

Development of a technology for reducing polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked food and smoked ingredients

Article

Accepted Version

Parker, J. K. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4121-5481>,
Lignou, S. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6971-2258>,
Shankland, K. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6566-0155>,
Kurwie, P., Griffiths, H. D. and Baines, D. A. (2018)
Development of a technology for reducing polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in smoked food and smoked ingredients. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 66 (10). pp. 2449-2458. ISSN 0021-8561 doi: 10.1021/acs.jafc.6b05399 Available at <https://reading-pure-test.eprints-hosting.org/68639/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.6b05399>

Publisher: American Chemical Society

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Development of a Zeolite Filter for Removing Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons from Smoke and Smoked Ingredients whilst Retaining the Smoky Flavor

Jane K. Parker,^{†*} Stella Lignou,[†] Kenneth Shankland,[†] Phillipa Kurwie,[†] Huw D. Griffiths,[§] and David A. Baines[‡]

[†] School of Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 6AP, U.K.

[§] Besmoke Ltd., Unit B1, Ford Airfield Industrial Estate, Arundel BN18 0HY, U.K.

[‡] Baines Food Consultancy Ltd., 22 Elisabeth Close, Thornbury, Bristol, BS35 2YN, U.K.

***Corresponding Author:**

Tel: +44 118 378 7455

E-mail: j.k.parker@reading.ac.uk

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 The popularity of smoked foodstuffs such as sauces, marinades and rubs is on the rise.
3 However, during the traditional smoking process, in addition to the desirable smoky aroma
4 compounds, harmful polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are also generated. In this
5 work, a selective filter was developed which reduces PAH concentrations in a smoke by up to
6 90%, whilst maintaining a desirable smoky flavor. Preliminary studies using a cocktail of 12
7 PAHs stirred with a zeolite showed the potential for this zeolite to selectively remove PAHs
8 from a simple solution. However pre-treatment of the smoke prior to application removed the
9 PAHs more efficiently and is more widely applicable to a range of food ingredients. Whilst
10 volatile analysis showed that there was a concomitant reduction in the concentration of the
11 smoky compounds such as 2-methoxyphenol (guaiacol), 2-methylphenol (*m*-cresol) and the
12 isoeugenols, sensory profiling showed that the difference in perception of flavor was minimal.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 **Keywords:** polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), smoke flavor, zeolite filter, GC-MS,

22 INTRODUCTION

23 Smoking of foods, although historically a means of preservation, is used nowadays to impart a
24 desirable smoky flavor to many popular foods, particularly rubs, sauces, seasonings and
25 marinades. The aroma compounds which contribute to the smoky flavor have been
26 characterized in smoked foods such as salmon,¹ sausages,² and smoke cured bacon,³ as well
27 as in liquid smoke⁴ derived from different woods⁵ and aromatic plants.⁶ The burning of lignin
28 produces phenols, particularly methoxyphenols, which impart potent smoky, burnt, tar,
29 phenolic and spicy notes. GC-Olfactometry has been used to show that 4-methylphenol (*p*-
30 cresol), 4-methoxyphenol (guaiacol) and (*E*)-2-methoxy-4-(1-propenyl)phenol (isoeugenol)
31 contribute to the smoky spicy notes¹ whereas sweeter notes such as vanilla and toffee arise
32 from the formation of vanillin, 2-furancarboxaldehyde, and 2-hydroxy-3-methyl-2-
33 cyclopenten-1-one (cyclopentenone).

34 However, the smoking process generates a group of dangerous carcinogens that are
35 responsible for lung cancer in cigarette smokers, and epidemiological evidence has implicated
36 food-derived polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the development of liver and other
37 cancers in humans.^{7, 8} Of the hundreds of PAHs generated during the smoking process, the
38 International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified benzo[a]pyrene (BaP) as a Group
39 1 carcinogen (i.e. known human carcinogen) and 16 others have been classified as either
40 Group 2A or Group 2B carcinogens (probable and possible carcinogens).⁹ The EU
41 Commission Regulation No 1881/2006 recognised the need to achieve levels of as low as
42 reasonably achievable, and set maximum concentrations of BaP between 1 and 20 µg/kg
43 depending on the food ingredient and the intended use. This was updated in 2008 by the
44 European Food Safety Authority¹⁰ who recommended that the sum of the concentrations of
45 benzo[a]pyrene (BaP), chrysene (CHR), benz[a]anthracene (BaA) and benzo[b]fluoranthene

46 (BbF), which collectively are referred to as PAH4, was more suitable as an indicator of
47 potential toxicity.

48 The food industry has been preparing smoke flavorings for several decades by condensing
49 aerosol smoke in water, then subjecting the resulting solution to a purification process.

50 Concerns about the occurrence of PAHs in smoke flavorings led the EU to initiate an
51 evaluation of smoke flavorings and determine the risk to consumers. They concluded that
52 there is less of a health concern with these products compared to the natural smoking
53 process,¹¹ but it is a requirement that these liquid smokes are labelled as “smoke flavoring”
54 and they cannot be labelled as natural. Such labelling is seen less favourably by consumers
55 and retailers in the current drive for natural and ‘clean label’ products. To address the health
56 concerns relating to smoking processes (particularly traditional smoking processes, but also
57 production of liquid smoke) there is a need for a new technology that is capable of reducing
58 the levels of PAHs in aerosol smoke, thereby reducing the exposure of consumers to PAHs,
59 whilst maintaining the desirable flavor of the smoked food products.

60 The reduction and potential elimination of PAHs from smoke and liquid smoke is of interest
61 to many industries (tobacco industry, car industry, environmental agencies, and foodstuffs)
62 and strategies have been reviewed.¹² Of those techniques investigated, treatment with a zeolite
63 has produced the most promising results. Radojičić et al.¹³ reported the use of a zeolite
64 catalyst CuZSM-5 to reduced PAHs in tobacco smoke, and the PAH content of exhaust gases
65 from a combustion engine was successfully reduced by treatment with the zeolite
66 clinoptilolite.¹⁴ The same zeolite has been used to remove PAHs from paraffin.¹⁵ Alternative
67 strategies have been used in different industries. Microbiological techniques for removal of
68 PAHs from contaminated environments (soil, water) have been reviewed Seo et al.,¹⁶ and
69 Rentz et al. report the specific degradation of BaP by *Sphingomonas yanoikuyae* JAR02.¹⁷

70 Our aim was to develop a zeolite filter which could be applied to a range of products
71 throughout the food industry, removing PAHs without compromising the desirable smoke
72 flavor. The zeolite, clinoptilolite, is an inexpensive naturally occurring aluminosilicate
73 mineral which has been shown to remove PAHs from cigarette smoke and paraffin, the latter
74 being a more challenging non-polar matrix. In this work, we demonstrate the effectiveness of
75 this zeolite in removing PAHs from various matrices, including smoke, on a laboratory scale
76 and in an industrial smoking chamber. In addition, our hypothesis, that the retention of PAHs
77 was selective and that aroma molecules would pass through the filter was tested. Both volatile
78 analysis and sensory analysis were used to investigate the flavor in food prepared from both
79 filtered and unfiltered smoke.

