

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (SI)

### **Towards harmonized criteria in Quality Assurance and Quality Control of non-targeted LC-HRMS analytical workflows for screening of emerging contaminants in human biomonitoring**

Noelia Caballero-Casero<sup>1\*</sup>, Lidia Belova<sup>1</sup>, Philippe Vervliet<sup>1</sup>, Jean-Philippe Antignac<sup>2</sup>, Argelia Castaño<sup>3</sup>, Laurent Debrauwer<sup>4,5</sup>, Marta Esteban López<sup>3</sup>, Carolin Huber<sup>6</sup>, Jana Klanova<sup>7</sup>, Martin Krauss<sup>6</sup>, Arjen Lommen<sup>8</sup>, Hans G.J. Mol<sup>8</sup>, Herbert Oberacher<sup>9</sup>, Olga Pardo<sup>10</sup>, Elliott J. Price<sup>7,11</sup>, Vera Reinstadler<sup>9</sup>, Chiara Maria Vitale<sup>7</sup>, Alexander L.N. van Nuijs<sup>1</sup>, Adrian Covaci<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Toxicological Center, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

<sup>2</sup>Oniris, INRAE, LABERCA, Nantes, France

<sup>3</sup>National Centre for Environmental Health, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain

<sup>4</sup>TOXALIM (Research Centre in Food Toxicology), Toulouse University, INRAE UMR 1331, ENVT, INP-Purpan, Paul Sabatier University, 31027 Toulouse, France

<sup>5</sup>Metatoul-AXIOM Platform, National Infrastructure for Metabolomics and Fluxomics: MetaboHUB, Toxalim, INRAE, F-31027 Toulouse, France

<sup>6</sup>UFZ, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Permosers Straße 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany

<sup>7</sup>RECETOX Centre, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

<sup>8</sup>Wageningen Food Safety Research, part of Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands

<sup>9</sup>Institute of Legal Medicine and Core Facility Metabolomics, Medical University of Innsbruck, Muellerstrasse 44, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

<sup>10</sup>Foundation for the Promotion of Health and Biomedical Research of the Valencia Region, FISABIO-Public Health, Av. Catalunya, 21, 46020, Valencia, Spain

<sup>11</sup>Faculty of Sports Studies, Masaryk University, Brno Czech Republic

\*Corresponding authors:

E-mail address: Noelia.CaballeroCasero@uantwerpen.be (N. Caballero-Casero)

and Adrian.Covaci@uantwerpen.be (A. Covaci)

34 **SI-1. Harmonised definitions**

35 The following definitions have been drawn from European legislation [1], international organisations, such  
36 as UNODC and IUPAC [2–6], scientific networks, like NORMAN, Eurachem and CITAC [7,8], and specialized  
37 literature [9–14].

38

39 *Accuracy*: the closeness of agreement between a test result and the accepted reference value. It is  
40 determined by determining trueness and precision.

41 *Aliquot*: a representative portion of a homogenous sample, assumed to be taken with negligible sampling  
42 error.

43 *Analyte*: the substance subject to analysis for its detection, identification, and/or quantitation.

44 *Analytical method*: the set of operations used in the performance of a specific chemical analysis,  
45 systematically presented in the order in which they have to be executed.

46 *Annotation*: the act of linking a detected mass spectrometric feature with a chemical. This action corresponds  
47 with the levels 3 and 4 from the Schymanski's scale [15]

48 *Background signal*: the null signal, obtained in the absence of analyte or interference derived signals.

49 *Baseline signal*: the summation of the background signal plus signal in the analyte (peak) region of interest  
50 due to interferents or contamination.

51 *Batch*: the set of samples that comprises a worklist analysed without stopping the equipment or without  
52 making big changes.

53 *Bias*: the difference between the test result and an accepted reference value.

54 *Biomarker of effect*: a change in biological response, which can be related to exposure to or toxic effects of  
55 chemicals.

56 *Biomarker of exposure*: the chemicals and their metabolites measurable in an organism that are related to  
57 the exposure of the organism to a chemical.

58 *Calibrator*: the pure analyte in a suitable solvent or matrix used to prepare the calibration curve.

59 *Certified reference material (CRM)*: a material that has had a specified analyte content assigned to it, and  
60 whose property values are given by a procedure which establishes traceability to an accurate realization of  
61 the unit in which the property values are expressed, and for which each value is accompanied by an  
62 uncertainty at a stated level of confidence.

63 *Clean-up*: a process to partially remove the matrix, which may cause the matrix effect, from the test portion.

64 *Comparability*: the degree to which different methods or results can be represented as similar.

65 *Comparable results*: the set of measurement outputs, for quantities of a given kind, which is metrologically  
66 traceable to the same reference.

