1 Dispersive liquid-liquid microextraction with deep eutectic solvent

2 coupled with GC-MS for the determination of chiral carvone in

3 herbaceous plants

4 Yuluan Wu^a, Ming Liang^a, Yanping Xian^{*a}, Rongqiao Chen^a, Junpeng Hu^a, Hang Dai^a,

5 Chenghao Liu^a, Xiangchang Hou^a

6

- 7 ^a Guangzhou Quality Supervision and Testing Institute, Research Center of Risk Dynamic
- 8 Detection and Early Warning for Food Safety of Guangzhou City, Key Laboratory of Detection
- 9 Technology for Food Safety of Guangzhou City, Guangzhou NQI-Quality Safety Science and

10 Technology Collaborative Innovation Center, Guangzhou 511447, China

11

12 *Corresponding authors: Yanping Xian

13 <u>zjyxyp2015@163.com</u>

14

15 Current address: No. 1-2, Zhujiang Road, Panyu District, Guangzhou, China

16 Tel: +86-20-83183575; Fax: +86-20-83183575

- 18
- 19
- 20

21 Table S1. Composition of the DE

No.	HBA	HBD	Water	Molar ratio
DES1	choline chloride	formic acid	/	1:2~1:3
DES2	choline chloride	phosphoric acid	/	1:2
DES3	choline chloride	lactic acid	/	1:2
DES4	choline chloride	glucose	water	2:1:1
DES5	choline chloride	diethylene glycol	/	1:2
DES6	choline chloride	glycerol	/	1:2
DES7	choline chloride	diethylamine	/	1:2

	Loval		Factors	
	Level	Liquid-solid ratio/mL·g ⁻¹	Extraction time/min	Extraction temperature/°C
	-1 (Low)	15	20	40
	0 (Center)	20	30	50
	1 (High)	25	40	60
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
21				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
26				
50				
37				
38				
39				
40				
11				
41				
42				
43				
44				

25 Table S2. Response surface experimental factors and level design.

N.	Liquid-solid ratio	Extraction	Extraction	Recove	ery (%)
NO.	/mL·g ⁻¹	time/min	temperature/°C	<i>L</i> -carvone	D-carvone
1	20	30	50	94.6	95.5
2	15	30	40	72.8	70.5
3	15	30	60	63.8	69.3
4	25	20	50	100.4	99.6
5	20	20	60	74.1	76.1
6	15	40	50	79.8	81.2
7	20	40	60	67.9	70.5
8	20	30	50	93.4	91.4
9	20	30	50	92.1	95.7
10	20	40	40	65.9	63.9
11	25	40	50	83.2	84.1
12	20	30	50	95.3	91.8
13	20	30	50	87.9	85.9
14	20	20	40	73.5	69.8
15	15	20	50	77.4	78.3
16	25	30	60	81.1	79.5
17	25	30	40	76.9	76.1

Table S3. Response surface experiment results.

.

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean suqare	F-value	P-value Prob>F	Significance
Model	1948.10	9	216.46	34.17	< 0.0001	significant
А	285.60	1	285.60	45.08	0.0003	
В	102.25	1	102.25	16.14	0.0051	
С	0.61	1	0.61	0.095	0.7663	
AB	96.04	1	96.04	15.16	0.0059	
AC	43.56	1	43.56	6.88	0.0343	
BC	0.49	1	0.49	0.077	0.7890	
A2	18.22	1	18.22	2.88	0.1338	
B2	121.87	1	121.87	19.24	0.0032	
C2	1206.84	1	1206.84	190.50	< 0.0001	
Residual	44.35	7	6.34			
Lack of fit	10.09	3	3.36	0.39	0.7656	Not significant
Pure error	34.25	4	8.56			
Corrected total	1992.44	16				
SD	2.52	R2	0.9777			
CV%	3.10	Adj-R2	0.9491			
		Pred-R2	0.8921			

1 able 54. ANOVA 101 response surface quadratic model of L-can

59 Note: Significant difference P<0.05, highly significant difference P<0.01

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean suqare	F-value	P-value	Significance
Model	1776.46	9	197.38	15.92	0.0007	significant
А	200.00	1	200.00	16.13	0.0051	
В	72.60	1	72.60	5.85	0.0461	
С	28.50	1	28.50	2.30	0.1733	
AB	84.64	1	84.64	6.82	0.0348	
AC	5.29	1	5.29	0.43	0.5345	
BC	0.023	1	0.023	1.814E-003	0.9672	
A2	6.50	1	6.50	0.52	0.4926	
B2	106.00	1	106.00	8.55	0.0222	
C2	1212.19	1	1212.19	97.74	< 0.0001	
Residual	86.81	7	12.40			
Lack of fit	23.28	3	7.76	0.49	0.7087	Not significant
Pure error	63.53	4	15.88			
Corrected total	1863.28	16				
SD	3.52	R2	0.9534			
CV	4.34	Adj-R2	0.8935			
		Pred-R2	0.7468			