80 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

81 **Materials**

82 **Chemicals.** Perylene and the mixture of PAHs were obtained from LGC Standards
83 (Teddington, U.K.). The mixture contained each of the following at 20.1 ± 0.1 mg/L in
84 dichloromethane: naphthalene (NPTH), acenaphthylene (ACYN), acenaphthene (ACEN),
85 fluorine (FLUO), phenanthrene (PHEN), anthracene (ANTH), fluoranthene (FLA), pyrene
86 (PYR), benz[a]anthracene (BaA), chrysene (CHR), benzo[b]fluoranthene (BbF),
87 benzo[k]fluoranthene (BkF), benzo[a]pyrene (BaP), indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene (IcdP),
88 dibenz[a,h]anthracene (DBahA) and benzo[ghi]perylene (BghiP). Cyclohexane (99.5%),
89 methanol and N,N-dimethylformamide (99.8%) were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich Co Ltd.
90 (Poole, U.K.). The aroma compound standards were obtained as follows: 2-
91 furancarboxaldehyde, benzeneacetaldehyde, 2-methylphenol, 3-methylphenol and 4-
92 methylphenol were obtained from Fisher Scientific (Loughborough, U.K.); 2-methoxy-4-
93 prop-2-enylphenol (eugenol) from Givaudan (Milton Keynes, U.K.); (*E*)-2-methoxy-4-(1-
94 propenyl)phenol with (*Z*)-2-methoxy-4-(1-propenyl)phenol present as a minor impurity from

95 Mane (London, U.K.); 3-methylcyclopentane-1,2-dione from IFF (Haverhill, U.K.); 5-
96 methyl-2-furancarboxaldehyde, 1-(5-methyl-2-furanyl)ethanone, 2-furanmethanol and 1-(5-
97 methyl-2-furanyl)propan-1-one from Oxford Organics (Hartlepool, U.K.); 1-(2-
98 furanyl)ethanone, phenol, benzofuran, 2-methoxyphenol, 4-methyl-2-methoxyphenol, 4-ethyl-
99 2-methoxyphenol, 4-ethenyl-2-methoxyphenol, 5-butyl-4-methyldihydrofuran-2(3*H*)-one
100 (unspecified mix of isomers), 4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzaldehyde, 4-hydroxy-3-
101 methoxybenzoic acid and 1,3-dimethoxy-2-hydroxybenzene (syringol) from Sigma Aldrich
102 (Poole, U.K.). All other chemicals used were standard laboratory chemicals.

103 **Ingredients:** Oak wood chips were supplied by Ashwood Smoking Chips Ltd. (Kettering,
104 U.K.), and preheated at 130 °C prior to use to reduce moisture content (12% loss after 3 h).
105 Rapeseed oil (refined and de-odorised) was obtained from BFP Wholesale (Leeds, U.K.) and
106 refined and deodorised MCT coconut oil was obtained from Oleon (Sutton, U.K.). Tomato
107 ketchup was obtained from a local supermarket.

108 **Zeolite.** Zeolite was supplied by RS Minerals Ltd. (Guisborough, U.K.). The material is a
109 calcium hydrated aluminosilicate of sedimentary origin, free of fibers and quartz, which
110 contains a minimum of 85% clinoptilolite and a maximum of 15% feldspar, micas and clays.
111 It was supplied both as a coarse grain size (grain size $> \sim 5$ mm) and as a medium grain size
112 (grain size ~ 1 –4 mm). The medium grain zeolite was used in some experiments as received
113 and 100 g was further fractionated for use in the laboratory experiments. A sieve shaker was
114 used to produce five different fractions: size 1, 75–180 μm (yield: 4.6 g); size 2, 180–355 μm
115 (6.4 g); size 3, 355 μm –1 mm (45.1 g); size 4, 1–1.4 mm (33.3 g); and size 5, > 1.4 (10.0 g).

116 **Reduction of PAHs from a simple matrix (experiments 1–3)**

117 For experiment 1, zeolite (0.5 g) was added to a mix (5 ml) of 16 PAHs in dichloromethane
118 (each present at 201 $\mu\text{g/L}$) and stirred. After 1 min, 500 μL was transferred to an Eppendorf
119 tube and centrifuged in an Eppendorf MiniSpin Microcentrifuge (Fisher Scientific,

120 Loughborough, U.K.) at maximum RCF (12,100 g) for 10 min prior to analysis by GC-MS.
121 This was repeated after 5 and 60 min. The grain sizes selected for this experiment were either
122 size 4 (1–1.4 mm) or size 2 (180–355 μm) and the zeolite was used either as received (AR) or
123 after heating at 270 °C in a GC oven for 12 h (HT).
124 For experiment 2, coconut oil (10 g) was spiked with 100 μL of the PAH mix (20.1 mg/L) and
125 stirred for 4 h with size 4 zeolite (0.5 g) which had been activated at 270 °C for 12 h. The
126 coconut oil was filtered and the PAHs extracted from the oil as described below. For
127 experiment 3, an aliquot (10 ml) of coconut oil that had been smoked for 72 h in a traditional
128 smoking chamber, was treated with size 4 activated zeolite (1 g) for either 1 h or 18 h. The
129 PAHs were extracted from the oil as described below prior to analysis by GC-MS.
130 Approximate quantitation was by comparison with 2 and 5 mg/L PAH mixes spiked into
131 unsmoked oil (100 μl in 10 g) and analyzed under the same conditions.

132 **Dual stream laboratory scale smoker (experiments 4–8)**

133 The laboratory scale dual stream smoker is illustrated in Figure S1. Smoke was produced by
134 heating a standard 1 L conical flask containing up to 100 g of chipped oak over a gas burner.
135 The conical flask was placed in a metal box containing 100 g sand (control) to disperse the
136 heat. Air was pumped in through the stopper and out through the side arm to a condenser flask
137 cooled by an ice bath. The uncondensed smoke was split and passed in parallel through two
138 identical glass chromatography columns (50 cm x 2 cm i.d.) with a sintered glass frit at the
139 bottom of each. One column (treated) was filled with zeolite (10 g, medium grain size as
140 received) and the other column (control) was filled with ceramic antibumping granules (70 g)
141 and enough sand (control) to balance the flows of the two columns (3–5 g). The smoke
142 (~200–400 ml/min) was collected in 40 g of water. The treated and the control conditions
143 were alternated between the two columns.

144 **Single stream pilot scale smoker (experiments 9–10)**

145 A single stream stainless steel rig¹⁸ was used for the smoking process. Medium grade zeolite
146 (1.4 mm, sieve size +14) was activated in a Lincat double stone base pizza oven (Lincoln,
147 U.K.) at 265–285 °C for 3 h prior to use. The wood furnace was loaded with 1.5 kg of dry oak
148 wood shavings and the oil pan was loaded with 700 g of rapeseed oil. The wood was charged
149 with hot ash and set to run for 6 h with the smoke running through one filter column and
150 bubbled through the rapeseed oil. In experiment 9, the rig was employed with a) the filter
151 empty, b) the filter containing 600 g zeolite as received and c) the filter containing 600 g
152 activated zeolite. In a second pilot scale experiment (experiment 10), three different grain
153 sizes of zeolite were used in the filter; size 5 (>1.4 mm), size 3 (355 µm–1 mm) and size 2
154 (180–355 µm).

155 **Manufacturing scale smoker (experiments 11–12)**

156 Additional trials (experiments 11–12) were carried out in a full scale smoking chamber in
157 which different quantities of activated zeolite were tested. PAH analysis was carried out by
158 Eurofins (Acton, U.K.) using a saponification step, followed by SPE and GC-MS similar to
159 the method described below for extraction from oils.

160 **Extraction of PAHs from aqueous samples (experiments 4–8)**

161 The entire sample (40 ml) was shaken with 22 ml methanol (optimum ratio of water:methanol
162 which had previously been determined) and the internal standard was added (1 ml of perylene
163 (200 µg/L)). The PAHs were extracted with SPE based on a method by Zha et al.¹⁹ The whole
164 sample was passed through a Bond Elut CH SPE cartridge (1 g bed, 6 ml total volume,
165 Crawford Scientific, Strathaven, U.K.) which had previously been conditioned with methanol
166 (10 ml). The column was then washed with HPLC grade water (3 times) and once with 10 ml
167 water methanol (65:35 v/v). The column was dried under vacuum (~70 kPa) for 30 min
168 (previously optimised) and then eluted with cyclohexane (4 ml). Recovery was >80% for all
169 PAHs except DBahA (70%).

170 **Extraction of PAHs from oil (experiments 2–3, 9–10)**

171 Extraction was based on a method reported by Stumpe-Viksna et al.²⁰ Oil (10 g) was placed
172 into a round bottomed flask, 12 g of potassium hydroxide, 100 ml of ethanol and internal
173 standard (perylene, 100 µL of 2010 ng/µL in dichloromethane) were added. The mixture was
174 heated for 1 h (78 °C) under reflux, filtered and extracted into cyclohexane. The cyclohexane
175 phase was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and concentrated by rotary evaporator under
176 reduced pressure (40 °C)

177 The extract was applied to a SPE cartridge (Bond Elute CH, 6ml, Crawford Scientific,
178 Strathaven, U.K.) previously conditioned with cyclohexane (5 ml). The flask was rinsed with
179 cyclohexane (3 ml), and the PAHs were eluted with cyclohexane (6 ml). The collected
180 fraction was evaporated to approximately 1 mL under a gentle stream of nitrogen. The
181 concentrated extracts were transferred to autosampler vials ready for analysis by GC/MS.

