Ed Carmines¹, Lise Fraissinet¹, Tom Barrett² Affiliations: ¹Chemular, Inc[,] Hudson, MI, ²Legend Technical Services, Inc. St Paul, MN Poster #8

Abstract

Leachable materials in product packaging present a possible hazard to consumers. Toxic materials may migrate out of the packaging into the e-liquid product and be inhaled by the consumer during use of the product. The classical approach to evaluating the potential of packaging material chemicals to migrate into the product is first to perform an extraction study using model solvent systems, and if materials are found at levels of toxicological concern, then a leachables study is performed throughout the shelf life of the product to confirm if the packaging material has the potential to migrate into the product during intended storage and use. The Product Quality Research Institute ("PQRI") Leachables and Extractables Working Group's recommended approach was followed to evaluate a Chubby Gorilla® e-liquid bottle. Specifically, the bottle and cap were tested using the USP 1663 method (Assessment of Extractables Associated with Pharmaceutical Packaging/Deliver Systems). Samples were extracted with aqueous solutions at pH 5.2 and 9.5 and a 50/50% solution of isopropanol and deionized water. The solutions were analyzed by GC/MS (volatiles and semi-volatiles), LC/MS (non-volatiles) and ICP/MS (metals). The bottle and cap did not appear to have the potential to leach materials of toxicological concern above the Safety Concern Threshold (SCT) or Toxicological Threshold of Concern (TTC). Under the conditions of use, the bottle was deemed acceptable as a packaging container for e-liquids.

Introduction

The final PMTA rule requires applicants to submit toxicological information about potential leachables from the container closure system. Chubby Gorilla is a major manufacturer of e-liquid bottles, and their bottles are common in the e-liquid industry. The traditional approach is to first determine if chemicals of toxicological potential can be extracted from the packaging using worst case model systems. These include aqueous and alcoholic systems of varying pH. If chemicals of concern are detected, further studies are conducted using actual e-liquids over the storage life of the product to determine if the extracted chemicals actually leach into the product.

Methods

60 ml clear PET Unicorn bottles with natural child resistant caps were tested (Figure 1). USP 1663, Assessment of Extractables Associated with Pharmaceutical Packaging/Delivery Systems, was followed. Extraction conditions and analyses conducted are shown in Table 1. Table 1 Test Conditions

| Solvent | Type of Extraction | Analysis Conducted | Test Article | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | Volatile Organic Residues GC/MS | | |
| pH 5.2 | Immersion at 50°C, 72 hours. | Semi-Volatile Organic Residues GC/MS | Triplicate Samples | |
| | | Non-Volatile Organic Residues (Targeted LC/MS/MS for | | |
| | | common additives & TOF w/structural elucidation by | | |
| | | accurate mass) | | |
| | | Leachable Metals ICP/MS and ICP/OES | | |
| | | Volatile Organic Residues GC/MS | | |
| рН 9.5 | Immersion at 50°C, 72 hours. | Semi-Volatile Organic Residues GC/MS | Triplicate Samples | |
| | | Non-Volatile Organic Residues (Targeted LC/MS/MS for | | |
| | | common additives & TOF w/structural elucidation by | | |
| | | accurate mass) | | |
| | | Leachable Metals ICP/MS and ICP/OES | | |
| | | Gross Total Extractables (% w/w) | | |
| 50/50 2- Propanol | Immersion at 50°C, 72 hours | Semi-Volatile Organic Residues GC/MS | Triplicate Samples | |
| Water Extraction | | | | |
| | | Non-Volatile Organic Residues (Targeted LC/MS/MS for | | |
| | | common additives & TOF w/structural elucidation by | | |
| | | accurate mass) | | |

Figure 1. Chubby Gorilla 60 ml Clear Bottle with Natural Cap



Evaluation of the Potential Extractables from a Chubby Gorilla E-liquid Bottle

Results

Table 2 shows the number of compounds detected under the various extraction conditions and analytical techniques.

