015).

One potential major source of groundwater contamination is associated with stormwater infiltration systems (SIS) that were initially designed to reduce the risk of flooding in urban areas (Fletcher et al., 2015). These SISs are often detention and infiltration basins collecting stormwater runoff from commercial, industrial or residential areas. Stormwater runoff is infiltrated from the surface to the aquifer through a porous medium (i.e. soil and vadose zone) acting as a barrier against pollutants (Mason et al., 1999). Nevertheless, the environmental efficiency of these SISs remains closely dependent on the capacity of infiltration medium to remove/retain contaminants from infiltrated water (Sébastian et al., 2015). For example, common urban contaminants such as heavy metals or polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons which are often attached to particles are efficiently retained by the soil infiltration basins (Winiarski et al., 2006). Nevertheless, little is known about the impact of infiltration practices on groundwater contamination by more polar and emerging organic pollutants. Thus, there is an urgent need to determine precisely the occurrence of organic contaminants such as certain polar pesticides and pharmaceuticals in groundwater and runoff in connection with infiltration basins.

A number of analytical methods have been developed for the measurement of polar organic contaminants in water, in particular high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) coupled with a triple quadrupole mass spectrometer (Q-q-Q) (Jansson and Kreuger, 2010; Lissalde et al., 2011; Petrie et al., 2016b). However, this operational mode has some limitations as, since it is a targeted analysis, only a pre-defined/determined list of compounds can be analysed and reference standards are needed. To circumvent these limitations, high resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) allows the detection of a large number of compounds without reference standards or pre-selection and enables comprehensive screening of pollutants to be facilitated

(Leendert et al., 2015). Two major approaches for post measurement processing exist: non-target screening (with no prior information), and suspect screening (with suspected substances based on prior information) (Schymanski et al., 2014b). HRMS coupled with a suspect screening approach is a useful tool as it allows a more comprehensive analysis than with target screening whilst being less time consuming than non-target screening. When analysing complex samples, suspect screening together with an adapted workflow is a good balance between target and non-target screening. Workflow is particularly important as it allows to narrow the positive findings by prioritizing compounds following specific thresholds while saving time and effort. Several suspect screening workflows are proposed in the literature. All are filtering strategies based on parameters such as exact mass, isotope pattern, signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio, retention time, peak shape and blank removal (Segura et al., 2011; Hug et al., 2014; Sjerps et al., 2016; Causanilles et al., 2017; Gago-Ferrero et al., 2018). They rely on comparison with commercial (Kaserzon et al., 2017; Pochodylo and Helbling, 2017) or in-house (Causanilles et al., 2017; Segura et al., 2011) databases. Replacement or adjustment of parts of HPLC-HRMS system might lead to changes in chromatography or mass measurement. Even minor, these changes could lead to non-accurate results when applying the suspect screening workflow. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to develop a workflow well adapted to the used analytical instrument, as well as the environmental matrix analysed.

Another challenge concerning the measurement of organic contaminants in groundwater is that they generally occur at low and variable concentrations. In most studies, spot (bottle or grab) sampling is the chosen method used for monitoring purposes (Duong et al., 2015; Lopez et al., 2015; Manamsa et al., 2016; Pitarch et al., 2016; Sorensen et al., 2015). However, this approach only provides a snapshot of contamination at a given time and, therefore, may not be truly representative of the appertaining environmental conditions over time. The use of passive sampling devices such as the polar organic chemical integrative sampler (POCIS) (Alvarez et 115 al., 2004; Van Metre et al., 2017), Chemcatcher® (Charriau et al., 2016; Lissalde et al., 2016; Petrie et al., 2016a) or the Empore™ disk (ED)-based sampler (Stephens et al., 2005; Shaw and Mueller, 2009; Stephens et al., 2009; Vermeirssen et al., 2013) are potentially able to overcome some of these limitations and to provide a more representative assessment of groundwater contamination. To the best of our knowledge, only two studies have been reported on the combination of passive sampling with HRMS for the assessment of contaminants in groundwater (Soulier et al., 2016) and surface water (Guibal et al., 2015). Both were based on the use of POCIS. This is the first time that an ED passive sampler is combined with suspect screening for assessment of groundwater contamination. This article also describes for the first time a novel type of rig which enabled the deployment in well bore holes.

The aims of the present study were: (i) to develop a novel analytical strategy that combines ED passive samplers with HRMS analysis for suspect screening of emerging pollutants in groundwater; (ii) to apply this strategy in the field to study the occurrence of pesticides and pharmaceuticals and to make assumptions about the potential transfer of compounds from surface to groundwater. To achieve this, a field study was conducted at five SISs during a storm weather event. The potential impact of infiltration practices on groundwater contamination was measured by comparing occurrence of pesticides and pharmaceuticals in stormwater runoff, SIS-non-impacted and SIS-impacted groundwater.

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Field site description

Field trials were undertaken at five SIS located in the eastern metropolitan area of Lyon, France (Fig. 1) (further details of the SIS are given in (Marmonier et al., 2013; Voisin et al., 2018). Unsaturated zone thickness, well depth, infiltration surface, catchment area and surroundings areas are given in Table S1. The five SIS (Django Reinhardt (DJR), Chemin de Feyzin (FEY), Grange Blanche (GB), Campus of the University Lyon 1 (IUT) and Minerve (MIN)) collected stormwater runoff from commercial, residential and/or industrial areas. Each site had a plastic tank placed at the surface of the SIS for collecting runoff and two wells (boreholes) to enable groundwater monitoring. One well was located in an upstream zone not impacted by the stormwater runoff plume (SIS-non-impacted well) and the other well located in the downstream aquifer zone impacted by stormwater runoff (SIS-impacted well) (Fig. 1). The wells were lined with either polyvinyl chloride or methacrylate tubes (with a minimum internal 147 diameter of 5.5 cm) perforated at their lower end (0.5 m) to establish an efficient hydraulic connection with the aquifer. Previous work has shown that at these five sites, the bulk water properties (conductivity, dissolved oxygen and temperature) found in the wells did not differ 150 from that of the groundwater in the aquifer (Foulquier et al., 2010; Voisin et al., 2018).

Fig. 1. Stormwater infiltration systems (SIS) in the Lyon conurbation investigated in this work; (a) geographical locations of the five SIS, and (b) position of the sampling points in each SIS. 154 DJR = Django-Reinhardt, $FEY = Feyzin$, $GB = Grange$ Blanche, IUT= Campus of the

University Lyon 1, MIN = Minerve. (Figure modified from Foulquier et al., 2009 and Voisin et al., 2018).

