Supplementary Material

Distribution, Sources, and Ecological Risk Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Agricultural and Dumpsite Soils in Sierra Leone

Mariama Janneh ^{a,b,c}, , Chengkai Qu ^a, Yuan Zhang ^a, Xinli Xing ^{a,b}, Oscar Nkwazema ^d, Fatuma Nyihirani ^{a,b} and Shihua Qi ^{a,b,*}

^aState Key Laboratory of Biogeology and Environmental Geology, China University of Geosciences,

Wuhan 430074, China

^bSchool of Environmental Studies, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, China

^cChemistry Department, School of Environmental Sciences, Njala University of Sierra Leone, Moyamba District, Sierra Leone 787247

^dSchool of Management Science and Engineering, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, China

* Correspondence: shihuaqi@cug.edu.cn; Tel.: +86-138-8602-8263.

Materials and methods

Text S1: Study area description

The Republic of Sierra Leone is divided into four Provinces (Southern Province, Northern Province, North-western Province, and Eastern Province), and two Western areas (western urban and western rural) and the provinces are divided into 14 districts which are further divided into 149 chiefdoms. The capital city is Freetown which is 27 meters above sea level. Freetown is situated on the coastline along the Peninsula Mountain extending into the Atlantic Ocean. Freetown is divided into western urban and western rural with a tropical climate.

Kingtom and Waterloo dumpsites are surrounded by residential areas and local agricultural farmland. Kingtom is the most densely populated and traffic congested area in Freetown. Waterloo is a rural community in the east about 30 kilometers from Freetown, which has also increased in size and population in recent years caused by overpopulation in Freetown. These are the two major dumpsites in the western areas, and they are enclosed by local farmers, wood-burning ovens (bakeries), street vendors, and stores. Households and public garbage, such as plastics, automobiles, and tires, is deposited unlawfully in dumpsites in a chaotic manner. As a result, during the dry season, when there is little or no rainfall, waste burning is common; Bonganema is in the southern province, Njala University residential area; Magburaka is in the northern province near agricultural soils along the Rokel River. Kabala, Makeni, and Sinikoro soil samples were all collected around local farmers and agricultural soil areas. In comparison Kingtom and Waterloo, the other cities appear to be less populated see Table S1. Text S2: Chemical Analysis, Analytical Procedures, and Sample Preparation

The soil samples were tested for the following 16 USEPA priority PAHs: Acenaphthene (Ace), Benzo(ghi)perylene (BghiP), Anthracene (Ant), Acenaphthylene (Acy), Benzo(a)anthracene (BaA), Benzo(b)Fluoranthene (BbF), Chrysene (Chr), Dibenzo anthracene (DahA), (a, h) Benzo(k)Fluoranthene (BkF), Fluorene (Flo), Fluoranthene (Fluo), Indeno(1,2,3-cd) Pyrene (IcdP), Benzo(a)Pyrene (BaP), Naphthalene (Nap), Pyrene (Pyr) and Phenanthrene (Phe). Analytical procedures and sample preparation methods in this research were comparable to those mentioned by 5,11,33-35. A solution of mixture recovery surrogates (Nap-d₈, Ace-d₁₀, Phe-d₁₀, Chr-d₁₂, and Perylened₁₂. 1000 ng of each) was spiked to ca. 10 g of the soil sample and Soxhlet extracted with 150 mL of dichloromethane (DCM) for 24 hrs. During the Soxhlet extraction, copper flacks were added to the solvent in the collection flask to get rid of elemental sulfur in soil samples. After replacing the solvent with n-hexane, the volume of each concentrated sample extract was reduced to 2-3 mL using a rotary evaporator (Heidolph-4000, Germany) before further purification. The extract was loaded onto an alumina-silica gel column (v: v = 2:1) column and rinsed with 30 mL of DCM/n-hexane (v:v = 2:3). A mild nitrogen stream (purity \geq 99.999%) was subsequently used to reduce the effluent to ca. 0.2 mL. Before the PAHs instrumental analysis, 1000 ng of hexamethylbenzene was added to the eluate as the internal standard. A gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS, Agilent 6890N GC-5975 MSD) installed with a DB-5 capillary column was utilized in the analysis of the soil samples for the 16 PAHs. The PAH standard reagents with concentrations of 200, 150, 100, 50, 20, and 10 μ g L⁻¹ nhexane solutions were used to build a six-point calibration curve with an internal standard. One

microlitre of each final sample was introduced into GC-MS and the carrier gas was helium (purity \geq 99.999%) set as constant flow at 1.2 mL min⁻¹. The GC oven temperature was set initially at 80°C (for 2 mins) and then increased to 290°C at a rate of 4°C min⁻¹ for 25 mins. The mass spectrometry was run in SCAN mode varied from (50-500 m/z) with 70eV Electronic Impact (EI) source, and the temperatures of the EI source and quadruple were 230°C and 150°C respectively. The target compounds were recognized by the GC retention time and characteristic ions and quantitated according to the characteristic ions.