| Extraction Conditions | Analytical Method | Number of Compounds Detected |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| pH 5.2 | GC/MS Semi-Volatiles | None Detected |
| рН 9.5 | GC/MS Semi-Volatiles | None Detected |
| 50/50 Isopropanol/Water | GC/MS Semi-Volatiles | 9 |
| pH 5.2 | GC/MS Volatiles | 1 |
| рН 9.5 | GC/MS Volatiles | 1 |
| pH 5.2 | LC/MS Non-Volatiles | 8 |
| рН 9.5 | LC/MS Non-Volatiles | 8 |
| 50/50 Isopropanol/Water | LC/MS Non-Volatiles | 12 |
| pH 5.2 | LC/MS Non-Volatiles TOF MS Scan | 18 |
| рН 9.5 | LC/MS Non-Volatiles TOF MS Scan | 16 |
| 50/50 Isopropanol/Water | LC/MS Non-Volatiles TOF MS Scan | 46 |
| pH 5.2 | Metal Analysis | 4 |
| рН 9.5 | Metal Analysis | 6 |

A total of 70 unique chemicals were identified ranging from 0.01 to 56 µg/bottle (**Table 3**). Many of the same chemicals were identified using the different extraction conditions and analytical techniques. Eight metals were identified (**Table 4**).