2.2. Chemicals and reagents

Adenine, adenosine, atenolol, atrazine, atrazine-desethyl, atrazine-desethyl-desisopropyl, boscalid, bromacil, caffeine, carbamazepine, carbendazim, cotinine, DEET, 2,6- dichlorobenzamide, diclofenac, diuron, fluopyram, hexazinone, imidacloprid, lamotrigine, lidocaine, metformin, metolachlor, morphine, nicotinamide, nicotine, paracetamol, prochloraz, propiconazole, propyzamide, prosulfocarb, simazine, sulfamethoxazole, theobromine, tramadol and venlafaxine were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Saint-Quentin Fallavier, France). Diflufenican and isoproturon were purchased from Riedel de Haen (Hanover, Germany). Irbesartan, telmisartan and valsartan were purchased from Tokyo Chemical Industry (Tokyo, Japan). Ethidimuron was purchased from Dr Ehrenstorfer (Augsburg, Germany). The purity of all chemicals was > 96%. Methanol (MeOH) (LC-MS grade) was from BioSolve (Dieuse, France). Acetone, ammonium formate and formic acid were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Milli-Q water (Millipore, Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, France) was used for all procedures. Individual stock solutions (1 mg mL^{-1}) were prepared in methanol (MeOH) or water depending on their specific solubilities. These stock solutions were then diluted or mixed to obtain the various working solutions.

2.3. Passive sampler preparation, deployment and extraction

SDB-RPS and SDB-XC Empore™ cross-linked co-polymeric resin EDs (47 mm diameter, 12 µm particle size, 0.5 mm thick (3M, Neuss, Germany)) are poly(styrenedivinylbenzene) (modified with sulfonic acid groups for SDB-RPS) used as reversed phase sorbent. Both are 100% co-polymeric particles that are spherical and porous. The SDB-RPS exhibits secondary cationic exchange due to sulfonic acid groups unlike the SDB-XC, which does not have a pH limitation. These sorbents are known to be able to retain hydrophobic and semi-polar analytes. These disks were, therefore, well suited to sequester the wide range of emerging pollutants that were likely to be found in the field trial sites. It should be noted, however, that the SDB disks will only sequester compounds that have an affinity for the sorbent and are able to bind to the material. It will not be efficient for the uptake of ionic compounds, such as acidic drugs; including diclofenac, ibuprofen and naproxen that are widely used as non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (Lindqvist et al., 2005). Such disks can be pre-cleaned prior to use and extracted after deployment easily using a simple funnel extraction system. They were conditioned by soaking in MeOH overnight then in water (5 min) prior to placing them on the deployment rig (Fig 2 and S1a). The deployment rig comprised of two custom made stainless 191 steel components (AT Engineering, Tadley, UK). An inner mesh $(0.25 \times 0.25 \text{ cm}^2)$ cylindrical cage (19 cm high, 4.5 cm diameter, Fig. 2) with four circular strengthening rods/supports and 'eye' ring to enable the device to be suspended at the required depth in the well using a rope line. A similar size outer mesh that was capable of being formed into a cylinder was used to secure the ED passive samplers (Fig. S1a). Four SDB-RPS and four SDB-XC EDs were carefully and evenly placed on the outer mesh support (Fig. S1a). The EDs were held in place by placing the inner mesh inside of the outer mesh and securing it using four stainless steel cable ties. Using this sized mesh allowed a good exchange of the surrounding water in the well with each of the ED. The deployment rigs (~ 4.7 cm overall external diameter) were designed to fit comfortably down the well bore holes (~ 5.5 cm diameter) (Fig. S1b). After assembly, each rig was fully submerged in Milli-Q water (2 L sealable glass jar) and stored at 4°C prior to deployment. Jars were transported to the deployment sites in cool boxes. A total of fifteen deployment rigs were used: five SIS, with three sampling points per SIS (tanks collecting stormwater runoff entering the basin, and SIS-non-impacted and SIS-impacted wells). Rigs 205 were deployed for ten days between $8th$ - $18th$ of December, 2017. The rigs were kept fully submerged in the tanks and at various depths below the aquifer in the wells (see Table S1). The deployment period coincided with several successive rainfall events (Fig. S2) so it was hoped that the EDs would sequester different types of pollutants associated with these stochastic 209 events. Water conductance and temperature (LTC Levelogger[®] Junior, Solinst, Canada), 210 dissolved oxygen (HOBO[®] U26, Onset, USA) and pH was measured during the trial. pH of the various water samples was between 7.2 and 8.1 during the deployment period of the rigs.

Fig. 2. Deployment rig showing the inner and outer stainless steel mesh components. In this 214 example, supporting three $EmporeTM$ disks.

After the deployment period, the rigs were taken back to the laboratory in cool boxes. The rig was disassembled and the EDs removed using tweezers. The acetone followed by MeOH extraction step is known to be a powerful solvent combination and give high extraction efficiencies of semi-polar and polar analytes sequestered on SDB Empore™ disks (Vermeirssen et al., 2009, 2013). Consequently, the EDs were stored in acetone (10 mL) at 220 4 °C. For processing, the vials containing the EDs were allowed to reach room temperature and rolled in a tube rotator (10 min). Subsequently, the acetone was transferred to a new vial. 222 MeOH (10 mL) was added to the ED and the vial was rolled for another 10 min. The acetone and MeOH fractions of each of the four SDB-XC or SDB-RPS disks per support were pooled (80 mL) together in order to subsequently make a more concentrated extract. The combined extracts were reduced to dryness under a gentle stream of nitrogen and stored at -20°C. Prior to analysis, extracts were reconstituted (500 µL) in water/MeOH (90/10, *v/v*).

2.4. Instrumental analysis

229 Extracts were analysed using an Ultimate 3000 UHPLC system (Thermo Scientific®, MA, USA) equipped with a binary pump and reversed-phase analytical column, coupled to a 231 quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometer $(Q$ -ToF) (Maxis Plus, Bruker Daltonics[®], Bremen, Germany). The software used to control the instrument and to acquire data was 233 otofControl 4.1 and HystarTM 4.1 (Bruker Daltonics[®]). Data Analysis[®] 4.4 and Target Analysis 234 for Screening and Quantitation $(TASO)^{\circledast}$ 1.4 (Bruker Daltonics[®]) were used for data processing. TASO[®] 1.4 includes two data bases (PesticideScreener 2.1 and ToxScreener 2.1) of about 2,500 pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds.

238 Separations were carried out using an Acclaim RSLC C_{18} column (2.1 x 100 mm, 2.2 μ m 239 particles, Thermo Fischer Scientific) maintained at 30° C; the injection volume was $5 \mu L$. The mobile phases consisted of: (A) water/MeOH (90/10, *v/v*); and (B) MeOH; with 5 mM ammonium formate and 0.01% formic acid in both phases for both positive and negative ionisation modes. The binary elution gradient started with 1% of (B) at a flow rate of 0.2 mL 243 min⁻¹ for 1 min, gradually increasing to 39% (B) for the next 2 min then increasing to 99.9% 244 (B) at 0.4 mL min⁻¹ for the following 11 min. The last condition was kept constant for 2 min 245 (flow rate 0.48 mL min⁻¹), then the initial conditions (1% B-99% A) were restored within 0.1 246 min (flow rate decreased to 0.2 mL min⁻¹) to re-equilibrate the column prior to the next injection.

