SUPLEMENTARY MATERIAL TO

Geyik C., Gümüş Z.P. & Yararbaş G. 2022. Composition analysis of e-liquids and their effects on healthy liver and pharyngeal carcinoma cell lines. *Trakya Univ J Nat Sci*, 24(1): xx-xx, DOI: 10.23902/trkjnat.1135237

1. Selected Parameters of Method Validation for Nicotine

1.1. Linearity

Linearity criterion was measured by standard test solution at 6 different concentration levels. Linearity calculations were performed over the HPLC fields obtained at each concentration step. The obtained values are given in Table S1.

Table S1. Linearity Table of Nicotine

Sample No	Concentration (µg/ml)	Peak Area (mAU * s)	Mean Peak Area (mAU * s)	% RSD	
		62			
1	1.00	57	58	5.51	
		56			
		103			
2	2.50	95	99	4.04	
		99			
		166		2.04	
3	5.00	172	170		
		172	7		
	10.00	318		1.70	
4		328	324		
	-	327	7		
		802			
5	25.00	791	801	1.19	
		810	7		
6		1611			
	50.00	1645	1632	1.11	
		1639	7		

For the linearity criterion for nicotine, each concentration was injected 3 times and the calibration graph plotted over the mean values of the areas is given in Fig. S1.



Fig. S1. Calibration graphs of nicotine

Fig. S2 shows the superimposed states of the chromatograms of the points used for linearity.



Fig. S2. Chromatograms of nicotine for each calibration point

According to chromatogram, it is also seen that there is no shift in the peak's retention times and there is good linearity.

1.2. Accuracy of method for nicotine

Test solutions prepared at low, medium and high concentrations were analyzed in order to determine how close the experimental values are to real values.

Electronic cigarette liquid with a zero nicotine ratio was used as a blank sample and the peak was not observed in the retention time where the nicotine peak.

Sample chromatograms for 3 concentrations selected for extraction reproducibility and recovery studies are given below. To calculate %recovery, following steps were used:

i) Standard with known concentration was applied and mean area is measured.

ii) From calibration plot, measured area is converted to concentration

iii) % recovery = $[(Measured concentration) / (Known concentration)] \times 100$

Three parallel samples were run for each concentration level and the results obtained were calculated as mean recovery and % RSD. The results obtained are given in Table S2 below.

Table S2. Recovery of nicotine for accuracy of nicotine method.

Sample No	Concentration (ug/ml)	Peak Area (mAU *s)	% Recovery	Mean Recovery	% RSD	
		92				
1	2.5	93	92.34			
		94				
		97		93.88	1.15	
2	2.5	96	96.11			
		95				
		93				
3	2.5	94	93,18			
		94				
		166		90.83	1.28	
4	5.0	168	91.88			
		163				
	5.0	161	89.99			
5		163				
		164				
	5.0	162				
6		165	90.62			
		164				
	10.0	319		96.53		
7		321	94.26			
		318				
8	10.0	326	96.36			
		325			0.44	
		327				
9	10.0	336		1		
		333	98.98			
		334	1			

2. Selected Parameters of Method Validation for Propylene Glycol (PG) and Glycerin (GY)

2.1. Linearity of PG and GLY

Table S3. Linearity values of PG

PG Sample No	Concentration (mg / mL)	Peak Area (mAU * s)	Mean Peak Area (mAU * s)	% RSD	
		306002			
1	0.2	319095	306792	3.89	
		295280			
		666848			
2	0.4	678921	676020	1.21	
		682292			
	0.6	1044090		3.16	
3		989375	1026838		
		1047050			
	0.8	1327930			
4		1380020	1372223	2.98	
		1408720			
5		1690790			
	1.0	1710720	1734583	3.43	
		1802240			
6	1.2	2159290			
		2152720	2159550	0.32	
		2166640			

Table S4. Linearity values of GLY

GLY Sample No	Concentration (mg / mL)	Peak Area (mAU * s)	Mean Peak Area (mAU * s)	% RSD	
		181418			
1	0.2	226792	197177	13.02	
		183320			
		381616		7.69	
2	0.4	428808	417825		
		443052			
	0.6	694399		3.80	
3		669475	695395		
		722312			
	0.8	929123		5.34	
4		998594	986742		
		1032510			
5		1223450		4.02	
	1.0	1265160	1271243		
		1325120			
6		1593480		2.22	
	1.2	1575240	1564967		
		1526180	7		



Fig. S3. Chromatograms of calibration point for PG and GLY



Fig. S4. Chromatogram of PG and GLY

2.2. Accuracy of method for PG and GLY

Recovery is calculated as described in 1.2

Table S5. Recoveries of PG and GLY for accuracy of method.

Sample No	Concentration (mg / mL)	Peak Area (mAU *s)	% Recovery	Recovery Mean Peak Area(%)	
		481789	91.27		3.85
1	0.3 (PG)	525230	98.51	94.65	
		499268	94.18		
2	0.6 (PG)	1134746	100.05		2.90
		1164270	102.51	99.77	
		1095106	96.74		
3	0.3 (GLY)	198169	103.88		
		206241	106,58	104.14	2.23
		192380	101.96		
4	0.6 (GLY)	478657	98.69		
		0.6 (GLY) 495736 101.54 99.07		99.07	2.33
		468327	96.97]	

3. Volatile compound analysis by mass spectroscopy

Table S6. Volatile compounds identified from Wiley MS spectra database

	A-CAR-0	A-CAR-9	A-CAR-18	B-CAP-0	B-CAR-0	B-STR-0	B*-STR-9	B*-STR-18	C-MIX-0	C-MIX-6	C-MIX-24
Ethyl n-butanoate							*	*			
Ethyl 2-methylbutanoate							*	*			
Methyl isobutyl ketone	*	*	*	*	*	*			*	*	*
Ethyl n-valerate							*	*			
Ethyl caproate							*				
Ethylene glucol	*	*	*				*				
Amylcarbinol						*					
beta-gamma-hexenol						*	*	*			
Thiocyanic acid, propyl ester	*	*	*	*							
Caramel Furanone	*										
Phenol, 2-methoxy-4-propyl-	*										
2,4-Dihydroxyacetophenon	*										
Bourbonal	*										
Quantrovanil	*										
Ethovan	*										
5-Methyl-2-furfural				*	*						
gamma-Valerolactone				*	*						
Hydrazine	*										
Gamma-N-Caprolactone	*	*	*								
Caprylene									*		
Nicotine		*	*				*	*		*	*
Benzyl Alcohol				*	*						
Perhydroisoquinoline									*		
Glycerol triacetate				*							
Methyl cinnamate							*				
Ethyl cinnamate						*					
gamma-Decanolactone				*		*					
Ludoctal					*		*				
Piperonal (Heliotropine)	*	*	*	*	*						