182 Two aliquots of unsmoked oil (10 g) were spiked with the mix of 16 PAHs (100 µL of 2 mg/L
183 or 100 µL of 5 mg/L in dichloromethane). A three point calibration curve was used to
184 estimate the concentration of the PAHs present in the smoked oils. For all but the
185 naphthalene, acenaphthylene, acenaphthene and fluorine, there was a good linear relationship
186 passing through the origin.

187 **Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS) of PAH extracts.**

188 The extracts were analyzed using an Agilent 7890A gas chromatograph equipped with a
189 Zebron ZB-AAA column (10 m x 0.25 mm i.d. x 0.25 µm film thickness) coupled to an
190 Agilent 5975C MSD. The carrier gas was helium (1.69 ml/min) and the extract (1 µl) was
191 injected in splitless mode. The GC oven was held at 45 °C for 135 s, the temperature was
192 raised to 280 °C at 8 °C/min and then to 300 °C at 16 °C/min and held for 4 min. Mass
193 spectra were recorded in electron impact mode at an ionization voltage of 70 eV and source
194 temperature of 300 °C. The MS was operated in SIM/SCAN mode using eight time windows,

195 monitoring the following groups of ions, (dwell time of each 25 ms) to identify and quantitate
196 the PAHs: NPTH m/z 128, 127, 102, 63; ACYN m/z 154, 153, 152, 76; ACEN m/z 154, 153,
197 152, 76; FLUO m/z 166, 1654, 139, 82; PHEN m/z 178, 176, 89; ANTH m/z 178, 176, 89;
198 FLA m/z 202, 200, 101, 100; PYR m/z 202, 200, 101, 100; BaA m/z 228, 226; CHR m/z 228,
199 226; BbF m/z 264, 252, 250, 126; BkF m/z 264, 252, 250, 126; BaP m/z 264, 252, 250, 126;
200 IcdP m/z 278, 276, 139, 138; DBahA m/z 278, 276, 139, 138; BghiP m/z 278, 276, 139, 138.
201 For each PAH, the identity was confirmed by comparison of the mass spectrum and the
202 retention time with those of the authentic standards. Data were controlled and stored by the
203 ChemStation system. Six point calibration curves in the range 5–500 $\mu\text{g/L}$ were carried out
204 for each PAH in the mix, each point in duplicate. Response factors were obtained for each
205 PAH ($r^2 > 0.99$) and these were used to quantitate the PAHs in the samples against the
206 internal standard. Limits of detection for each method were estimated based on serial dilutions
207 of the standard mix.

208 **Thermogravimetry**

209 A thermogravimetric measurement was carried out on a TA Instruments Q50
210 thermogravimetric analyzer. Zeolite (53.55 mg) was accurately weighed into a sample pan
211 and placed in the instrument. The sample was first equilibrated at 30 °C then raised to 270 °C
212 at a rate of 5 °C/min, then held at 270 °C to give a total experiment duration of 12 h. The
213 weight of the sample was recorded over the course of the experiment.

214 **Powder X-ray diffraction**

215 Powder X-ray diffraction data were collected from zeolite samples on a Bruker D8 Advance
216 (Cu $K_{\alpha 1}$, $\lambda = 1.54056 \text{ \AA}$) diffractometer operating in capillary transmission mode. The
217 diffractometer was equipped with a LynxEye detector. Monochromatic Cu $K_{\alpha 1}$ is achieved
218 with the use of a curved Johansson type primary monochromator. Furthermore, an 8 mm
219 detector aperture slit and a metal knife edge collimator were used to minimise air scattering.

220 Samples were packed into 0.7 mm borosilicate glass capillaries before mounting on the
221 diffractometer and rotated throughout the data collections in order to minimise any preferred
222 orientation effects. An Oxford Cryosystems Cryostream Compact, mounted co-axially with
223 the sample, allowed temperature control of the sample in the range room temperature to 220
224 °C. The temperature of the Cryostream was ramped from 20 °C to 100 °C directly, and then to
225 220 °C in 10 °C increments, before finally cooling to 20 °C. The sample was allowed to
226 equilibrate at each temperature for 5 min before a diffraction data collection was started.
227 Diffraction data in the range 4°–45° 2 θ were collected with a step size of 0.017° 2 θ and a
228 count time per step of 0.6 s. At the end of the experiment, the capillary was stored, open to the
229 atmosphere for four days before data were recollected at room temperature.

230 **Extraction and analysis of volatile compounds**

231 The volatiles were analyzed by SPME/GC-MS. Aliquots of oil (5 g) or tomato ketchup (5 g)
232 were placed in a 20 ml SPME vial and were extracted using a DVB/Carboxen/PDMS
233 Stableflex fiber (SupelCo, Poole, U.K.). The samples were equilibrated at 40 °C for 10 min
234 with intermittent stirring prior to exposure to the fiber for 10 min at 40 °C. The fiber was
235 desorbed in the injection port for 20 min and the volatile compounds analyzed using an
236 Agilent 7890A gas chromatograph equipped with a Zebron ZB-5MSi column (30 m x 0.25
237 mm i.d. x 1 μ m film thickness) coupled to an Agilent 5975C MSD. Helium was the carrier gas
238 (1.2 ml/min). After desorption, the oven was maintained at 40 °C for 5 min, then raised to 250
239 °C at 4°C/min. Mass spectra were recorded in electron impact mode at an ionization voltage
240 of 70 eV and source temperature of 230 °C. A scan range of m/z 29–400 with a scan time of
241 0.69 s was employed and the data were controlled and stored by the ChemStation system.
242 Volatiles were identified by comparing each mass spectrum with those of authentic samples
243 analyzed under similar conditions. To confirm the identification, a homologous series of *n*-
244 alkanes (C₅–C₃₀) were analyzed under the same experimental conditions to obtain LRI values,

245 which were compared to the LRIs of authentic compounds. The identity was confirmed by
246 running both the sample and the standards on a Stabilwax-DA column (30 m x 0.25 mm i.d. x
247 0.5 µm film thickness) from Thames Restek (Saunderton, U.K.). Analysis was carried out in
248 triplicate for experiment 10, and in duplicate for experiment 12. Each set were run in one
249 randomised block and the peak area of a standard 2-octanol solution run at the beginning and
250 end of the series varied by less than 10%.

251 **Sensory profiling**

252 Tomato ketchup (100 g) was stirred with oil (2 g) which had been prepared (Experiment 10)
253 on the pilot scale rig using either size 2, 3 or 5 activated zeolite or no zeolite (control). All
254 samples were left to equilibrate for 1 h prior to tasting in amber bottles. A panel of nine
255 trained assessors, each with a minimum of six months experience, was used for sensory
256 profiling of the tomato ketchups. The assessors were first asked to describe the sensory
257 characteristics of the smoky tomato ketchups. Following this initial collection of terms, with
258 the help of references, a consensus vocabulary, consisting of 8 odor terms, 4 taste terms, 7
259 flavor terms, 3 mouthfeel terms and 3 after-effect terms was agreed by the assessors. The
260 quantitative sensory assessment took place in individual sensory booths under red light and at
261 room temperature controlled to 20 ± 0.5 °C. Assessors were provided with a glass of warm
262 water and unsalted crackers for palate cleansing between samples. Samples were presented to
263 the assessors in a balanced randomised order and they were asked to assess the aroma of the
264 ketchup. Then after tasting a small quantity off a teaspoon, they assessed the taste, overall
265 flavor and mouthfeel of the ketchup and, after a 60 s break, the after-effect. The intensity of
266 each attribute for each samples was recorded by the assessors on a 100-point unstructured line
267 scale. All data were collected using Compusense version 5 software (Compusense Inc.,
268 Guelph, Ontario, Canada). A duplicate assessment was carried out in a separate session.

269 **Statistical analysis**

270 ANOVA was carried out on the volatile analysis from experiment 10 and multiple pairwise
271 comparisons were done using the Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) test with the
272 significance level set at $p = 0.05$. SENPAQ version 3.2 (Qi Statistics, Reading, U.K.) was
273 used to carry out two-way ANOVA on sensory profiling data where main effects were tested
274 against the sample by assessor interaction. Multiple pairwise comparisons were done using
275 the Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) test with the significance level set at $p = 0.05$.