The Q-ToF system was equipped with an electrospray ionization interface (ESI) operating in positive or negative ionization modes with the following settings: capillary voltage of 3,600 V, 251 end plate offset of 500 V, nebulizer pressure of 3 bar (N_2) , drying gas of 9 L min⁻¹ (N_2) , and drying temperature of 200°C. The analysis was performed in full scan over the mass range of 80-1000 Da, with a scan rate of 1 Hz. The analysis was carried out in profile mode with the following transfer parameters: funnel 1 RF of 200 Vpp, multipole RF of 50 Vpp, quadrupole energy of 5 eV, collision energy of 7 eV, stepping basic and a pre-pulse storage of 5 ms. The instrument resolution was estimated at 20,738 (FWHM) at *m/z* = 376.0381. A solution of 257 sodium formate and acetate (10 mM) to form clusters was used for external calibration at the beginning of each run. The ions selected for recalibrating the mass axis were the protonated 259 reference ions $([M+H]⁺$, 34 masses from 90.9766 to 948.8727) with high precision calibration (HPC) mode at a search range ± 0.05 *m/z*. Accepted standard deviations were below 0.5 ppm.

2.5. Liquid chromatography-Q-ToF data acquisition

MS/MS experiments were conducted using three different data acquisition modes: MS, broadband collision induced dissociation mode (bbCID, data independent analysis) and autoMS/MS mode (data dependent analysis) with a cycle time of 3 s and an acquisition frequency 266 of 1 Hz in order to record 1 spectra s^{-1} . Unspiked and spiked extracts (with reference 267 compounds at 500 μ g L⁻¹) were injected using the auto-MS/MS mode.

For quality assurance / quality control (QA/QC), several laboratory control samples were used. Mass accuracy of the detector was monitored at the beginning of each run and recalibrated if mass error exceeded 0.5 ppm. A quality control was injected every 12 analyses to check 271 retention times and sensitivity during data acquisition. This was a mix of 10 μ L of each extract 272 and spiked at 500 μ g L⁻¹ with a standard solution of eight compounds: atrazine, atrazine-desethyl-desisopropyl, boscalid, carbendazim, diclofenac, imidacloprid, prochloraz and sulfamethoxazole. These compounds were also used to correct the database retention times. Background signals were identified by analysis of blanks (solvent blank and procedural blank). Solvent blanks were also injected to monitor column carryover.

2.6. Filtering strategy

Filtering of information was undertaken by comparing experimental sample data with theoretical data for each compound. All precursor and product ions were evaluated using three 281 criteria (i) retention time (Δt_R) , (ii) m/z $(\Delta m/z)$ and (iii) isotope pattern (expressed as mSigma) (Table S2). Deviations between experimental and theoretical data were scored high [H], medium [M] or low [L] according to tolerance thresholds set for each of the three criteria. Additionally, the detection of at least one product ion for each precursor ion was mandatory. T-scores correspond to the combination of the scores for each of the three criteria for both precursor and product ions; the detailed calculation of these values is detailed in Table S2. Compounds had to meet three criteria to appear in the wide list of suspects: a retention time 288 deviation within the tolerance threshold of \pm 0.5 min, a low T-score and at least one product ion detected (Fig. 3). Then, the final list of suspects was built as follows: compounds having a very high T-score were definitively considered as suspects without further verification; for compounds having high, medium or low T-scores, manual verification of chromatographic peak shapes, Δ*m/z* and S/N ratios was carried out in order to reduce false positives. Manual verification of such parameters remains necessary even when comparing with a database (Hug et al., 2014; Pochodylo and Helbling, 2017; Segura et al., 2011). Suspects exhibiting a chromatographic peak without Gaussian peak shape or having a S/N ratio below 10 were excluded. Furthermore, those having a precursor ion with [L] Δ*m/z* score were excluded (Fig. 3). The mSigma parameter was not taken into account at this stage, as a poor peak intensity could lead to a wrong mSigma calculation, even with a true positive because of possible interferences. Therefore, compounds present at low concentration in the sample extract or displaying a low sensitivity with the analysis method may be improperly excluded.

Fig. 3. Schematic of workflow used for the suspect screening of compounds.

2.7. Evaluation of contamination in stormwater runoff and groundwater

Based on the list of contaminants detected in the three water types (stormwater runoff, SIS-non-impacted and SIS-impacted groundwater) at the five SIS, we evaluated the mean number of pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds found. The 40 confirmed compounds exhibit a S/N ratio high enough to enable the comparison of the three water types. The range of pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds were compared among the three water types using a mixed model with SIS as the random factor and water types as the fixed factor to take into account the statistical dependence of waters collected at the same SIS. When mixed models gave significant results for water type differences, *post hoc* Tukey's honest significance difference tests were performed to determine whether significant pairwise differences occurred among water types. For the two variables (pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds), the normality and the homoscedasticity of the residues were tested using the Shapiro-Wilk's test and the Bartlett's test, respectively. As these assumptions were not met for pharmaceutical compounds, data were log transformed before statistical analyses. Venn diagrams were also constructed for each site to determine the percentages of pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds that were obtained from the three water types. This type of analysis highlighted the percentages of compounds that were found from one, two or the three water types. The percentages obtained from the five SIS independently were averaged to obtain Venn diagrams illustrating the mean percentages of pesticides and pharmaceutical compounds found in each water type and in several water types. In addition, a more precise description of the compounds found allowed us to evaluate which compounds were only found in one water type for the five sites. The percentages obtained from the five SIS were averaged to obtain Venn diagrams for pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds within the whole dataset. Statistical tests were performed using R software (R Development Core Team 2008) (Bunn and Korpela, n.d.) (https://www.R-project.org/) and Venn diagrams were constructed using Venny 2.1.0 (http://bioinfogp.cnb.csic.es/tools/venny).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Design and use of passive samplers

Passive sampling devices have been used for many years to monitor pollutants (mainly low molecular mass hydrocarbons and other volatile and semi-volatile non-polar chemicals) in groundwater. There is a wide range of different devices available and these have been reviewed (Centre d'expertise en analyse environnementale du Québec, 2012). Little work has been undertaken to monitor polar pollutants e.g. pharmaceuticals and personal care products in this medium using these devices. To our knowledge there are only three applications of the use of passive samplers to monitor polar substances in groundwater (Berho et al., 2013; Soulier et al., 2016; Ahkola et al., 2017).