 Table 3. Unique Chemicals Extracted from the Bottle and Cap

| Chemical | Maximum Extracted (µg/bottle) | Chemical | Maximum Extracted (µg/bottle) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (2-dodecylphenyl)methanesulfonic Acid | 6.3 | Ethylene Terephthalate Cyclic Trimer | 1.0 |
| (2S)-1-Hydroxy-3-(stearoyloxy)-2- | 2.9 | Heptanoic Acid | 0.23 |
| propanyl(4Z,7Z,10Z,13Z,16Z,19Z)- | | | |
| 4,7,10,13,16,19-docosahexaenoate | | | |
| (2S,3S)-3-Amino-1,2-heptadecanediol | <mark>53</mark> | Hexadecane | 0.93 |
| 5-[(2-Biphenylyloxy)sulfonyl]-2-thienyl}acetic acid | 1.7 | Hexadecanoic Acid | 22 |
| 10-Hendecenoic Acid | 0.29 | Irgafos 168 | 1.3 |
| 13-Docosenamide, (Z)- | 1.7 | Irganox 1010 | 1.35 |
| 1-Hydroxy-3-[(3-hydroxydecanoyl)oxy]-2-propanyl (9Z)-9-hexadecenoate | 1.3 | Irganox 1076 | 0.74 |
| 2-(Bis{2-[2-(hexyloxy)ethoxy]ethyl}amino)ethanol | 3.2 | Laurixamine | 2.8 |
| 2,4-Di-tert-butylphenol | 2.9 | Lauryldiethanolamine | <mark>56</mark> |
| 2-[2-(Decylamino)ethoxy]ethanol | 12 | Methyl (1a'S,1b'S,5'S,5a'S,6a'S)-5'-(alpha- | <u>50</u> 1.5 |
| | | Lallopyranosyloxy)-4-(4-hydroxy-3- methoxybenzoyl)-5-oxo-1a',5',5a',6a'-tetrahydro- 1b'H,5H-s[orp[furan-2,6'- oxireno[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-c]pyran]-2'- carboxylate | 1.0 |
| 2-[2-(Octadecylamino)ethoxy]ethanol | 5.3 | Methyl {2-[2-(3,4-dihydroxyphenyl)-3,5- dihydroxy-4,8-dioxo-9,10-dihydro-4H,8H- pyrano[2,3-f]chromen-10-yl]-6- methoxyphenoxy}acetate | 1.2 |
| 2-[2-(Octylamino)ethoxy]ethanol | 8.5 | N,N-Dimethyloleamide | 2.0 |
| 2-[Dodecyl(2-hydroxyethyl)amino]ethyl stearate | 4.3 | N-nonylnonanamide | 1.1 |
| 2-{2-[2-(Dodecylamino)ethoxy]ethoxy}ethanol | 27 | Nonanoic Acid | 0.63 |
| 2-{2-[2-(Octylamino)ethoxy]ethoxy}ethanol | 5.8 | Nonylphenol Ethoxylates | 4.4 |
| 2-{2-[4-(Dimethylamino)-2- | 3.5 | n-Propyl acetate | 0.071 |
| (dodecyloxy)butoxy]ethoxy}ethanol | | | |
| 3-(Hexadecylamino)-1,2-propanediol | 27 | Octadecanoic Acid | 2.3 |
| 3,6,9-Trioxa-12-azatetracosan-1-ol | 9.1 | Octanoic Acid | 1.9 |
| 3-Butyl-6,9,12-trioxa-3-azahexadecan-1-ol | 2.1 | Oleamide | 14 |
| 4-(Dodecyloxy)benzenesulfinic Acid | 5.1 | Oleic Acid | 5.4 |
| 4-[2,7-Bis(3-carboxypropyl)-6-hydroxy-3-oxo- | 6.2 | Oxidized Irgafos 168 | 2.6 |
| 3Hxanthen-9-yl]isophthalic acid | | | |
| 1-Decylbenzenesulfonic Acid | 1.1 | Palmitamide | <1.0 |
| O-Octadecenamide, (Z)- | 4.7 | Palmitamidohexadecanediol | 1.2 |
| Compound Similar to 2-[2- | 25 | PEG-3 Capramine | 11 |
| Decylamino)ethoxy]ethanol | | | |
| Compound Similar to 2-{2-[2- | 2.0 | PEG-3 Myristamine | 5.3 |
| Dodecylamino)ethoxy]ethoxy}ethanol Cyclic and Linear Siloxanes with a Dimethyl | 7.4 | PEG-3 Oleamine | 4.7 |
| siloxane(-(CH3)2SiO-) Repeat Unit | | | 4.0 |
| Decanal | 1.1 | PEG-3 Palmitamine | 4.9 |
| Decanoic Acid | 2.2 | Possible Ionic Surfactant | 1.9 |
| Dibutyl phthalate | 1.8 | Possible Slip-Agent | 3.3 |
| Dimethyldibenzylidene sorbitol | 3.7 | Tetradecanoic Acid | <u> </u> |
| Dioctylamine Dodecane | 1.1 1.8 | Triethylsilanol Trimethyl 3-hydroxy-6-(2-hydroxy-5- methylbenzoyl)-1,2,4-benzenetricarboxylate | 3.1 |
| Dodecanoic Acid | 1.3 | Ultranox 626 Diphosphate | 1.2 |
| Erucamide | 6.1 | Ultranox 626 Monophosphate | 1.3 |
| | ł | Undecylbenzenesulfonic Acid | 3.6 |

Table 4. Maximum Amount of Metals Extracted Exceeding Background

| Metal | Maximum Extracted (µg/bottle) | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Antimony | 0.39 | | |
| Barium | 0.39 | | |
| Calcium | 1.5 | | |
| Copper | 0.03 | | |
| Manganese | 0.017 | | |
| Molybdenum | 0.27 | | |
| Potassium | <mark>280</mark> | | |
| Tin | 7.9 | | |