276 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

277 **Reduction of PAHs from a simple matrix (experiments 1–3)**

278 Preliminary experiments consisted of stirring a standard mixture of 16 PAHs (201 $\mu\text{g/L}$) in
279 dichloromethane in the presence of the zeolite. Two zeolite grain sizes were investigated, size
280 4 (1–1.4 mm) or size (2, 180–355 μm), the zeolite was used both as received and after
281 activating at 270 °C, and exposure times were 1, 5 or 60 min. Table 1 shows the concentration
282 of the selected PAHs remaining after exposure to the zeolite, under each set of conditions.
283 The full set of 16 PAHs is given in the supplementary material. There are very clear trends.
284 The greatest difference was observed between the size 4 and size 2 grain size, with far greater
285 reductions achieved when the fine grains were used. The increase in surface area of the
286 particles provides greater exposure of the PAHs to the zeolite structure. A greater reduction in
287 PAHs was also observed in the pre-heated zeolite (HT) compared to zeolite in its natural state
288 (AR), with, for example, the BaP concentration reduced after 60 min to 3% of the original
289 using pre-heated medium zeolite, compared to 60% using the natural zeolite (experiment 1c
290 vs. 1f). Furthermore, where there was a reduction in PAHs observed, there was a strong
291 tendency for a greater reduction as the exposure time increased.
292 It was also observed that for each of the different PAHs, the concentrations were not all
293 reduced to the same extent. There was a tendency for the higher molecular weight PAHs to
294 decrease more than those of lower molecular weight. There was no significant reduction in

295 naphthalene with any of the exposure conditions, and only small reductions (<20%) in
296 fluorene and phenanthrene. Benzo[a]pyrene showed the greatest reduction when the heated
297 (HT) zeolite was used (experiment 1e–1g and experiment 1j–1l). The best conditions for
298 reducing PAH levels were achieved in experiment 1l utilizing pre-heated and finely ground
299 zeolite. This produced a reduction in all PAHs except naphthalene, a reduction >94% for each
300 of the four regulated PAHs, and a reduction in BaP of >99.9% (0.2 ng/L remaining). This
301 shows a reduction in the concentration of the Group 1 carcinogen BaP, significantly greater
302 than reported for any other mitigation strategy.

303 When food grade deodorised coconut oil was used as the matrix (experiment 2), and spiked
304 with the standard mixture of 16 PAHs (201 µg/L), after stirring with size 4 zeolite which had
305 been activated (12 h at 270 °C), the same trends were not observed (Table 1). It may be that in
306 the more lipophilic environment, migration of the PAHs into the zeolite is slower and less
307 energetically favorable. The deodorised oil was also subjected to a real smoking process
308 (rather than addition of a mix of PAHs). The oil was smoked with oak chips in a smoking
309 chamber for 72 h and the resulting smoked oil was stirred with size 4 zeolite for 1 or 18 h and
310 analyzed for PAHs (experiment 3). There was no consistent trend and concentration of PAHs
311 was only reduced on average to 60% of the original (Table 1). Note however, that after 18 h
312 exposure to the heated zeolite, benzo[b]fluoranthene and benz[a]pyrene showed the greatest
313 reduction with only 15 and 20% remaining respectively.

314 The concentration of PAHs generated during the 72 h smoke varied quite substantially from
315 20 µg/kg for phenanthrene whereas the more carcinogenic PAHs were present at 1–2 µg/kg in
316 the untreated sample, specifically benzo[a]pyrene was found at 1.4 µg/kg and the PAH4 total
317 was estimated to be 7 µg/L. These levels are within the limits recommended by the EC
318 Commission Regulation No 1881/2006 which set maximum concentrations as low as
319 reasonably achievable (ALARA) at 2 and 20 µg/kg for BaP and PAH4 respectively in coconut

320 oil intended for direct human consumption or use as an ingredient in food. However, our aim
321 was to reduce these levels yet further to minimise human exposure to these known
322 carcinogens.

323 Although this technique demonstrated that in principal PAHs can be removed from simple
324 matrices by stirring with zeolite, in practice, the reduction from the coconut oil was not
325 sufficient to make this a useful technique for the food industry. Furthermore, this technique
326 could only be applied to the most simple food matrices and could not be applied more
327 generally to smoked foods such as smoked spices, smoked sauces and other key food
328 ingredients. Subsequent experiments were designed to test the capacity of the zeolite to
329 reduce the concentration of PAHs in smoke used to prepare smoked foods, rather than
330 extracting them from the foods or ingredients post smoking. The working hypothesis was that
331 removing PAHs from an aqueous smoke environment, in which the PAHs are poorly soluble,
332 would be easier than removing them from a lipophilic environment.

333 **Reduction of PAHs from smoke (experiments 4–12)**

334 The generation of smoke from the burning of wood is a highly variable process, particularly
335 when carried out on a laboratory scale. For this reason a dual stream smoker was devised so
336 that one source of smoke could be split into two equal streams which would allow comparison
337 of a treated smoke with a control. The laboratory scale rig is shown in Figure S1. Smoke was
338 collected in 40 ml of water (selected for safety reasons and ease of analysis) and the samples
339 were extracted by SPE prior to analysis by GC-MS. The process was run five times, each with
340 slight modifications (Table 2). Firstly, it is clear that the smoking process was very variable
341 but, in all cases, a decrease in PAHs was observed in the zeolite-treated sample compared to
342 the control. In experiments 4 and 5, the zeolite was only activated in a beaker for 3 h at 270
343 °C and the reduction of PAHs was only 40% in the best cases. With 17 h activation in
344 experiment 6, 7 and 8, there was a far greater reduction in all the PAHs. In experiment 6, the

345 concentration of all PAHs was reduced by >80% and, in the most successful experiment 7,
346 they were all decreased by >90%. Of the group of PAH4, the concentrations of chrysene and
347 benzo[a]anthracene were reduced by 92 and 94% respectively, and benzo[b]fluorene and
348 benzo[a]pyrene were reduced to concentrations both below the limit of detection for this
349 method. Thus, although the generation of smoke is variable, the reduction in the concentration
350 of PAHs is consistent if the zeolite is activated for sufficient time.

351 Having demonstrated the potential of the zeolite to remove PAHs from smoke, a single stream
352 pilot scale smoker was built, which produced a consistent stream of smoke. The filter could
353 be filled with inert material, or left empty, and the filtered smoke was collected in rapeseed
354 oil. In experiment 9, both the native zeolite and the activated zeolite were tested against a
355 control and, when the activated zeolite was used, there was a consistent decrease in the
356 concentration of PAHs. When this was repeated (experiment 10) using activated zeolite of
357 different grain size (sizes 2, 3 and 5), the coarse zeolite (size 5) was not effective, the medium
358 reduced the concentration of PAHs by only 40–60% but the fine (size 2) produced a smoked
359 oil where the concentrations of all the PAH4 were below 0.5 µg/L. These trends are similar to
360 those where the zeolite came into direct contact with the matrix (Table 1), and indicates that
361 the zeolite must be activated prior to use, and that maximizing the surface area of the zeolite
362 is key to developing an efficient process for removing PAHs from smoke. Further data from
363 smoked oil produced on a manufacturing scale is provided in Table 2 (experiments 11 and 12)
364 to show that this reduction in the concentration of PAHs can be achieved in an industrial
365 smoking chamber.

366 **Zeolite Structure**

367 For successful removal of PAHs, the requirement to activate the zeolite led us to investigate
368 its structure in more detail, in an attempt to understand the structural changes taking place
369 during activation and the rate at which the zeolite structure reverts to its native state. The

370 thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) (Figure S2) shows a weight loss of ca. 11.5%, due to water
371 loss with the majority of the loss occurring by the time the sample reached 270 °C. Water loss
372 was essentially complete after 2 h.

373 The powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) pattern of the zeolite changed markedly upon heating,
374 reflecting the structural changes that arise from the loss of bound water in the structure.

375 Figures S3 and S4 show the changes in the diffraction patterns as the temperature was raised
376 in steps from 20 °C to 220 °C, whilst Figures S5 and S6 compare the pattern of the sample
377 after cooling back to 20 °C either immediately (Figure S5) or after 4 days (Figure S6).