342 We designed a simple sampler based on the Chemcatcher[®] principles, designed to fit comfortably down the well bore holes, that used only a naked Empore™ disk as the active receiving phase (Figure 2, S1a, b). Such an approach has been used previously to sequester a wide range of polar pollutants (Stephens et al., 2005; Shaw and Mueller, 2009; Stephens et al., 2009; Vermeirssen et al., 2013) in coastal and surface waters. The attractiveness of this design over the POCIS is that there is no polyethersulphone (PES) diffusion membrane overlying the receiving phase. It has been reported that some of the more hydrophobic compounds (e.g. log *Kow* > 4.25) can be retained in the PES membrane and, thereby, do not reach the sorbent layer and be detected in the subsequent analytical screening procedures (Soulier et al., 2016). Not having a PES membrane also helps to increase the diffusional uptake of analytes and thereby decrease the resultant analytical detection limits. This simple, low cost, yet robust, cage design also permitted the deployment of up to nine (similar or different types of sorbent chemistries) Empore™ disks on one rig and also maintained an open structure to allow good lateral flow of water whilst within the bore hole well.

No pharmaceuticals or polar pesticides, that were subsequently screened for, were detectable in the pre-washed Empore™ disks (fabrication blanks) prior to their use in the passive sampler rigs. After the 10-day deployment all the disks were still retained in place by the secured outer cage support. There was no visible biofouling of the surface of the Empore™ disks in those rigs deployed in bore hole wells. In addition, the use of a bound sorbent in the form of an

Empore™ disk, ensured that the active sampling area did not alter during the field deployments. This can be a problem with the use of loose sorbent material, as is used in the POCIS and can lead to variable results (Mills et al., 2014).

3.2. Suspect screening and confirmation

All the extracts from the passive sampling devices were analyzed by LC-Q-ToF. Using the workflow described in the Material and Methods section, 101 suspected compounds were finally selected. Compounds formula, theoretical exact masses, theoretical retention times, detection rates in SIS-non-impacted and in SIS-impacted groundwater and in runoff water as well as average T-scores and levels of confidence are details in Table S3. The workflow proposed by Schymanski et al. (2014) divides the confidence of identification into 5 levels: 372 level $5 =$ exact mass, level $4 =$ unequivocal molecular formula, level $3 =$ tentative candidate, level $2b$ = probable structure by diagnostic evidence, level $2a$ = probable structure by library spectrum match and level 1 = confirmed structure by reference standard. In order to reach the level 1 confidence, confirmation by injection of a reference standard for the measurement of retention time, MS and MS/MS spectra was carried out. Among the final list of suspects, compounds with high and very high T-score and considered to be relevant according to the literature (Lopez et al., 2015; Marmonier et al., 2013) were selected for confirmation as well as compounds that were available in our laboratory. In total, 43 compounds were selected in positive ion mode. No compound was selected in negative ion mode as none was suspected except a few already detected in positive ion mode (bromacil, diuron, propyzamide). Among the 30 analysed samples, a set of six representative samples of all the compounds to be confirmed (i.e. with the highest intensities) were selected for re-injection. Unspiked and spiked 384 samples (500 μ g L⁻¹) were injected with the auto-MS/MS mode. Thus, 33 compounds were fragmented and 10 were not fragmented probably due to low concentrations and/or co-elutions with compounds more concentrated or more sensitive. For these 10 compounds, specific selected mass by daughter scan mode method was created. Retention time and MS/MS spectra of unspiked and spiked samples were compared. Furthermore, experimental product ions were matched with the literature. A schematic workflow of the structure confirmation of identified compounds is shown Fig. S3 together with an example of identification of metolachlor (Fig. S4). The application of the suspect screening workflow is helpful in the search for contaminants 392 in groundwater. TASQ[®] 1.4 software provides a turnkey solution for the screening and allows narrowing the search to a list of almost 2,500 pesticides and pharmaceuticals. However, the quasi-systematic verification of some criteria such as chromatographic peak shape and S/N ratio cannot be neglected. The manual verification of these criteria for each suspect is time consuming, but the overall suspect screening workflow remains very helpful to have an overview of the occurrence of contaminants in groundwater.

Finally, of the 43 compounds to be confirmed, 40 were effectively confirmed. Only three were false positives: indomethacin, phenazone and simazine. Although 2-hydroxysimazine appeared with a high average T-score in the list of suspects of 17 samples, it resulted a false positive as 402 the retention time differed from that of the reference standard ($\Delta t_R = 0.2$ min). Indomethacin and phenazone showed insufficient matching with the reference standard MS/MS spectra (Table S4).

3.3. Water quality monitoring using passive samplers

3.3.1. Comparison of SDB-RPS and SDB-XC disks

A total of 30 samples were analyzed: three samples per site (SIS-non-impacted and SIS-impacted groundwater and runoff water) with two extraction disks each (SDB-RPS and SDB-XC). Our results showed that SDB-RPS and SDB-XC extraction disks displayed similar sampling properties. Indeed, for a given site, the comparison of the positive findings showed as expected, that the majority of the contaminants sampled were comparable between the disks (Fig. S5). These results confirmed those of (Vermeirssen et al., 2009) in a study comparing the performance of the two disks for sampling polar organic compounds in treated sewage effluent. As a result, in order to take advantage of the complementarity provided by the two disks, no distinction was made between the two disks and combined results are presented.

3.3.2 Occurrence of contaminants in groundwater and runoff water

The application of passive sampling in combination with the suspect screening allowed the detection of 101 suspects of pesticides and pharmaceuticals. From the 40 confirmed compounds, 30 were detected in groundwater (Table 1), including 16 pesticides and 14 pharmaceuticals.

Table 1. List of contaminants identified (Level 1) in SIS-non-impacted and SIS-impacted groundwater samples collected from EDs exposed in the five SIS around Lyon, France.

The majority of the pesticides found in groundwater had already been reported previously in other European studies. Atrazine, desethyl atrazine, DEET, 2,6-dichlorobenzamide, diuron, isoproturon, metolachlor, propiconazole, propyzamide and simazine were quantified by Lopez et al. (2015) during two screening trials of 494 French groundwater sites. Hexazinone was found by (Berho et al., 2013) during four trials at two French groundwater sites. Bromacil and imidacloprid were previously detected in Spain (Pitarch et al., 2016) and a German study reported the presence of carbendazim (Reh et al., 2013). In contrast, to the best of our knowledge, there is no other study reporting the presence of ethidimuron and fluopyram in European groundwaters. In the case of pharmaceuticals, caffeine, carbamazepine, cotinine, diclofenac, sulfamethoxazole and tramadol were detected by Lopez et al., 2015 in French groundwater. Lidocaine and nicotine have been reported to be present in European groundwater (Lapworth et al., 2012), irbesartan was found by (Pitarch et al., 2016) in Spain and lamotrigine and theobromine were detected in Germany (Bollmann et al., 2016; Reh et al., 2013). To our knowledge, adenine, adenosine and nicotinamide have never been detected previously in groundwater samples.