67 *Contamination*: unintended introduction of the analyte or interferent that can interfere in the analysis into a  
68 sample, extract, or internal standard solution at any stage of the analytical method.

69 *Cross-contamination*: the response of contaminants or interferents in a run analysis that comes from a  
70 different run analysis or sample.

71 *Detection*: analytical signal that may be assigned to an analyte or substance present in a sample.

72 *Determination*: the application of the complete analytical process for detecting, identifying, and quantifying  
73 an analytical parameter of an analyte.

74 *False negative rate*: the fraction of incorrect (false negative) results obtained when a test is applied to positive  
75 samples.

76 *False positive rate*: the fraction of incorrect (false positive) results obtained when a test is applied to positive  
77 samples.

78 *Feature (mass spectrometric)*: an instrumental response that is characterized by retention time, MS spectra  
79 and optionally MS/MS spectra data. This information enable the annotation process.

80 *Field blank*: a sample without the test portion or using an equivalent amount of suitable solvent in place of  
81 the test portion, that is subjected to all aspects of sample collection, field-processing preservation, and  
82 transportation to which the complete analytical procedure is applied. It can be used as synonym of  
83 procedural blank sample though usually the last ones are implemented into the laboratory. That means the  
84 procedural blank samples do not cover the sampling stage.

85 *Fortified sample*: a sample enriched with a known amount of analyte(s).

86 *Harmonisation*: bringing about agreement on terminology, concepts, etc. so those different entities can  
87 interact based on the same terms of reference.

88 *Human matrix*: any discrete biological material of human origin that can be sampled and processed. Examples  
89 are blood, serum, plasma, urine, faeces, saliva, sputum, and various discrete tissues.

90 *Identification*: assigning a detected analytical signal by non-targeted or suspect screening to one individual  
91 analyte or to a group of compounds based on matching their properties. This action corresponds with the  
92 levels 1 and 2 from the Schymanski's scale [15]

93 *Identification level (or level of identification confidence)*: an approach for communicating identification  
94 confidence. The common approach used (in environmental research) includes five levels and was proposed  
95 by Schymanski et al. [15].

96 *Interference effect*: a systematic error in the analysis caused by a substance in the sample that contributes to  
97 the response of the analytical measurement, without influencing its sensitivity for the analyte of interest.

98 *Interferent*: any substance other than the analyte that gives a similar analytical response to the analyte or  
99 alters the analytical result.

100 *Interlaboratory comparability investigation (ICI)*: a measure to harmonize analytical methods and their  
101 application this way improving the comparability of analytical results. For this purpose control materials  
102 (reference materials) can be used. ICIs are even necessary when the laboratories use the same analytical  
103 standard operating procedure (SOP).

104 *Interlaboratory comparison study*: the organisation, performance, and evaluation of tests on the same  
105 sample by two or more laboratories under documented conditions to determine testing performance,  
106 which results are compiled into a single report. The results of the laboratories are compared to the  
107 consensus values, calculated from results of all the participants after the elimination of the outliers values.

108 *Internal Standard (IS)*: a substance not contained in the sample with physical-chemical properties as similar  
109 as possible to those of the analyte that has to be identified, which is added to the sample in known  
110 concentration.

111 *Laboratory reference sample*: a sample that has had a specified analyte content assigned to it, that is  
112 prepared and tested (homogeneity and stability) by a specific laboratory to be used within interlaboratory  
113 study. The analyte amount is given by the laboratory and ensures its traceability.

114 *Limit of detection*: the minimum amount of an analyte that can be measured by the analytical method and  
115 that can be reliably distinguished from baseline signal.

116 *Linearity*: the ability of an analytical method to elicit signals that are directly proportional to the amount of  
117 the given analytes or analytical parameters in samples within a given range.

118 *Mass accuracy*: the average of the difference between the accurate measured mass to charge ( $m/z$ ) of an ion  
119 and the exact mass to charge, of  $n$  individual measures.

120 *Matrix*: all constituents of a sample other than the analytes.

121 *Matrix effect*: a systematic error in the analysis caused by the influence of matrix constituent on the  
122 sensitivity of the analytical measurement of the analyte by suppression or enhancement.

123 *Monitoring*: the continuous or repeated observation, measurement, and evaluation of a process in a certain  
124 field of application, according to given schedules in space and time.

125 *Noise*: a set of undesirable fluctuations of the baseline or background signal of an instrument.

126 *Outlier*: a result that appears to differ unreasonably from the population of the other results.

127 *Performance characteristic*: the parameter that defines the functional quality of an analytical method. This  
128 may be for instance selectivity, accuracy, trueness, precision, repeatability, reproducibility, recovery,  
129 detection capability, or stability.