378 The PXRD and TGA results show structural changes associated with water loss from the
379 zeolite crystal structure. The extent of water loss is in reasonable agreement with previous
380 measurements.²¹ That the water loss is associated with structural changes is evidenced by the
381 significant changes in the appearance of the powder X-ray diffraction pattern as a function of
382 temperature. The patterns for the sample at 220 °C and then after cooling back to 20 °C are
383 largely superimposable and even after 4 days of storage, the sample had not fully reverted to
384 its "as received" state. This slow re-uptake of water from the atmosphere was undoubtedly a
385 function of the fact that the sample remained inside the 0.7 mm glass capillary during the
386 storage period. Other experiments (not shown here) indicated that reversion to "as received"
387 state after heating occurred much more quickly when the sample was left fully open to the
388 atmosphere and that grain size played a role in the speed of reversion. This reversion process
389 was important when considering scale-up to industrial smoking chambers.

390 No further attempt has been made to understand the mechanistic basis of PAH removal by the
391 zeolite, nor to relate size of PAHs removed to zeolite pore size. Such an investigation would
392 require detailed crystallographic and computational work that lies outside the scope of the
393 current investigation.

394 **Volatile Analysis**

395 The smoked rapeseed oils produced in experiments 10 and 12 were retained for volatile
396 analysis. Figure 1 shows the volatile profile of the control smoke vs. the smoke filtered
397 through the fine grain zeolite. Inspection of Figure 1 suggests that the loss of volatile
398 components is minimal when the fine filter is employed, corroborated by only a 7% decrease
399 in the total area of those peaks analysed (Table 3). This is extremely encouraging and shows
400 that most of the volatile compounds were not retained by the fine particulate zeolite and, more
401 importantly, it demonstrates that the observed reduction in the concentration of PAHs is not
402 simply a result of less smoke being passed through the rig. There was, however, a tendency
403 for the peak areas of the later eluting compounds to be diminished, which warranted a more
404 detailed analysis of the volatile data.

405 In excess of 200 compounds were identified, of which 24 were selected for comparison. The
406 selection was based on previous GC-O work by Varlet et al,¹ with some additional
407 compounds of interest. The details of the volatile analysis are shown in Table 3, where the
408 changes in volatiles are expressed as the mean peak area normalized to the control where no
409 filter was employed. The full data including the coefficients of variation for experiments 10
410 and 12 are shown in Table S1. The overall trends in Table 3 are clear. Whereas the overall
411 volatile profiles are similar, for all compounds analyzed except 5-methyl-2-
412 furancarboxaldehyde, there were significant differences between the samples. For all
413 compounds except 2-furancarboxaldehyde, 2-furanmethanol, 5-methyl-2-
414 furancarboxaldehyde and 1-(2-furanyl)ethanone, the unfiltered smoke contained the greatest
415 amount whereas use of the fine filter produced the least, suggesting that the filter did indeed
416 retain some of the key smoky compounds. Whilst 50% of the 4-methoxyphenol was retained,
417 the isoeugenol isomers were not detected when the fine filter was used. The furans were
418 relatively unchanged across the four oils, but the key smoky compounds were more affected,
419 particularly the methoxyphenols (guaiacols), many of which were reduced to 30% or less of

420 the original amount. These changes are likely to affect the overall perception of the smoky
421 aroma, so further work is in progress to estimate the relative contribution of the different
422 compounds to the aroma of smoke.

423 It is also noticeable in Table 3 that there were some apparent anomalies in the volatile profiles
424 of the two intermediate samples (size 5 vs. size 3 zeolite filter), particularly in phenol and 2-
425 methoxyphenol where the peak areas were higher in the sample prepared with the smaller
426 grain size 3. This trend can be seen in the total peak area and in other volatiles, particularly
427 the lower molecular weight ones (Table 3) and can only be explained as a result of the
428 inconsistency of the smoking process, which for some reason has produced more of the highly
429 volatile smoke compounds. This difference may be widespread across the whole
430 chromatogram, but just less evident when the reduction in volatiles is greater (higher
431 molecular weight).

432 Informal sensory assessment of the smoked oils from experiment 10 revealed some minor
433 changes in the aroma of the sample after treatment with the filtered smoke, compared to the
434 control, but these differences tended to be a reduction in the harsh acrid notes and the overall
435 flavor was even anecdotally improved. Formal sensory profiling was carried out on these four
436 samples dosed into tomato ketchup at 2% (see below). The changes in the volatile profiles of
437 the tomato ketchups are shown in Table 3, and the trends are similar to those found in the oils.
438 The oils generated in experiment 11 were also analyzed for volatile compounds. In this
439 experiment, the weight of zeolite used increased across the series, and there was concomitant
440 decrease in the PAHs. In this series, there was a very clear trend in the volatile profile: as the
441 weight of zeolite used increased, all the phenols, guaiacols, and syringol showed a significant
442 decrease in peak area. This was less so for the group of furans which remained relatively
443 stable across the series. Thus in both series, there was a consistent decrease in key smoke
444 compounds as the filter “strength” was increased, and in the most extreme cases, syringol was

445 reduced to 6% of the control and the isoeugenols were removed completely. It is important to
446 establish what the impact on flavor perception is, given this decrease in key smoke
447 compounds.

448 **Sensory Analysis**

449 Sensory analysis of the tomato ketchups revealed few significant differences between the
450 samples (Table 4). Of the 25 attributes scored, only two (sweet aroma and throat burn)
451 showed significant differences between samples of ketchup. However, Fisher's LSD also
452 showed some emerging trends which are consistent with the volatile data. There was a
453 tendency for the smoky bonfire and smoky mackerel notes to decrease across the series and
454 this could be explained by the concomitant decrease in smoke-related volatiles such as the
455 higher molecular weight guaiacols, isoeugenols and 1,3-dimethoxy-2-hydroxybenzene.
456 However, the differences in these attributes were not observed in the flavor attributes,
457 possibly masked by the intensity of the neat ketchup. The ketchup produced from the oil
458 prepared with the fine zeolite filter was found to have a significantly sweeter aroma than the
459 other three, and this may be a result of a decrease in the some of the smoky notes which
460 otherwise mask the sweetness of the ketchup. Juicy fruity and tomato aroma followed the
461 same trend but the difference was not significant at $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.13$ and 0.2 respectively).
462 Interestingly, when size 3 zeolite was used, the corresponding ketchup was found to have
463 significantly more throatburn than the others. This may be related to the anomaly in the
464 volatile profile discussed above.

465 The volatile data suggest that many of the key smoke compounds were present at lower
466 concentrations in the PAH-reduced oils. However, the preliminary sensory data suggests that
467 the impact on the flavor perception is minimal and the filtered smoke may even produce a
468 slightly sweeter but less smoky oil. This relationships between the flavor perception,

469 consumer preference and the volatile profile are currently being investigated in much more
470 detail in a range of food ingredients.

471 **Comparison with other mitigation strategies**

472 Mitigation strategies for PAHs in smoked foods have been proposed at all stages of the
473 smoking process. Selection of the wood has already been widely investigated with respect to
474 minimising PAH formation. Smoking of hardwoods such as oak, apple and alder produce
475 fewer PAHs compared to softwoods like spruce and pine²⁰ due to the lower lignin content
476 (oak 24% c.f. pine 35%).²² Hitzel et al,²³ in the only paper where the aroma compounds were
477 investigated in any detail, showed that during the smoking of frankfurters and mini salamis,
478 the PAHs could be reduced by 35–55% by replacing beech with poplar or hickory, with very
479 little change in the content of the key aroma compounds (guaiacol, 4-methylguaiacol,
480 syringol, eugenol and (*E*)-isoeugenol). In liquid smoke, a reduction in total carcinogenic
481 PAHs from 0.78 µg/kg (poplar) to 0.2–0.4 µg/kg for oak, cherry and beech was achieved on a
482 laboratory scale,²⁴ but such low concentrations may not be representative of large scale
483 smokers.

484 The conditions of the smoking process have also been thoroughly investigated. In a
485 comparison reported by Duedahl-Olesen et al,²⁵ cold smoking of fish with BaP concentration
486 ranging from 0–0.8 µg/kg was preferable to hot smoking (0.1–2 µg/kg), traditional smoking
487 (mean, 5.3 µg/kg, n=213) or home smoking (up to 11 µg/kg). Several authors have
488 determined optimum temperatures for the burning zone in terms of reducing the concentration
489 of PAHs,²⁵ but information on the flavor is often lacking. Temperatures below 450 °C may
490 limit the formation of PAHs, but also the formation of flavor.¹²

491 However, the treatment of the smoke prior to the smoking process has achieved greater
492 reductions in the concentration of PAHs. More than 50 years ago, electrostatic precipitation of
493 the solids in smoke was shown to reduce BaP by 66%²⁶ and treatment of smoke with an

494 aqueous scrubber prior to smoking fish was shown to reduce BaP by at least 70%.²² More
495 recently, a filter comprising ice, cloth and activated carbon²⁷ has been patented specifically to
496 produce “tasteless super-purified smoke”.