In runoff, 31 compounds were confirmed (Table S5) that included 11 pesticide and 20 pharmaceutical compounds. Only a few studies have assessed pesticides contamination of urban runoff in Europe. Bollmann et al. (2014) found diuron and propiconazole in runoff in a study in Denmark, and metolachlor was reported by (Gasperi et al., 2014) in stormwater collected in France. Dichlorobenzamide, diflufenican, propyzamide and prosulfocarb were previously detected in Sweden rivers and streams (Jansson and Kreuger, 2010). DEET was previously reported by (Moschet et al., 2015) during a large field study of urban affected rivers in Sweden and bromacil was detected in river water in Spain (Pitarch et al., 2016). To the best of our knowledge, no study has reported the presence of atrazine-desethyl-desisopropyl (DEDIA) neither in runoff nor in surface water, but it has been found in groundwater (Lopez et al., 2015). In addition, fluopyram has not been reported to be present in either groundwater, runoff or surface water. Like pesticides, very few European studies have dealt with the occurrence of pharmaceuticals in urban runoff. Carbamazepine and diclofenac were found in stormwater by Launay et al., (2016) in a study undertaken in Germany. Atenolol, caffeine, irbesartan, lamotrigine, lidocaine, metformin, paracetamol, telmisartan, tramadol, valsartan and venlafaxine were found by (Moschet et al., 2015) in urban affected rivers in Sweden. Cotinine, nicotine and morphine have been found in rivers of the United Kingdom (Petrie et al., 2016a).

3.3.3 Potential transfer of pesticides and pharmaceutical compounds from surface to groundwater

The number of pesticides detected in the SIS was significantly different among water types 463 (Fig. 4a, mixed model, water type effect, $F_{(2,8)} = 14.2$, $p \le 0.01$) with a higher diversity of compounds in SIS-impacted groundwater than in stormwater runoff and SIS-non-impacted groundwater (Tukey's *post hoc* tests, p < 0.05 for comparison between SIS-impacted groundwater and other water types). This "enrichment" in pesticide compounds of SIS-impacted groundwater in comparison with SIS-non-impacted groundwater might have been due to the contamination of groundwater with pesticides occurring in stormwater runoff. 469 Nevertheless, only 9 ± 7 % of the pesticides were uniquely shared by stormwater runoff and SIS-impacted groundwater (Fig. 4b) and this percentage was not associated with specific compounds only detected from ED deployed in these two water types (Fig. 5). Thus, our results did not suggest that some pesticides originating from urban stormwater runoff significantly contaminated the aquifer. Several pesticides are ubiquitous (detected in the three water types) and represented 19% of compounds (Fig. 4b) including diuron, DEET, fluopyram and metolachlor (Fig. 5). Such results are not surprising, as these compounds are known to be common persistent contaminants in groundwater and are also widely used in urban areas. For example, diuron is constantly emitted as it is used as film preservatives and slowly released to the environment (Bollmann et al., 2014) and DEET is a domestic insect repellent widely used across the world (Loos et al., 2010; Sorensen et al., 2015; Stuart et al., 2014). We also observed that more than 51% of pesticide compounds were only collected from EDs deployed in groundwater (SIS-impacted and SIS-non-impacted), highlighting the impact of agricultural practices on aquifer contamination. Indeed, the listing of pesticides detected in groundwater showed the occurrence of contaminants such as atrazine, atrazine-desethyl or simazine associated with agricultural practices (Böhlke, 2002). It is also worth noting that about 17% of pesticides in stormwater runoff were not detected in groundwater (Fig. 4b) and could be associated with three molecules: DEDIA, prosulfocarb and diflufenican (Fig. 5). The lack of detection of these stormwater runoff compounds in groundwater samples suggests an efficient effect of soil and vadoze zone to prevent the contamination of groundwater by these pesticides. Such interpretation would be highly dependent on the chemical properties of the three pesticides that determine their sorption and their degradability in the environment. Indeed, the Groundwater Ubiquity Score (GUS), which is a leaching potential indicator based on the physico-chemical properties, is among the lowest for these pesticides in comparison to all 19 confirmed pesticides (Köck-Schulmeyer et al., 2014). Our analysis also indicated that 16% of pesticides were only detected in SIS-impacted groundwater (Fig. 4b) with one specific

compound (carbendazim, Fig. 5). This observation suggested that the infiltration of stormwater runoff from surface to groundwater might have remobilized and transferred pesticides from the soil and the vadose zone, leading to the detection of these compounds in SIS-impacted groundwater whereas they were not present in stormwater runoff. These results were also found in a study of the effectiveness of a detention basin in removing emerging contaminants (Sébastian et al., 2015). It was found that carbendazim might be temporary stored at the bottom of the basin and thereafter remobilized and released.

Fig. 4. Mean number of pesticide (a) and pharmaceutical compounds (c) detected in each water 504 type (mean \pm confidence interval %, n = 5 stormwater infiltration systems). Venn diagrams

showing the percentages of pesticide (b) and pharmaceutical compounds (d) found in each water type and common between two or three water types (percentages are means ± confidence 507 interval, $n = 5$ stormwater infiltration systems)

Fig. 5. Detection of confirmed pesticide and pharmaceutical compounds in SIS-non-impacted and SIS-impacted groundwater and runoff water. Data for the two extraction disks (SDB-RPS and SDB-XC) are combined.

The number of pharmaceutical compounds detected in SISs was significantly different among 515 water types (Fig. 4c, mixed model, water type effect, $F_{(2,8)} = 30.7$, p < 0.001) with a higher diversity of compounds in stormwater runoff than in groundwater (Tukey's *post hoc* tests, p < 517 0.001 for comparison between stormwater runoff and other water types). Indeed, only 12% of compounds were detected from EDs deployed in groundwater (Fig. 4d) with sulfamethoxazole as the unique compound recovered from groundwater and not detected in stormwater runoff

(Fig. 5). It was previously found that sulfamethoxazole is mobile, only slightly degradable and therefore easily transported to groundwater (Banzhaf et al., 2012). Thus, the occurrence of this compound in groundwater might be due to an ancient aquifer contamination without any link with SIS impact. More than 85% of pharmaceutical compounds were detected in stormwater runoff for the five SISs, including a mean percentage of 47% that were only detected in stormwater runoff (Fig. 4d). Seven pharmaceutical compounds were only found in stormwater runoff: atenolol metformin, morphine paracetamol, telmisartan valsartan and venlafaxine. Our results suggest that these compounds were not significantly transferred from surface to groundwater in the studied SISs.