71]	Fable S5.	ANOVA	for response	surface	quadratic	model	of D-carvor	ie.
------	-----------	-------	--------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------------	-----

72 Note: Significant difference P<0.05, highly significant difference P<0.01

Analytes	Matrix	Instrumental method	Pre-treatment method	Linear range	LOD	Recoveries	Precision	Reference
Carvone and nitrendipine	Skin diffusate and microemulsions	UFLC	Direct measurement after dilution	0.125- 30µg/mL	0.075µg/mL	90-105%	<10%	1
Carvone, cineole, perillaldehyd e, perillyl alcohol and sobrerol	The diet of laboratory animals	HPLC	Extracted by 90% methanol in water	1-150 μg/mL	2 µg/g	97.9±2.6%	5.5-23.3%	2
Piperine, embeline, and carvone	Ayurvedic formulation catpusphadhya churna	HPTLC	Extracted by methanol using a Soxhlet apparatus.	1-9 ng/spot	0.2 ng/spot	100.09	/	3
Carvone, menthol, thymol, carvacrol and methyl salicylate	Chicken breast	GC-MS/MS	QuEChERS	2-100 mg/L	LOQ: 2.9 µg/kg	80-102%	<15%	4
Ratios of <i>d,l</i> -Carvone	Caraway seeds and speamint leaves	HPLC	Extracted with supercritical fluid of carbon dioxide	Caraway se contain bot	eds contain only d h d-carvone (7%) a	<i>l</i> -carvone and spea and <i>l</i> -carvone (939	umint leaves %)	5
Chiral terpenoids	Essential oil of Mentha spicata	GC-FID and GC-MS	Hydrodistilled to extract essential oils	(S)-(+)-Ca	rvone has been ide in <i>M. spicate</i>	ntified as the major ressential oils	or compound	6
Composition al analysis	Spearmint (<i>Mentha</i> <i>spicata</i>) essential oil	GC-MS	Isolation of the essential oil by hydrodistillation	The five me spearmint e (14.63%), t terpinoleno	ost abundant const essential oil are (+) p-bourbonene (1.13 ne (0.82%).	ituents of the Iran carvone (73.20%) 3%), cineole (1.10	ian), limonen %) and 3-	7
Composition al analysis	Celery (<i>Apium</i> graveolens) leaf and root	GC-MS	Extracted with liquid carbon dioxide	The main c carvone and contained h amount of c	onstituents in the of d 3n-butylphthalid igher amount of li carvone.	bil of roots were li e. The essential oi monene, and very	monene, l of leaves small	8
D and L- Carvone	Herbaceous plants	GC-MS	Extract by DES	0.5-50.0 mg/kg	8.0 mg/kg	83.5%-101.3%	3.2-6.1%	This work

81 Table S6 Comparison with other methods reported in the literature for the detection of carvone

82 UFLC: ultra fast liquid chromatographic83 HPTLC: High performance thin layer chromatography

84

85 **References**

86	1	R. Gannu, V. V. Yamsani, S. K. Yamsani, C. R. Palem, S. Voruganti and M. R. Yamsani, J.
87		Pharmaceut. Biomed., 2009, 50 , 1080-1084.
88	2	L. Tao and M. A. Pereira, <i>J. Chromatogr. A</i> , 1998, 793 , 71-76.
89	3	K. L. Jain, R. K. Patel and H. P. Patel, <i>J. AOAC Int.</i> , 2014, 97(3) , 773-777.
90	4	F. Cozzi, I. Eder-Neuhauser, K Teichmann and M. Zaunschirm, J. Food Drug Anal., 2021, 29,
91		255-261.
92	5	M. Bounoshita, K. Hibi and H. Nakamura, <i>Anal. Sci</i> ., 1993, 9 , 425-428.
93	6	V. S. Pragadheesh, A. Yadav and C. S. Chanotiya, J. Chromatogr. B, 2015, 1002, 30-41.
94	7	M. Jalali-Heravi, R. S. Moazeni-Pourasil and H. Sereshti, Anal. Methods, 2014, 6, 6753-6759.
95	8	A. Sipailiene, P. R. Venskutonis, A Sarkinas and V. Cypiene, Acta Horticulturae, 2005, 677, 71-
96		77.
97		