497 Downstream from the smoking process, UV light and oxygen have been used to effect an
498 80% reduction of BaP in smoked herring²⁸ but very little information is available on the
499 relative toxicity of the products of UV oxidation and it has been speculated that they may be
500 more toxic than the PAHs.¹² Storage in polyethylene packaging has been shown to reduce the
501 concentration of PAHs in food,²³ and low density polyethylene (LDPE) achieved 97%
502 reduction in PAHs over a 7 day storage period in an aqueous model. A significantly smaller
503 reduction was achieved in oil or water-oil emulsion or in roasted duck skin (73% reduction).²⁹
504 In these cases the mechanism is simply presumed to be migration of the PAHs into the
505 polymer.

506 The use of our clinoptilolite filter has several advantages over these methods. The filters
507 already reported simply act as a barrier to tar, PAHs and flavor. We have shown that although
508 inevitably some tar is removed by the zeolite filter, the PAH content of the smoke which
509 passes through is further reduced. BaP was reduced by 90% and PAH4 by 85% in a
510 commercial smoking chamber. We have demonstrated that the smoke filtered through the
511 zeolite is far from tasteless and has flavor properties very similar to the unfiltered smoke.

512 The use of a zeolite to treat the smoke is far more readily applicable than any biotechnological
513 method and more consistent than relying on packaging material to reduce the concentration of
514 PAHs, although the latter may be used to further reduce low levels of PAHs. It has been
515 successfully applied to oak-smoke oil and water which have subsequently been applied to
516 food products, and it has been used for direct smoking of paprika, jalapeno and tomato flakes.

517 **Acknowledgements.** This research was funded by a U.K. Technology Strategy Board
518 SPARK award, the Technology Strategy Board Nutrition for Life CRD No 33578-241148 and
519 Besmoke Ltd.

520 **Associated Content**

521 The dual stream processor is shown in Figure S1, the thermogravimetric analysis in Figure S2
522 and the PDXRA data in Figures S3–6. Full details of the volatile analysis are given in Tables
523 S1, S2 and S3. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

524

525 **REFERENCES**

- 526 1. Varlet, V.; Sérot, T.; Cardinal, M.; Knockaert, C.; Prost, C. Olfactometric
527 determination of the most potent odor-active compounds in salmon muscle (*Salmo salar*)
528 smoked by using four smoke generation techniques. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2007**, *55*, 4518–
529 4525.
- 530 2. Guillard, A.-S.; Grondin, C.; Mekhtiche, L.; Sémon, E. Study of smoked sausages
531 phenolic flavour compounds by solid phase microextraction. In *Flavour Research at the Dawn*
532 *of the Twenty-First Century*, Le Queré, J. L.; Etiévant, P., Eds.; Tec & Doc: 2003; 622–625.
- 533 3. Yu, A.-N.; Sun, B.-G. Flavour substances of Chinese traditional smoke-cured bacon.
534 *Food Chem.* **2005**, *89*, 227–233.
- 535 4. Guillén, M. D.; Manzanos, M. J. Study of the volatile composition of an aqueous oak
536 smoke preparation. *Food Chem.* **2002**, *79*, 283–292.
- 537 5. Guillén, M. D.; Ibargoitia, M. L. Volatile components of aqueous liquid smokes from
538 *Vitis vinifera L* shoots and *Fagus sylvatica L* wood. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* **1996**, *72*, 104–110.
- 539 6. Guillén, M. D.; Manzanos, M. J. Characteristics of smoke flavorings obtained from
540 mixtures of oak (*Quercus sp.*) wood and aromatic plants (*Thymus vulgaris L.* and *Salvia*
541 *lavandulifolia Vahl.*). *Flavour Fragrance J.* **2005**, *20*, 676–685.
- 542 7. Alonge, D. O. Carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) determined in
543 Nigerian kundi (smoke-dried meat). *J. Sci. Food Agric.* **1988**, *43*, 167–72.
- 544 8. Committee on Diet, Nutrition and Cancer, Assembly of Life Sciences, National
545 Research Council, Diet, Nutrition and Cancer. In *National Academy Press: Washington DC*,
546 1982.
- 547 9. International Agency for Research on Cancer Monographs on the Evaluation of
548 Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Some non-heterocyclic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and
549 some related exposures. 2010, 92.

- 550 10. European Food Safety A., Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Food - Scientific
551 Opinion of the Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain. *EFSA Journal* **2008**, 724, 1–114.
- 552 11. Regulation (EC) No 2065/2003, Recital 6. *Off. J. Eur. Union* **2003**, L309/1–309/8.
- 553 12. Šimko, P. Factors affecting elimination of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from
554 smoked meat foods and liquid smoke flavorings. *Mol. Nutr. Food Res.* **2005**, 49, 637–647.
- 555 13. Radojičić, V.; Alagić, S.; Adnadjević, B.; Maktouf, A. B. Effect of varied quantities of
556 zeolite on the reduction of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in tobacco smoke. *Afr J.*
557 *Biotechnol.* **2012**, 11, 10041–10047.
- 558 14. Mačala, J.; Pandová, I.; Gondová, T.; Dubayová, K. Reduction of polycyclic aromatic
559 hydrocarbons and nitrogen monoxide in combustion engine exhaust gases. *Mineral Resources*
560 *Management; The Journal of Polish Academy of Sciences* **2012**, 28, 113–123.
- 561 15. Fahghihian, H.; Mousazadeh, M. H. Removal of PAHs from *n*-paraffin by modified
562 clinoptilolite. *Iran. J. Chem. Chem. Eng.* **2007**, 26, 121–127.
- 563 16. Seo, J.-S.; Keum, Y.-S.; Li, Q. X. Bacterial degradation of aromatic compounds. *Int.*
564 *J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2009**, 6, 278–309.
- 565 17. Rentz, J. A.; Alvarez, P. J. J.; Schnoor, J. L. Benzo[a]pyrene degradation by
566 *Sphingomonas yanoikuyae* JAR02. *Environmental Pollution* **2008**, 151, 669–677.
- 567 18. Griffiths, H. D.; Baines, D. A.; Parker-Gray, J. K. Smoked Food, method for smoking
568 food and apparatus therefor. WO2015007742 A1 (Puresmoke Ltd.) Jan 22nd 2015, doi:
569 WO2015007742 A1.
- 570 19. Zha, Q.; Qian, N. X.; Moldoveanu, S. C. Analysis of polycyclic aromatic
571 hydrocarbons in the particulate phase of cigarette smoke using a gas chromatographic-high-
572 resolution mass spectrometric technique. *J. Chromatogr. Sci.* **2002**, 40, 403–408.
- 573 20. Stumpe-Viksna, I.; Bartkevičs, V.; Kukāre, A.; Morozovs, A. Polycyclic aromatic
574 hydrocarbons in meat smoked with different types of wood. *Food Chem.* **2008**, 110, 794–797.