In addition, the mean percentage of pharmaceutical compounds uniquely shared by stormwater 531 runoff and SIS-impacted groundwater was quite low 9 ± 7 % (similar to the mean percentage uniquely shared by stormwater runoff and SIS-non-impacted groundwater, Fig. 4d) and was due in part to irbesartan and tramadol which were two compounds only detected in 2 of the 10 analyses performed on EDs deployed in SIS-impacted groundwater (Fig. 5). As observed for pesticides, our results did not indicate a significant contamination of the aquifer by pharmaceutical compounds occurring in urban stormwater runoff. It is also worth noting that around 25% of pharmaceutical compounds were detected in the three water types for the five SISs (Fig. 4d) including adenosine, adenine, caffeine, carbamazepine, lamotrigine, and theobromine (Fig. 5). The large distribution of these compounds in both stormwater runoff and groundwater might have been due to (1) multiple sources of contaminants for aquifers and urban areas and/or (2) persistence of these compounds in the environment.

Overall, the results of the present study indicated a low influence of SIS on the contamination of groundwater by pesticides and pharmaceutical compounds contained in stormwater runoff. Nevertheless, these conclusions must be taken with caution because the present study was based on one campaign performed during a classical autumnal rainy period. More experiments are clearly needed to consider the influence of rainfall characteristics (intensities, duration) or/and the season on the potential transfer of contaminants through SIS. A quantification (or semi-quantification) of contaminant concentrations is also of major importance to evaluate processes occurring in SISs influencing the dynamics of contaminants.

4. Conclusion

This study showed the performance of novel ED passive samplers used in combination with high resolution mass spectrometry analysis and suspect screening processing workflow to detect groundwater contamination. Our results highlighted the relevance of our strategy to characterize the occurrence of pesticides and pharmaceuticals in groundwater in a simple way. The new design of the passive samplers enables deployment in well bore holes, allowing a more accurate assessment of groundwater contamination than spot sampling. Passive samplers allowed the detection of contaminants usually found at very low concentration in water as compounds were accumulated on the extraction disk. As a result, our strategy allowed the analysis of a large number of contaminants: a wide list of suspects was obtained as the suspect screening approach has the ability to prioritize also the less well-known compounds. 101 suspects were detected in the five SIS, including 40 confirmed compounds. Overall, pesticides were mainly found in groundwater unlike pharmaceuticals which were more detected in runoff waters. Therefore, the presence of pesticides in groundwater cannot be explained exclusively by the infiltration of the runoff water. Several pesticides, like atrazine, have probably reached and contaminated groundwater for many years. In the case of pharmaceuticals, our results suggest that they were brought by runoff water. However, pharmaceuticals found in runoff waters were not always found in SIS-impacted groundwater. In addition, when comparing the frequency of detection, SIS-impacted groundwater was not significantly more contaminated than non-impacted zones. This suggests a lower transfer from the infiltration basin to the groundwater. To better understand the mechanisms involved in the migration of contaminants through the soil, a supplementary field exposure with a semi-quantitative approach will be undertaken. In addition, this would allow the approach to be validated and proposed for groundwater monitoring applications.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by ANR FROG-ANR-16-CE32-0006 project. The authors thank Alexandre Verdu (Bruker Daltonics) for his collaboration, Jérémy Voisin for assisting with the field observatory in urban water management (OTHU - www.othu.org/ - FED 4161) and Adil Bakir (University of Portsmouth) for assistance with the sampler deployment rigs. We also acknowledge the Greater Lyon Water Agency, the Rhone Mediterranean Corsica Water Agency and the Rhône Alpes Auvergne Region for logistic support.