The Product Quality Research Institute (PQRI) Leachables and Extractables Working Group's recommended evaluation approach was followed. A Safety Concern Threshold (SCT) was used to determine if any identified extracted chemicals require further evaluation. The FDA threshold of regulation for substances used in food-contact packaging of 1.5 µg/day was utilized as the SCT. The SCT was converted into a relative amount, expressed in terms of the amount of an individual extractable in the product in the bottle. The amount of E-liquid consumed per day was used to determine the relative Safety Concern Threshold (rSCT). Using the SCT of 1.5 µg/day and the daily consumption of 2.58 ml yields a relative SCT of 0.581 µg/ml. Since the bottle contains 60 ml, the rSCT was calculated as 34.86 µg/bottle. Only 2 chemicals and a metal exceeded the rSCT (Highlighted). If an extractable exceeded the rSCT, the Toxicological Threshold of Concern (TTC) was determined for the extracted chemical based on its Cramer Classification. Inhalation TTC's (Tluczkiewicz et al. 2016) were used for the analysis: 2 µg/day and 4.26 mg/day for Cramer Class III and I compounds, respectively. Any Cramer Class II chemicals were presumed to be Class III for this safety evaluation process

Table 5 lists the chemicals that exceeded the rSCT, their Cramer Class, and the respective inhalation TTC. Lauryl diethanolamine was detected but it did not exceed its TTC of 108 µg/bottle. (2S,3S)-3-Amino-1,2 heptadecanediol was also detected. The amount, 53 µg/bottle exceeds the TTC of 0.05 µg/bottle for a Cramer Class II chemical. The compound does not have a chemical abstract service number and is only identified by its ChemSpider ID. It is not on the TSCA inventory and is not on any list of carcinogens, mutagens, or reproductive toxicants. Figure 3 shows the structure of (2S,3S)-3-Amino-1,2 heptadecanediol. There is no toxicity information available on the chemical. The chemical is not predicted to be a mutagen or carcinogen by the CAESAR QSAR modeling software. Based on the levels, the structure, and QSAR modeling results it is unlikely that (2S,3S)-3-Amino-1,2 heptadecanediol presents a significant leachable hazard. Table 5. Extractable Compounds that Exceed

| Tentatively Identified Compound | CAS Number or ChemSpider ID | Average (µg/bottle) | Cramer Class | Inhalation TTC (µg/bottle) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Lauryl diethanolamine | 1541-67-9 | 56 | I | 108 |
| (2S,3S)-3-Amino-1,2 | 8261006 | 53 | II | 0.05 |
| heptadecanediol | | | | |
| Potassium | 7440-09-7 | 280 | - | - |

Figure 3. Structure of (2S,3S)-3-Amino-1,2 heptadecanediol

Potassium was identified in the metal analysis at a level of 280 µg/bottle. Potassium is an ion that is required for life. It occurs naturally in foods. The Dietary Reference Intake for females 19 years and older is 2,600 mg/day and for males 19 years and older 3,400 mg/day (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Health and Medicine Division; Food and Nutrition Board; Committee to Review the Dietary Reference Intakes for Sodium and Potassium 2019). The potential amount of potassium in the product as a result of potential migration from the packaging (280 µg/day) will not result in significant exposure when compared to the normal daily recommended consumption. Potential potassium migration from the plastic bottle and cap does not present a risk to the consumer.

Conclusion

References

21 CFR 170.39 -- Threshold of Regulation for Substances Used in Food-Contact Articles." n.d. Accessed August 15, 2023. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/part-170/section-170.39.

https://doi.org/10.1016/s0015-6264(76)80522-6.

https://doi.org/10.4172/2155-6105.1000229.

CHEMULAR

An extractable study was performed on the 60ml Chubby Gorilla bottle. The bottle and cap do not appear to have the potential to leach materials at levels of toxicological concern. The container closure system is appropriate for use with e-liquids.

Cramer, G. M., R. A. Ford, and R. L. Hall. 1978. "Estimation of Toxic Hazard--a Decision Tree Approach." Food and Cosmetics Toxicology 16 (3): 255–76.

Dautzenberg, Bertrand. 2015. "Real-Time Characterization of E-Cigarettes Use: The 1 Million Puffs Study." Journal of Addiction Research & Therapy 06 (02).

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Health and Medicine Division; Food and Nutrition Board; Committee to Review the Dietary Reference