- 575 21. Knowlton, G. D.; McKague, H. L.; White, T. R. Thermal study of types of water
576 associated with clinoptilolite. *Clays and Clay Minerals* **1981**, *29*, 403–411.
- 577 22. Moodie, I. M. Reduction of 3,4-benzopyrene content in curing smoke by scrubbing. *J.*
578 *Sci. Food Agr.* **1970**, *21*, 485–488.
- 579 23. Hitzel, A.; Pöhlmann, M.; Schwägele, F.; Speer, K.; Jira, W. Polycyclic aromatic
580 hydrocarbons (PAH) and phenolic substances in meat products smoked with different types of
581 wood and smoking spices. *Food Chem.* **2013**, *139*, 155–162.
- 582 24. Guillén, M. D.; Sopelana, P.; Acuanza Partearroyo, M. Polycyclic Aromatic
583 Hydrocarbons in Liquid Smoke Flavorings Obtained from Different Types of Wood. Effect of
584 Storage in Polyethylene Flasks on Their Concentrations. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2000**, *48*,
585 5083–5087.
- 586 25. Duedahl-Olesen, L.; Christensen, J. H.; Hoejgaard, A.; Granby, K.; Timm-Heinrich,
587 M. Influence of smoking parameters on the concentration of polycyclic aromatic
588 hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Danish smoked fish. *Food Addit. Contam., Part A* **2010**, *27*, 1294–
589 1305.
- 590 26 Rhee, K.S.; Bratzler, L.J. Polycyclic hydrocarbon composition of wood smoke, *J.*
591 *Food Sci.* **1968**, *33*, 626–631.
- 592 27. Kowalski, W. R. Process for manufacturing tasteless super purified smoke for treating
593 seafood nto be frozen and thawed. WO99/27794, 22nd March 2012.
- 594 28. Šimko, P. Changes of benzo(a)pyrene contents in smoked fish during storage. *Food*
595 *Chem.* **1991**, *40*, 293–300.
- 596 29. Chen, J.; Chen, S. Removal of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons by low density
597 polyethylene from liquid model and roasted meat. *Food Chem.* **2004**, *90*, 461-469.
598

599 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

600 Figure 1 Comparison of the total ion chromatogram of rapeseed oils smoked with and without
601 a fine zeolite filter

Table 1 Concentration of PAHs in Dichloromethane or Coconut Oil after Exposure to Zeolite, (Control=201 µg/L)

expt no	experimental conditions zeolite ^b	size ^c	time ^d	BaA ^a	CHR ^a	BbF ^a	BkF	BaP ^a	IcdP	DBahA	BghiP
matrix = dichloromethane											
1a	AR	4	1	179 ^e	199	126	163	154	123	117	138
1b	AR	4	5	167	195	108	149	135	117	103	108
1c	AR	4	60	146	183	98	130	120	115	103	128
1d	HT	4	1	90	132	71	69	45	97	83	69
1e	HT	4	5	58	92	56	45	16	59	56	32
1f	HT	4	60	39	65	46	23	5	33	50	10
1g	AR	2	1	31	42	31	17	27	40	29	39
1h	AR	2	5	42	66	38	27	31	43	40	34
1i	AR	2	60	40	59	37	26	29	46	42	33
1j	HT	2	1	8.6	11.8	11.5	3.9	0.3	nd	3.2	nd
1k	HT	2	5	8.1	13.0	12.7	3.8	0.3	1.4	5.7	0.9
1l	HT	2	60	7.1	12.2	12.1	3.2	0.1	nd	6.6	nd
matrix = coconut oil											
2a	HT	M	240	209	208	184	185	174	169	163	149
3a	None			1.4 ^f	2.3	1.5	0.3	1.4	1.3	0.5	0.8
3b	HT	M	60	1.2 ^g	1.8	0.8	0.2	1.1	1.4	0.3	0.4
3c	HT	M	1080	0.8 ^g	1.6	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.5	0.2	0.3

^aEU regulated PAH4

^bAR=zeolite as received, HT=zeolite heated at 270 °C for 12 h

^cZeolite grain size 4 (1–1.4 mm) or size 2 (180–355 µm)

^dExposure time (min)

^eConcentration (µg/L) compared to control (control = 201 µg/L)

^fConcentration (µg/L) of naturally smoked oil before treatment

^gConcentration (µg/L) of naturally smoked oil after treatment

nd = not detected

Table 2 Concentration of PAHs in Smoke Treated with Zeolite Filter compared to Untreated Control

expt no	experimental conditions			BaA ^a	CHR ^a	BbF ^a	BkF	BaP ^a	IcdP	DBahA	BghiP
	filter ^b	time ^c	flow rate ^d	dual stream laboratory scale smoker collected in CH ₂ Cl ₂ (ng/L)							
4a	C sand	68	200	295	273	146	115	123	67	48	21
4b	T zeolite HT (3 h)	68	200	140	121	65	54	59	45	23	29
5a	C sand	20	400	21	42	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
5b	T zeolite HT (3 h)	20	400	16	24	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
6a	C sand	20	400	208	192	31	19	53	27	16	19
6b	T zeolite HT (17 h)	20	400	25	26	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
7a	C sand	20	400	283	278	31	16	57	17	12	11
7b	T zeolite HT (17 h)	20	400	17	21	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
8a	C sand	20	400	36	38	5	5	11	nd	nd	nd
8b	T zeolite HT (17 h)	20	400	19	22	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
	filter ^b	zeolite size ^e		single stream pilot scale smoker collected in rapeseed oil (µg/L)							
9a	C empty			2	5	1.6	0.3	2.1	1.3	0.7	0.8
9b	T zeolite AR	4		1	3	1.5	0.6	<0.5	3.4	1.7	1.7
9c	T zeolite HT (3 h)	4		1	1	0.4	0.2	<0.2	0.4	<0.2	0.4
10a	C empty			8.5	14	4.3	1.4	3.7	0.81	<0.5	1.7
10b	T zeolite HT (3 h)	5		8.2	14	2.9	1.3	2.8	0.75	<0.5	1.0
10c	T zeolite HT (3 h)	3		3.3	5.7	2.1	0.92	1.4	0.51	<0.5	0.89
10d	T zeolite HT (3 h)	2		<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
	filter ^b	filter comp ^f		full scale smoking chamber collected in rapeseed oil (µg/L)							
11a	C empty			51	80	29	6.5	20	4.8	<1	8.9
11b	T zeolite HT (3 h)	10%		32	57	16	4.2	11	3.4	<1	4.1
11c	T zeolite HT (3 h)	20%		20	33	12	3	7.2	2.2	<1	3.7
11d	T zeolite HT (3 h)	30%		8.5	15	3.9	1.3	2.4	0.78	<1	0.96
11e	T zeolite HT (3 h)	40%		7.8	11	4.4	2.4	3.7	0.83	<1	0.92
12a	C empty			63	92	31	5.9	23	8.9	<1	10
12b	T zeolite HT (3 h)	30%		16	24	5.4	1.6	3.3	0.98	<1	1.5
12c	T zeolite HT (3 h)	40%		18	30	11	1.3	5.5	2	<1	3.1
12d	T zeolite HT (3 h)	50%		9.5	16	5	0.9	2.4	0.91	<1	1.4

^aEU regulated PAH4

^bFilter T = smoke treated with zeolite, C = control with either sand dispersed through antibumping granules (dual stream processor) or nothing (single stream processor and smoking chamber). The zeolite was used as received (AR) or after activation (HT) by heating at 270 °C for the specified time (h)

^cTotal run time (h)

^dFlow rate through rig (ml/min)

^eZeolite grain size as defined in methods section

^fComposition of filter (% zeolite)

nd = not detected, limit of detection estimated at 5–10 ng/L, % coefficient of variation of the method determined at ~10%

Table 3 Changes in the Relative Peak Areas of Selected Aroma Compounds in Smoked Oil when Different Filter Treatments were Used to Produce the Smoke, and in Tomato Ketchup Dosed with 2% of the Corresponding Oils