References

- Ahkola, H., Tuominen, S., Karlsson, S., Perkola, N., Huttula, T., Saraperä, S., Artimo, A., Korpiharju, T., Äystö, L., Fjäder, P., Assmuth, T., Rosendahl, K., Nysten, T., 2017. Presence of active pharmaceutical ingredients in the continuum of surface and ground water used in drinking water production. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 24, 26778–26791. Alvarez, D.A., Petty, J.D., Huckins, J.N., Jones-Lepp, T.L., Getting, D.T., Goddard, J.P., Manahan,
- S.E., 2004. Development of a passive, in situ, integrative sampler for hydrophilic organic contaminants in aquatic environments. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 23, 1640.
- Banzhaf, S., Krein, A., Scheytt, T., 2012. Using selected pharmaceutical compounds as indicators for surface water and groundwater interaction in the hyporheic zone of a low permeability riverbank: selected pharmaceuticals as indicators in a low permeability riverbank. Hydrol. Process. n/a-n/a.
- Berho, C., Togola, A., Coureau, C., Ghestem, J.-P., Amalric, L., 2013. Applicability of polar organic compound integrative samplers for monitoring pesticides in groundwater. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 20, 5220–5228.
- Böhlke, J.-K., 2002. Groundwater recharge and agricultural contamination. Hydrogeol. J. 10, 153– 179.
- Bollmann, A.F., Seitz, W., Prasse, C., Lucke, T., Schulz, W., Ternes, T., 2016. Occurrence and fate of amisulpride, sulpiride, and lamotrigine in municipal wastewater treatment plants with biological treatment and ozonation. J. Hazard. Mater. 320, 204–215.
- Bollmann, U.E., Vollertsen, J., Carmeliet, J., Bester, K., 2014. Dynamics of biocide emissions from buildings in a suburban stormwater catchment – Concentrations, mass loads and emission processes. Water Res. 56, 66–76.
- Bunn, A., Korpela, M., n.d. An introduction to dplR 16.
- Centre d'expertise en analyse environnementale du Québec (2012). Sampling Guide for Environmental Analysis: Booklet 3 – Sampling Groundwater, 54 p., 1 appendix. http://www.ceaeq.gouv.qc.ca/documents/publications/echantillonnage/eaux_soutC3_ang.pdf
- Causanilles, A., Kinyua, J., Ruttkies, C., van Nuijs, A.L.N., Emke, E., Covaci, A., de Voogt, P., 2017. Qualitative screening for new psychoactive substances in wastewater collected during a city festival using liquid chromatography coupled to high-resolution mass spectrometry. Chemosphere 184, 1186–1193.
- Charriau, A., Lissalde, S., Poulier, G., Mazzella, N., Buzier, R., Guibaud, G., 2016. Overview of the Chemcatcher® for the passive sampling of various pollutants in aquatic environments Part A: Principles, calibration, preparation and analysis of the sampler. Talanta 148, 556–571.
- Danielopol, D.L., Gibert, J., Griebler, C., Gunatilaka, A., Hahn, H.J., Messana, G., Notenboom, J., Sket, B., 2004. Incorporating ecological perspectives in European groundwater management policy. Environ. Conserv. 31, 185–189.
- Duong, H.T., Kadokami, K., Chau, H.T.C., Nguyen, T.Q., Nguyen, T.T., Kong, L., 2015. Groundwater screening for 940 organic micro-pollutants in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 22, 19835–19847.
- Fletcher, T.D., Shuster, W., Hunt, W.F., Ashley, R., Butler, D., Arthur, S., Trowsdale, S., Barraud, S., Semadeni-Davies, A., Bertrand-Krajewski, J.-L., Mikkelsen, P.S., Rivard, G., Uhl, M., Dagenais, D., Viklander, M., 2015. SUDS, LID, BMPs, WSUD and more – The evolution and application of terminology surrounding urban drainage. Urban Water J. 12, 525–542.
- Foulquier, A., Malard, F., Mermillod-Blondin, F., Datry, T., Simon, L., Montuelle, B., Gibert, J., 2010. Vertical change in dissolved organic carbon and oxygen at the water table region of an aquifer recharged with stormwater: biological uptake or mixing? Biogeochemistry 99, 31–47.
- Gago-Ferrero, P., Krettek, A., Fischer, S., Wiberg, K., Ahrens, L., 2018. Suspect Screening and Regulatory Databases: A Powerful Combination To Identify Emerging Micropollutants. Environ. Sci. Technol. 52, 6881–6894.
- Gasperi, J., Sebastian, C., Ruban, V., Delamain, M., Percot, S., Wiest, L., Mirande, C., Caupos, E., Demare, D., Kessoo, M.D.K., Saad, M., Schwartz, J.J., Dubois, P., Fratta, C., Wolff, H., Moilleron, R., Chebbo, G., Cren, C., Millet, M., Barraud, S., Gromaire, M.C., 2014. Micropollutants in urban stormwater: occurrence, concentrations, and atmospheric contributions for a wide range of contaminants in three French catchments. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 21, 5267–5281.
- Guibal, R., Lissalde, S., Charriau, A., Poulier, G., Mazzella, N., Guibaud, G., 2015. Coupling passive sampling and time of flight mass spectrometry for a better estimation of polar pesticide freshwater contamination: Simultaneous target quantification and screening analysis. J. Chromatogr. A 1387, 75–85.
- Hug, C., Ulrich, N., Schulze, T., Brack, W., Krauss, M., 2014. Identification of novel micropollutants in wastewater by a combination of suspect and nontarget screening. Environ. Pollut. 184, 25– 32.
- Jansson, C., Kreuger, J., 2010. Multiresidue analysis of 95 pesticides at low nanogram/liter levels in surface waters using online preconcentration and high performance liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry. J. AOAC Int. 93, 1732–1747.
- Kaserzon, S.L., Heffernan, A.L., Thompson, K., Mueller, J.F., Gomez Ramos, M.J., 2017. Rapid screening and identification of chemical hazards in surface and drinking water using high resolution mass spectrometry and a case-control filter. Chemosphere 182, 656–664.
- Köck-Schulmeyer, M., Ginebreda, A., Postigo, C., Garrido, T., Fraile, J., López de Alda, M., Barceló, D., 2014. Four-year advanced monitoring program of polar pesticides in groundwater of Catalonia (NE-Spain). Sci. Total Environ. 470–471, 1087–1098.
- Kurwadkar, S., 2017. Groundwater Pollution and Vulnerability Assessment. Water Environ. Res. 89, 1561–1577.
- Lapworth, D.J., Baran, N., Stuart, M.E., Ward, R.S., 2012. Emerging organic contaminants in groundwater: A review of sources, fate and occurrence. Environ. Pollut. 163, 287–303.
- Launay, M.A., Dittmer, U., Steinmetz, H., 2016. Organic micropollutants discharged by combined sewer overflows – Characterisation of pollutant sources and stormwater-related processes. Water Res. 104, 82–92.
- Leendert, V., Van Langenhove, H., Demeestere, K., 2015. Trends in liquid chromatography coupled to high-resolution mass spectrometry for multi-residue analysis of organic micropollutants in aquatic environments. TrAC Trends Anal. Chem. 67, 192–208.
- Lindqvist, N., Tuhkanen, T., Kronberg, L., 2005. Occurrence of acidic pharmaceuticals in raw and treated sewages and in receiving waters. Water Res. 39, 2219–2228.
- Lissalde, S., Charriau, A., Poulier, G., Mazzella, N., Buzier, R., Guibaud, G., 2016. Overview of the Chemcatcher® for the passive sampling of various pollutants in aquatic environments Part B: Field handling and environmental applications for the monitoring of pollutants and their biological effects. Talanta 148, 572–582.
- Lissalde, S., Mazzella, N., Fauvelle, V., Delmas, F., Mazellier, P., Legube, B., 2011. Liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry method for thirty-three pesticides in natural water and comparison of performance between classical solid phase extraction and passive sampling approaches. J. Chromatogr. A 1218, 1492–1502.
- Loos, R., Locoro, G., Comero, S., Contini, S., Schwesig, D., Werres, F., Balsaa, P., Gans, O., Weiss, S., Blaha, L., Bolchi, M., Gawlik, B.M., 2010. Pan-European survey on the occurrence of selected polar organic persistent pollutants in ground water. Water Res. 44, 4115–4126.