Results

Table S1. Population density and environmental surroundings of the study area

Sampling sites	Sample ID	Main areas	Population	The environmental surround
Kingtom dumpsite	KT	Freetown	1,955,964	Landfill, Settlements, Wetland -
Waterloo dumpsite	WL	Freetown	666,270	Landfill, Settlements, Thicket, Herbaceous savan
Makeni	MK	Northern Province	154,970	Settlements, Herbaceous savann
Magburaka	MB	Northern Province	42,300	Savanna, Settlements, Rokel river, Woodland, Gal Agricultu
Kabala	KB	Northern Province	20,970	Agriculture, Mangro
Sinikoro	SN	Northern Province	4,222	Savanna, Settlements, Mangrove, Woodlan
Bonganema	BG	Southern province	318,555	Savanna, Gallery Forest, riparian forest, W

Sierra Leone population density as of 2015 census

Table S1a. Relationship between $\sum 16$ PAHs concentration and total population

\sum 16PAHs concentration	Total population
1	0.953
0.953	1
	∑16PAHs concentration 1 0.953

Spearman's correlation at p < 0.05.

ding of the study area

– floodplain. Agriculture

na, Agriculture in shallows, and recession.

na, Mangrove. Agriculture

llery. Forest and riparian forest, Mangrove. are.

ove, Savanna.

nd, Agriculture, Rocky land in NNE.

Vater bodies, Mangrove, Agriculture.

Research areas (cities)	Main areas	Averag e	∑PAHs range in soils (ng/g)	Authors
Kingtom (Freetown)	Western urban	1142.37	697.84-1,749.90	This research
Waterloo (Freetown)	Western rural	265.12	168.3-389.34	This research
Bonganema	Southern province	54.30	42.42-64.31	This research
Magburaka	Northern province	79.69	24.90-123.50	This research
Kabala	Northern province	54.11	25.82-81.42	This research
Makeni	Northern province	36.55	24.1-49.0	This research
Sinikoro	Northern province	52.34	45.54–59.14	This research
Central China	Dajiuhu	42.4	7.3–191.5	(Xing et al., 2020)
Shenyang, China	Urban areas	2370	283-21821	(Luo et al., 2020)
Hong Kong, China	Rural areas	57.6	42.3–410	(Zhang et al., 2006)
Beijing, China	Urban areas	3917	219–27,825	(Tang et al., 2005)
Southern Italy	Caserata provincial territory	137	10-4191	(Qi et al., 2019)
Southern Italy	Urban areas	84.9	7.6–755	(Thiombane et al., 2019)
Turin, Italy	Urban areas	857	148–3,410	(Morillo et al., 2007)
Southern Italy	Rural areas	333	1.87–11,353	(Thiombane et al., 2019)
Moscow, Russia	Urban areas	1553.9	208–9,604	(Agapkina et al., 2007)
Glasgow, UK	Urban areas	11930	48–51,822	(Morillo et al., 2007)
London, UK	Urban areas	18000	400-67,000	(Vane et al., 2014)
Seville, Spain	Urban areas	807.5	89.5–4,004	(Morillo et al., 2008)
Delhi, India	Rural areas	1910	830-3,880	(Agarwal et al., 2009)
Delhi, India	Urban areas	6838.6	81.6-45,017	(Kumar et al., 2012)
Ghana, Kumasi	Kumasi	442.5	14.8-2084	(Bortey-Sam et al., 2014)

Table S2. Comparison of worldwide Σ PAH mean concentrations (ng/g dw) in topsoil from selected cities in Sierra Leone

S6

014)

Table S3. PAHs-ring percentage (%) composition, mean (ng/g dw), and range (ng/g dw) distribution in the topsoil (0-20 cm)p

		Kingtom			Waterloo			Bonganen	na		Magbural	ka		Makeni			Kabala			Sinikoro	
PAHs-rings	Percentage	Mean	Range	Percentage	Range	Mean	Percentag e	Mean	Range	Percentage	Mean	Range	Percentag e	Mean	Range	Percentage	Mean	Range	Percentag e	Mean	Range
2-ring	16.54	188.98	75.46–268.52	25.59	35.04–113.46	67.83	45.49	24.41	21.11–27.68	48.58	36.07	9.73-62.40	53	19.25	8.75–29.75	56.56	30.33	10.55–50.11	57	29.83	27.54–32.13
3-ring	13.04	148.91	113.97–176.24	16.07	31.56–49.18	42.60	34.99	1878	14.89–20.94	16.46	12.22	10.50-13.93	31.24	11.34	10.05–12.64	27.42	14.70	5.80-20.60	25.61	13.41	11.24–15.57
4-ring	30.48	348.17	219.16-540.77	34.74	61.80–136.28	92.11	17.25	9.26	6.06–11.64	18.07	13.42	3.46-23.37	13.54	4.62	0.80–5.48	11.41	4.24	0.49–12.23	13.32	5.48	2.49-13.95
5-ring	29.62	338.43	221.71-567.80	18.07	31.69–64.60	47.91	1.77	0.95	0.29–1.72	12.95	9.61	1.10–18.13	1.53	0.55	0.21-0.71	4.03	1.92	1.15-4.32	2.91	1.13	0.35-3.05
6-ring	10.32	117.88	70.35–196.07	5.53	11.34–17.19	14.67	0.51	0.27	0.27–0.28	3.95	2.93	0.83-5.03	0.69	0.25	0.06–0.45	0.58	0.21	0.00-0.62	1.15	0.56	0.28-1.21