130 *Population*: a finite or infinite set of individuals (people, things or events) that have at least one trait in  
131 common.

132 *Precision*: the closeness of agreement between independent test results obtained under stipulated  
133 (predetermined) conditions. The measure of precision is computed as the standard deviation of the test  
134 result.

135 *Procedural blank or blank sample*: a sample without the test portion or using an equivalent amount of  
136 suitable solvent in place of the test portion, to which the complete analytical procedure is applied.

137 *Qualitative method*: an analytical method that determines the presence or absence of a known constituent  
138 or identifies a substance based on its chemical, biological, or physical properties.

139 *Quality assurance (QA)*: the set of system of activities whose purpose is to provide the confidence that the  
140 analytical method or the system fulfills the defined standards of quality with a stated level of confidence.

141 *Quality control (QC)*: the overall system of activities whose purpose is to control the quality of the results.

142 *Quantitative method*: an analytical method which determines the amount or mass fraction of an analyte in a  
143 sample.

144 *Range (in the analytical sense)*: the interval between the upper and the lower amount of the analyte in the  
145 sample for which it has been determined that the method is applicable or analytical parameter is accepted.

146 *Recovery*: the percentage of the true amount of an analyte, present in or added to the test portion, which is  
147 recovered during the analytical procedure. It is determined during validation instead of trueness when no  
148 certified reference material is available.

149 *Repeatability*: the precision for independent test results, which are obtained with the same method on  
150 identical test portions, in the same laboratory by the same operator using the same equipment within short  
151 intervals of time.

152 *Representativeness*: the consistency between the results and the laboratory samples, and between them,  
153 the analytical object and the analytical problem.

154 *Reproducibility*: the precision for independent test results, which are obtained with the same method on  
155 identical test portions, but the laboratory, operator, and/or equipment can be different within larger  
156 intervals of time than one run analysis.

157 *Response*: the output of an analytical system as a reaction to a certain stimulus.

158 *Result*: a set of analytical values being attributed to a measured compound together with any other available  
159 relevant information as the uncertainty of the measurement.

160 *Robustness or ruggedness*: capability of an analytical method to remain unaffected by small changes in  
161 experimental conditions.

162 *Sample preparation*: the set of operations required to convert the test portion into the treated portion.

163 *Sample*: the totality of an analysis material having an identical composition or quality.

164 *Sampling*: the set of operations needed to obtain a sample or specimen including planning, collecting,  
165 recording, labelling, sealing, shipping, etc.

166 *Screening method*: a procedure used to detect the presence of an analyte or class of substances at the level  
167 of interest.

168 *Selectivity/Specificity*: the ability to discriminate between the analyte (*specificity*) or a number of analytes  
169 (*selectivity*) to be determined and other materials in the test sample. Matrix influences may affect the  
170 analyte signal directly by the interference effect either indirectly by the matrix effect. This characteristic is  
171 predominantly a function of the measuring technique described but can vary according to the class of  
172 compound or matrix.

173 *Sensitivity*: the smallest detectable change in the response of a measuring instrument of the analytical  
174 method, typically expressed as the slope of the calibration curve.

175 *Signal to noise ratio*: the measurement of the precision of the instrumental signal, expressed mostly by the  
176 ratio of the net signal value to a baseline noise parameter (standard deviation or peak to peak distance).

177 *Signal*: the response of an instrument to certain stimuli. A signal is characterized by at least three parameters:  
178 position, intensity, and width (symmetry, shape).

179 *Solvent blank*: the mixture of all the solvents used during sample preparation and/or aliquot of solvent for  
180 checking instrumental performance and background contamination.

181 *Stability*: the resistance to decomposition or other physicochemical changes of a sample along the time.

182 *Standard operating procedure (SOP)*: the set of written instructions that describes a repetitive activity  
183 followed by an organization.

184 *Subsample*: the quantity of material drawn from the test sample on which the analysis is carried out.

185 *Substance*: the matter of particular or definite chemical constitution and its metabolites.

186 *Suspect compound*: the known compounds in terms of chemical name and molecular formula which are  
187 expected to be present in a sample. For these compounds, either no reference standard or incomplete mass  
188 spectrometric reference data are available.

189 *Synthetic matrix*: a sample where the test portion is substituted by a mixture of the main components of the  
190 matrix under study; or by a commercial matrix with a different source origin.

191 *System suitability*: the holistic ensuring that an analytical system performs properly against documented  
192 performance specifications, for a specific analytical method.

193 *Target compound*: the compounds of known chemical name and structure and of which full mass  
194 spectrometric reference data, including MS/MS fragmentation and retention time, is available to enable  
195 annotation. Reference data have been usually acquired with certified reference standards and quantitative  
196 targeted methods are available, alongside some exposure and risk assessment data.