compound	identification		none ^a	smoked oils				sig ^b	tomato ketchup with smoked oils (2%)				
	LRI	LRI		coarse ^a	medium ^a	fine ^a	none ^a		coarse ^a	medium ^a	fine ^a	sig ^b	
	DB5 ^c	Wax ^d		size 5	size 3	size 2	size 5		size 3	size 2			
2-furancarboxaldehyde	835	1382	100 d ^e	103 c	114 b	118 a	***	100 b	101 b	115 a	117 a	***	
2-furanmethanol	854	1575	100 b	119 a	92 c	74 d	***	100 a	105 a	88 a	78 a	ns	
1-(2-furanyl)ethanone	913	1424	100 b	91 c	111 a	98 b	***	100 b	89 c	117 a	96 b	***	
5-methyl-2-furancarboxaldehyde	967	1498	100 a	87 b	104 ab	86 a	ns	100 b	87 c	103 a	101 c	***	
phenol	977	1927	100 a	71 b	94 a	31 c	***	100 a	70 c	94 b	32 d	***	
benzofuran	1006	1426	100 b	60 c	112 a	62 c	***	100 b	56 c	116 a	63 c	***	
3-methylcyclopentane-1,2-dione	1031	1749	100 a	81 b	56 c	14 d	***	100 a	81 a	51 b	12 c	***	
1-(5-methyl-2-furanyl)ethanone	1041	1424	100 a	69 b	98 a	51 c	**	100 a	70 b	104 a	52 c	***	
benzeneacetaldehyde	1050	1557	100 a	80 b	72 b	49 c	***	100 a	81 b	88 ab	74 b	*	
2-methylphenol	1053	1923	100 a	68 b	88 ab	31 c	***	100 a	68 c	89 b	31 d	***	
3/4-methylphenol	1073	2013	100 a	65 b	81 ab	18 c	***	100 a	65 c	82 b	19 d	***	
2-methoxyphenol	1094	1783	100 a	73 b	86 ab	49 c	**	100 a	71 c	86 b	47 d	***	
1-(5-methyl-2-furanyl)propanone	1134	1605	100 a	63 bc	87 ab	42 c	**	100 a	64 b	89 a	41 c	***	
4-methyl-2-methoxyphenol	1199	1880	100 a	68 b	71 b	27 c	***	100 a	69 b	73 b	29 c	***	
4-ethyl-2-methoxyphenol	1287	1953	100 a	63 b	60 b	20 c	***	100 a	64 b	64 b	21 c	***	
5-butyl-4-methyldihydrofuran-2(3 <i>H</i>)-one ^f	1298	1818	100 a	65 b	56 b	25 c	***	nd	nd	nd	nd		
4-ethenyl-2-methoxyphenol	1322	2139	100 a	62 b	27 c	9 c	***	100 a	65 b	29 c	9 d	***	
5-butyl-4-methyldihydrofuran-2(3 <i>H</i>)-one ^f	1332	1889	100 a	64 b	46 c	13 d	***	100 a	63 b	46 c	13 d	***	
1,3-dimethoxy-2-hydroxybenzene	1358	2203	100 a	74 b	32 c	6 d	***	100 a	73 b	38 c	5 d	***	
2-methoxy-4-prop-2-enylphenol	1367	2111	100 a	67 b	40 c	13 d	***	na	na	na	na		
4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzaldehyde	1406	2556	100 a	71 a	30 b	4 b	**	100 a	72 a	30 b	nd b	**	
(<i>Z</i>)-2-methoxy-4-(prop-1-enyl)phenol	1409	2195	100 a	58 ab	39 b	nd c	***	na	na	na	na		
4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzoic acid	1428		100 a	76 b	15 c	2 c	***	100 a	80 b	22 c	nd c		
(<i>E</i>)-2-methoxy-4-(prop-1-enyl)phenol	1431	2299	100 a	50 b	25 bc	nd c	***	na	na	na	na	***	

total peak area for these compounds	100	93	104	93	100	86	102	83
-------------------------------------	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----

^aZeolite filter and grain size used in the smoking

^bSignificance of difference between samples, obtained from ANOVA; ns, no significant difference between means ($p > 0.05$); * significant at the 5% level; ** significant at the 1% level; *** significant at the 0.1% level

^cLinear retention index (LRI), calculated from a linear equation between each pair of straight chain alkanes C5–C30 on a DB5 column

^dLRI on Stabilwax DA column

^eRelative amount (mean $n=3$) compared to control (100), within each row values with the same letter are not significantly different using Fisher's least square difference at $p=0.05$

^fUnspecified mix of isomers

nd = not detected

na = not analysed because compound present in large amounts in the control tomato ketchupas part of spice blend.

Table 4 Changes in the Relative Peak Areas of Selected Aroma Compounds in Smoked Oil with Different % of Zeolite Incorporated in The Filter Used to Produce the Smoke

compound	identification			% zeolite in filter (experiment 12) ^a			
	LRI DB5 ^c	LRI Wax ^d	ID ^b	none	30%	40%	50%
2-furancarboxaldehyde	835	1382	A	100 ^e	117	117	119
2-furanmethanol	854	1575	A	100	39	26	20
1-(2-furanyl)ethanone	913	1424	A	100	90	75	72
5-methyl-2-furancarboxaldehyde	967	1498	A	100	116	94	91
phenol	977	1927	A	100	76	49	46
benzofuran	1006	1426	A	100	49	73	87
3-methylcyclopentane-1,2-dione	1031	1749	A	100	83	41	28
1-(5-methyl-2-furanyl)ethanone	1041	1424	A	100	79	52	45
benzeneacetaldehyde	1050	1557	A	100	110	89	89
2-methylphenol	1053	1923	A	100	61	38	34
3/4-methylphenol	1073	2013	A	100	59	37	31
2-methoxyphenol	1094	1783	A	100	94	64	59
1-(5-methyl-2-furanyl)propanone	1134	1605	A	100	48	38	33
4-methyl-2-methoxyphenol	1199	1880	A	100	104	67	58
4-ethyl-2-methoxyphenol	1287	1953	A	100	79	46	35
5-butyl-4-methyldihydrofuran-2(3 <i>H</i>)-one ^f	1298	1818	A	100	75	47	39
4-ethenyl-2-methoxyphenol	1322	2139	A	100	79	48	40
5-butyl-4-methyldihydrofuran-2(3 <i>H</i>)-one ^f	1332	1889	A	100	67	43	38
1,3-dimethoxy-2-hydroxybenzene	1358	2203	A	100	57	29	20
2-methoxy-4-prop-2-enylphenol	1367	2111	A	100	84	54	45
4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzaldehyde	1406	2556	A	100	124	72	52
(<i>Z</i>)-2-methoxy-4-(prop-1-enyl)phenol	1409	2195	C	100	80	49	38
4-hydroxy-3-methoxybenzoic acid	1428		B	100	62	29	18
(<i>E</i>)-2-methoxy-4-(prop-1-enyl)phenol	1431	2299	A	100	86	57	44
total peak area of these compounds				100	94	97	77

^aZeolite (%) incorporated into the filter during smoking

^bA indicates MS and LRI agree with those of the authentic compound run under the same conditions on both columns, B indicates agreement with authentic compound on DB5 column, C indicates agreement on both columns with minor isomer present in authentic compound

^cLinear retention index (LRI), calculated from a linear equation between each pair of straight chain alkanes C₅–C₃₀ on a DB5 column

^dLRI on Stabilwax DA column

^eRelative amount compared to control, control = 100

Table 5 Mean Scores for Sensory Attributes of Tomato Ketchup Dosed with Smoked Oil


attribute	zeolite grain size				LSD ^a	prob ^b
	control exp 10a	size 5 expt 10b	size 3 expt 10c	size 2 expt 10d		
aroma						
smoky bonfire (burnt paper) ^c	32 ab ^d	34 ab	36 a	26 b	9	0.14
smoked mackerel (smoked mackerel)	24 a	22 ab	15 b	18 ab	9	0.16
coal tar/diesel (coal tar soap)	8	7	8	6	3	0.36
rubber (rubber tube)	8	13	8	14	8	0.32
melted plastic	6	9	6	7	5	0.44
tomato	20	20	21	24	5	0.20
juicy/fruity	5 b	4 b	7 ab	9 a	4	0.13
sweet	21 b	23 b	22 b	27 a	4	0.03
taste						
sweet taste	23	26	25	26	7	0.74
acidic	23	24	21	22	5	0.75
salty taste	10 b	13 a	12 ab	11 ab	3	0.19
umami	21	20	22	23	6	0.70
flavor						
smoky bonfire	28	28	29	27	7	0.95
smoked mackerel	20	15	14	15	8	0.38
coal tar/diesel	9	10	13	10	4	0.23
rubber	15	21	15	22	11	0.50
melted plastic	19	20	23	22	7	0.70
tomato	22	18	18	21	5	0.22
juicy/fruity	7	3	4	5	4	0.22
mouthfeel						
drying mouthfeel	21	21	21	21	5	0.99
tingle	4	4	3	4	3	0.91
throat burn	4 b	3 b	7 a	3 b	3	0.05
after-effects						
sweet	18	16	18	20	5	0.49
bitter	9	10	9	9	4	0.86
rubber	13	18	12	15	8	0.56

^aFisher's least significance difference at $p = 0.05$

^bProbability, obtained from ANOVA, that there is a difference between means

^cAroma references

^dMean of two replicate assessment for each assessor (18 replicates in total), means labelled with the same letters (or not labelled) are not significantly different $p < 0.05$.



TOC GRAPHIC