Tale S4 Spearman's correlation coefficients (r) amongst soil properties and PAHs concentration

	2-ring PAHs	3-ring PAHs	4-ring PAHs	5-ring PAHs	6-ring PAHs	LMWPAHs	HMWPAHs	∑7PAHs	∑16PAHs	pН	Silt	Sand	Clay
2-ring PAHs	1												
3-ring PAHs	0.82	1											
4-ring PAHs	0.82	0.91	1										
5-ring PAHs	0.78	0.72	0.84	1									
6-ring PAHs	0.72	0.65	0.77	0.88	1								
LMWPAHs	0.97	0.90	0.89	0.76	0.74	1							
HMWPAHs	0.79	0.87	0.99	0.90	0.81	0.86	1						

profile

∑7PAHs	0.71	0.63	0.77	0.92	0.95	0.71	0.82	1					
∑16PAHs	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.83	0.75	0.97	0.93	0.75	1				
pН	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.71	0.74	0.60	0.63	0.76	0.63	1			
Silt	-0.32	-0.46	-0.50	-0.59	-0.70	-0.39	-0.55	-0.69	-0.47	-0.40	1		
Sand	0.24	0.38	0.41	0.55	0.67	0.29	0.47	0.67	0.38	0.45	-0.98	1	
Clay	-0.29	-0.44	-0.42	-0.55	-0.65	-0.32	-0.47	-0.65	-0.41	-0.56	0.91	-0.95	1

Note: Highest Significance levels at $p < 0.05^*$ and $p < 0.01^{**}$ are indicated in bold italics.

Table S5. Soil physico-chemical properties range and geometric mean distribution in the soil profile

Soil properties	Kingtom	Gmean	Waterloo	Gmean	Bonganema	Gmean	Magburaka	Gmean	Makeni	Gmean	Sinikoro	Gmean	Kabala	Gmean
Clay content	12.7–17.2	14.9	6.4–12.1	8.5	22.8-39.3	30.2	17.3.–26.8	21.5	13.8–31.9	21.0	8.5.–28.6	15.6	27.2–36.1	31.4
Silt content	24.3-26.4	26.3	11.6–20.6	15.7	36.0-44.5	40.7	41.1-43.7	42.3	16.8–38.5	25.4	22.4–55.3	35.2	42.0–49.5	45.6
Sand content	55.7-63.0	58.5	67.3–81.9	74.8	16.2-41.1	26.3	29.6–41.7	35.1	29.7–69.4	45.4	15.1–69.1	33.3	14.4–30.8	21.0
pH levels	7.8-8.0	7.9	5.1–6.6	5.6	5.2–5.8	5.6	5.5-6.0	5.7	6.3–6.8	6.6	6.3–6.3	6.3	6.3–6.8	6.6

Geometric mean=Gmean

Table S6. Comparison of Toxicity equivalent quantity TEQ_{BaP} mean values in the soil profile from selected cities in Sierra Leone

Research areas	Name of regions	<i>TEQBaP</i> mean values (ng/g)	References
Kingtom, Freetown	Western urban	153.6	This research
Waterloo, Freetown	Western rural	24.9	This research
Bonganema	Southern province	1.08	This research
Magburaka	Northern Province	6.67	This research
Kabala	Northern Province	1.45	This research
Makeni	Northern Province	0.33	This research
Sinikoro	Northern Province	1.13	This research
Campania	Rural	661	(Thiombane et al., 2019)

Delhi (India)	Urban	218	(Agarwal et al., 2006)
United Kingdom	Rural	83.5	(Nam et al., 2008)
Campania	Urban	54.9	(Thiombane et al., 2019)
Tarragonain (Spain)	Urban	64	(Nadal et al., 2007)
Gwangju (Korea)	Urban	14.3	(Islam et al., 2017)
Norway	Rural	14.3	(Nam et al., 2008)
Poland	Agricultural soil	11.9	(Maliszewska-Kordybach et al., 2

Toxicity equivalent quantity =TEQ_{BaP}



, 2009)



Figure S1 Total individual PAHs concentration distribution in KT, Kingtom; WL, Waterloo; BG, Bonganema; KB, Kabala; MK, Makeni; SN, Sinikoro, and MB, Magburaka



Figure S2 The relationship between the sum of total PAHs concentration and the total population in each studied area



Dahl 4. 16 PAHs

Figure S3 PAHs mean concentration and distribution in Kingtom; KT, Waterloo; WL, Bonganema; BG, Kabala; KB, Makeni; MK, Sinikoro; SN, and Magburaka; MB

S11



Figure S4 LMW-PAHs and HMW-PAHs concentrations (ng/g dw) in topsoil of the study area



Figure S5 Soil pH and particle-sizes distribution in the soil profile

S12



Figure S6 Soil particle-sizes percentage composition and distribution in the soil profile

S13