- Lopez, B., Ollivier, P., Togola, A., Baran, N., Ghestem, J.-P., 2015. Screening of French groundwater for regulated and emerging contaminants. Sci. Total Environ. 518–519, 562–573.
- Mali, N., Cerar, S., Koroša, A., Auersperger, P., 2017. Passive sampling as a tool for identifying micro-organic compounds in groundwater. Sci. Total Environ. 593–594, 722–734.
- Manamsa, K., Crane, E., Stuart, M., Talbot, J., Lapworth, D., Hart, A., 2016. A national-scale assessment of micro-organic contaminants in groundwater of England and Wales. Sci. Total Environ. 568, 712–726.
- Marmonier, P., Maazouzi, C., Foulquier, A., Navel, S., François, C., Hervant, F., Mermillod-Blondin, F., Vieney, A., Barraud, S., Togola, A., Piscart, C., 2013. The use of crustaceans as sentinel organisms to evaluate groundwater ecological quality. Ecol. Eng. 57, 118–132.
- Mason, Y., Ammann, A.A., Ulrich, A., Sigg, L., 1999. Behavior of Heavy Metals, Nutrients, and Major Components during Roof Runoff Infiltration. Environ. Sci. Technol. 33, 1588–1597.
- Mills, G.A., Gravell, A., Vrana, B., Harman, C., Budzinski, H., Mazzella, N., Ocelka, T., 2014. Measurement of environmental pollutants using passive sampling devices – an updated commentary on the current state of the art. Env. Sci Process. Impacts 16, 369–373.
- Moschet, C., Vermeirssen, E.L.M., Singer, H., Stamm, C., Hollender, J., 2015. Evaluation of in-situ calibration of Chemcatcher passive samplers for 322 micropollutants in agricultural and urban affected rivers. Water Res. 71, 306–317.
- Petrie, B., Gravell, A., Mills, G.A., Youdan, J., Barden, R., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2016a. In Situ Calibration of a New Chemcatcher Configuration for the Determination of Polar Organic Micropollutants in Wastewater Effluent. Environ. Sci. Technol. 50, 9469–9478.
- Petrie, B., Youdan, J., Barden, R., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2016b. Multi-residue analysis of 90 emerging contaminants in liquid and solid environmental matrices by ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry. J. Chromatogr. A 1431, 64–78.
- Pitarch, E., Cervera, M.I., Portolés, T., Ibáñez, M., Barreda, M., Renau-Pruñonosa, A., Morell, I., López, F., Albarrán, F., Hernández, F., 2016. Comprehensive monitoring of organic micro-pollutants in surface and groundwater in the surrounding of a solid-waste treatment plant of Castellón, Spain. Sci. Total Environ. 548–549, 211–220.
- Pochodylo, A.L., Helbling, D.E., 2017. Emerging investigators series: prioritization of suspect hits in a sensitive suspect screening workflow for comprehensive micropollutant characterization in environmental samples. Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol. 3, 54–65.
- Postigo, C., Barceló, D., 2015. Synthetic organic compounds and their transformation products in groundwater: Occurrence, fate and mitigation. Sci. Total Environ. 503–504, 32–47.
- Reh, R., Licha, T., Geyer, T., Nödler, K., Sauter, M., 2013. Occurrence and spatial distribution of organic micro-pollutants in a complex hydrogeological karst system during low flow and high flow periods, results of a two-year study. Sci. Total Environ. 443, 438–445.
- Schymanski, E.L., Jeon, J., Gulde, R., Fenner, K., Ruff, M., Singer, H.P., Hollender, J., 2014a. Identifying Small Molecules via High Resolution Mass Spectrometry: Communicating Confidence. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 2097–2098.
- Schymanski, E.L., Singer, H.P., Longrée, P., Loos, M., Ruff, M., Stravs, M.A., Ripollés Vidal, C., Hollender, J., 2014b. Strategies to Characterize Polar Organic Contamination in Wastewater: Exploring the Capability of High Resolution Mass Spectrometry. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 1811–1818.
- Sébastian, C., Becouze-Lareure, C., Lipeme Kouyi, G., Barraud, S., 2015. Event-based quantification of emerging pollutant removal for an open stormwater retention basin – Loads, efficiency and importance of uncertainties. Water Res. 72, 239–250.
- Segura, P.A., MacLeod, S.L., Lemoine, P., Sauvé, S., Gagnon, C., 2011. Quantification of carbamazepine and atrazine and screening of suspect organic contaminants in surface and drinking waters. Chemosphere 84, 1085–1094.
- Shaw, M., Mueller, J.F., 2009. Time Integrative Passive Sampling: How Well Do Chemcatchers Integrate Fluctuating Pollutant Concentrations? Environ. Sci. Technol. 43, 1443–1448.
- Sjerps, R.M.A., Vughs, D., van Leerdam, J.A., ter Laak, T.L., van Wezel, A.P., 2016. Data-driven prioritization of chemicals for various water types using suspect screening LC-HRMS. Water Res. 93, 254–264.
- Sorensen, J.P.R., Lapworth, D.J., Nkhuwa, D.C.W., Stuart, M.E., Gooddy, D.C., Bell, R.A., Chirwa, M., Kabika, J., Liemisa, M., Chibesa, M., Pedley, S., 2015. Emerging contaminants in urban groundwater sources in Africa. Water Res. 72, 51–63.
- Soulier, C., Coureau, C., Togola, A., 2016. Environmental forensics in groundwater coupling passive sampling and high resolution mass spectrometry for screening. Sci. Total Environ. 563–564, 845–854.
- Stephens, B.S., Kapernick, A., Eaglesham, G., Mueller, J., 2005. Aquatic Passive Sampling of Herbicides on Naked Particle Loaded Membranes: Accelerated Measurement and Empirical Estimation of Kinetic Parameters. Environ. Sci. Technol. 39, 8891–8897.
- Stephens, B.S., Kapernick, A.P., Eaglesham, G., Mueller, J.F., 2009. Event monitoring of herbicides with naked and membrane-covered Empore disk integrative passive sampling devices. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 58, 1116–1122.
- Stuart, M., Lapworth, D., Crane, E., Hart, A., 2012. Review of risk from potential emerging contaminants in UK groundwater. Sci. Total Environ. 416, 1–21.
- Stuart, M.E., Lapworth, D.J., Thomas, J., Edwards, L., 2014. Fingerprinting groundwater pollution in catchments with contrasting contaminant sources using microorganic compounds. Sci. Total Environ. 468–469, 564–577.
- Van Metre, P.C., Alvarez, D.A., Mahler, B.J., Nowell, L., Sandstrom, M., Moran, P., 2017. Complex mixtures of Pesticides in Midwest U.S. streams indicated by POCIS time-integrating samplers. Environ. Pollut. 220, 431–440.
- Vermeirssen, E.L.M., Bramaz, N., Hollender, J., Singer, H., Escher, B.I., 2009. Passive sampling combined with ecotoxicological and chemical analysis of pharmaceuticals and biocides – 756 evaluation of three ChemcatcherTM configurations. Water Res. 43, 903–914.
- Vermeirssen, E.L.M., Dietschweiler, C., Escher, B.I., van der Voet, J., Hollender, J., 2013. Uptake and release kinetics of 22 polar organic chemicals in the Chemcatcher passive sampler. Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 405, 5225–5236.
- Voisin, J., Cournoyer, B., Vienney, A., Mermillod-Blondin, F., 2018. Aquifer recharge with stormwater runoff in urban areas: Influence of vadose zone thickness on nutrient and bacterial transfers from the surface of infiltration basins to groundwater. Sci. Total Environ. 637–638, 1496–1507.
- Vulliet, E., Cren-Olivé, C., 2011. Screening of pharmaceuticals and hormones at the regional scale, in surface and groundwaters intended to human consumption. Environ. Pollut. 159, 2929–2934.
- Vulliet, E., Tournier, M., Vauchez, A., Wiest, L., Baudot, R., Lafay, F., Kiss, A., Cren-Olivé, C., 2014. Survey regarding the occurrence of selected organic micropollutants in the groundwaters of overseas departments. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 21, 7512–7521.
- Winiarski, T., Bedell, J.-P., Delolme, C., Perrodin, Y., 2006. The impact of stormwater on a soil profile in an infiltration basin. Hydrogeol. J. 14, 1244–1251.
-