197 *Test sample*: a sample prepared from a laboratory sample and from which test portions will be taken.

198 *Trueness*: the closeness of agreement between the average value obtained from a large series of test results  
199 and an accepted reference value.

200 *Unknown compound*: a compound without any structure or identity information prior to the analytical  
201 workflow.

202 *Validation*: a process by which it is evaluated if the performance characteristics of the analytical method  
203 meet the particular requirements of specific intended use in quantitative terms.

204

## 205 **References**

- 206 [1] 96/23/Ec Commission Decision, COMMISSION DECISION 2002/657/EC of 12 August 2002  
207 implementing Council Directive 96/23/EC concerning the performance of analytical methods and the  
208 interpretation of results, Off. J. Eur. Communities. L 221/8 (2002).  
209 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>.
- 210 [2] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), ed., Glossary of Terms for Quality Assurance and,  
211 United Nations Publication, New York, 2009.
- 212 [3] L.A. Currie, International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry Nomenclature in Evaluation of  
213 Analytical Methods Including Detection and Quantification Capabilities, Cramers Natl. Represent. K.  
214 Doerffel (GDR), I. Giolito (Brazil), E. Grushka (Israel), W. E. Harris (Canada J. Stay. 67 (1995) 1699–  
215 1723. <https://old.iupac.org/publications/pac/1995/pdf/6710x1699.pdf>.
- 216 [4] EMA, Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. Guideline on bioanalytical method  
217 validation, EMEA/CHMP/EWP/192217/2009 Rev. 1 Corr. 2\*\*. (2012) 1–23.  
218 <https://doi.org/EMA/CHMP/EWP/192217/2009>.
- 219 [5] IUPAC, Harmonised guidelines for the in-house validation of methods of analysis (technical report),  
220 Guideline. (2000) 1–34.
- 221 [6] M. Thompson, S.L.R. Ellison, R. Wood, Harmonized guidelines for single-laboratory validation of  
222 methods of analysis (IUPAC Technical Report), Pure Appl. Chem. 74 (2002) 835–855.  
223 <https://doi.org/10.1351/pac200274050835>.
- 224 [7] V. Barwick, CITAC / EURACHEM GUIDE Guide to Quality in Analytical Chemistry An Aid to  
225 Accreditation, 3rd (2016), 2002. [www.eurachem.org](http://www.eurachem.org). (accessed February 10, 2020).
- 226 [8] Norman Network, Glossary of Terms | NORMAN, (n.d.). [https://www.norman-](https://www.norman-network.net/?q=node/9)  
227 [network.net/?q=node/9](https://www.norman-network.net/?q=node/9) (accessed April 30, 2020).
- 228 [9] L. Cuadros-Rodríguez, L. Gámiz-Gracia, A. Carrasco-Pancorbo, C. Ruiz-Samblás, Glossary of Analytical  
229 Terms, 2013. [https://www.seqa.es/SEQA2013/Glosario\\_archivo\\_final.pdf](https://www.seqa.es/SEQA2013/Glosario_archivo_final.pdf).
- 230 [10] A. Howard, Glossary of Analytical Terms, in: Compos. Artifice Music Henry Purcell, Cambridge  
231 University Press, 2019: pp. xix–xxii. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139030458.001>.
- 232 [11] H.T. Karnes, G. Shiu, V.P. Shah, Validation of Bioanalytical methods. Review, Pharm. Res. 8 (1991) 421–  
233 426.
- 234 [12] H. Oberacher, M. Sasse, J.P. Antignac, Y. Guitton, L. Debrauwer, E.L. Jamin, T. Schulze, M. Krauss, A.  
235 Covaci, N. Caballero-Casero, K. Rousseau, A. Damont, F. Fenaille, M. Lamoree, E.L. Schymanski, A  
236 European proposal for quality control and quality assurance of tandem mass spectral libraries,  
237 Environ. Sci. Eur. 32 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-020-00314-9>.
- 238 [13] W.R. Ott, A.C. Steinemann, L.A. Wallace, Biomarkers of exposure, in: Expo. Anal., 1st Editio, 2007: pp.  
239 395–404.
- 240 [14] A.G. Brenton, A.R. Godfrey, Accurate mass measurement: Terminology and treatment of data, J. Am.  
241 Soc. Mass Spectrom. 21 (2010) 1821–1835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasms.2010.06.006>.
- 242 [15] E.L. Schymanski, J. Jeon, R. Gulde, K. Fenner, M. Ruff, H.P. Singer, J. Hollender, Identifying small  
243 molecules via high resolution mass spectrometry: Communicating confidence, Environ. Sci. Technol.  
244 48 (2014) 2097–2098. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es5002105>.