Surface-enhanced Raman Spectroscopy for Emerging Contaminant Analysis in Drinking Water

Seo Won Cho,[1,2] Haoran Wei*[1,2]

1. Environmental Chemistry and Technology Program, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 660 N. Park St., Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

2. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

* Corresponding author. E-mail: haoran.wei3@wisc.edu; Telephone: +1 (608) 263-6278

In preparation for ***Frontiers of Environmental Science and Engineering***

Graphic Abstract



Abstract

Emerging contaminants (ECs) in drinking water pose threats to public health due to their environmental prevalence and potential toxicity. The occurrence of ECs in our drinking water supplies depends on their physicochemical properties, discharging rate, and susceptibility to removal by water treatment processes. Uncertain health effects of long-term exposure to ECs justify their regular monitoring in drinking water supplies. In this review article, we will summarize the current status and future opportunities of surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy (SERS) for EC analysis in drinking water. Working principles of SERS are first introduced and a comparison of SERS and liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry in terms of cost, time, sensitivity, and availability is made. Subsequently, we discuss the strategies for designing effective SERS sensors for EC analysis based on four categories — per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, novel pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and endocrine-disrupting chemicals. In addition to maximizing the intrinsic enhancement factors of SERS substrates, strategies to improve hot spot accessibilities to the targeting ECs is equally important. This is the first review article focusing on SERS analysis of ECs in drinking water. The discussions are not only guided by numerous endeavors to advance SERS technology but also by the drinking water regulatory policy.

Keywords: Emerging contaminant, Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy, Drinking water monitoring, Sensor, Regulatory policy

1. Introduction

Definition of emerging contaminants. Emerging contaminants (ECs), or contaminants of emerging concern (CECs), have frequently appeared in scientific literature, governmental reports, newspapers, and so on, but a unified and clear definition of ECs by the authorities for environmental protection and management is still missing. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) describes ECs as "chemicals that are increasingly detected at low levels in surface water and may have an impact on aquatic life" (EPA, 2022a). The United States Geological Survey describes ECs as "chemicals making it into our lakes and rivers and having a detrimental effect on aquatic species or non-aquatic species via food web accumulation" (USGS, 2019). A recent review article describes ECs as "new contaminants with uncertain effects but the potential for significant harm" (Khan et al., 2022). These descriptions from different perspectives, such as occurrence, impact on natural waters, and toxicity, provide the readers a general impression rather than a strict definition on what emerging contaminants are. Accordingly, whether a chemical can be considered as an EC might be subjective and strongly depends on public perception, so the list of ECs will also change as time evolves. At the beginning of this review article, we will first set up the boundary for our following discussions by proposing a more specific definition of ECs in terms of drinking water safety.

In the perspective of drinking water safety, ECs refer to any potentially hazardous matter, including organic chemicals, inorganic ions, and pathogens, that are detectable in drinking water supplies and pose potential risks to human health. Therefore, the frequent occurrence of a pollutant in drinking water is the first criterion that qualifies it as an emerging contaminant. In this situation, a large population may be subject to chronic exposure of such pollutants via drinking water. The second criterion that qualifies a pollutant as an EC is its potential adverse effects on human health.

ECs usually occur in drinking water at very low concentrations (<1 part per billion) that will not elicit any acute toxicities to humans. However, their long-term effects on human health remain largely uncertain. From the perspective of risk assessment, risk equals to exposure multiplied by toxicity. For a specific EC, the product of its certain exposure (ubiquitous occurrence) and uncertain toxicity (unknown long-term effect) gives an uncertain but potentially high risk to humans (Fig. 1).



Figure 1. Schematic illustrating the definition of emerging contaminants in drinking water.

Occurrence of ECs in drinking water. The prevalence of emerging contaminants in drinking water sources, including both surface water and groundwater, has raised increasing concerns of drinking water safety (Houtman, 2010; Schriks et al., 2010). ECs enter freshwater systems primarily via treated municipal/industrial wastewater effluents and urban/agricultural runoffs (Fawell and Ong, 2012). The occurrence and fate of ECs in drinking water sources are determined by their physicochemical properties. Higher water solubility, stronger polarity, and lower octanol-water partition coefficient (K_{ow}) endow the contaminants with higher mobility in the water stream and thus a higher chance to reach the tap water (Jones-Lepp et al., 2012). On the contrary, hydrophobic contaminants are more likely to be sequestered by activated sludge, sediments, and soils, and thus are much less frequently detected in drinking water supplies

(Petrović et al., 2003). The pervasive use of emerging contaminants also affects their fate in drinking water sources. For example, azithromycin, a widely used macrolide antibiotic, is considered pseudo-persistent in the Colorado River and its tributaries because of its heavy use in the US and high tendency to be discharged into natural streams (Jones-Lepp et al., 2012; Bu et al., 2016).

Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. SERS is an emerging and ultrasensitive analytical tool that has been widely used for chemical analysis (Langer et al., 2019; Wei and Cho, 2021; Wang and Wei, 2022). SERS originates from a unique optical phenomenon called localized surface plasmon resonance (LSPR), where the conduction electrons of a metal nanoparticle collectively oscillate induced by an impinging electromagnetic wave with a specific frequency (Haynes et al., 2005; Schlücker, 2014). As a result of LSPR, the electric field within nanoscale proximity of the metal nanoparticle surfaces is significantly enhanced, which in turn will enhance the Raman scattering of a molecule that locates within this enhanced electric field. The enhancement of Raman cross section of a molecule can be over 10^{10} when the molecular electronic levels match the incident photon energy or there is charge transfer between the molecule and the metal nanoparticle. In this situation, single molecular detection has been regularly achieved (Kneipp et al., 1997; Camden et al., 2008; Le Ru and Etchegoin, 2012). Because of their unique dielectric function, gold or silver nanoparticles (AuNPs or AgNPs) hold LSPR at visible light wavelengths, and are thus amenable to the 532-, 633-., and 785-nm lasers commonly equipped in commercial Raman spectrometers. When AuNPs or AgNPs are very close to each other, further enhancement of the electric field will occur within the gaps between the nanoparticles, which are called SERS “hot spots” (Moskovits, 2005; Ou et al., 2011). Hot spots are essential for

ultrasensitive SERS analysis, but their heterogeneous distribution across a SERS substrate is also the primary cause of irreproducible SERS signals (Wei et al., 2018a).

Similar to infrared spectroscopy (IR), SERS also provides abundant information on the relative motions of atoms within a molecule, which are fingerprinting characteristics of a molecule and thus can be used for pollutant identification (Mulvaney and Keating, 2000). Unlike IR that is sensitive to chemical bonds with large dipole moment change, SERS has a different selection rule that offers complementary vibrational information on primarily symmetric bonds, such as benzene rings and C=C bonds (Long, 1977). As a result, SERS does not produce high intensities for the vibrational modes of water molecules and thus can be directly used for pollutant analysis in aqueous phase. Compared with fluorescence spectroscopy, SERS exhibits higher photostability and much more information (usually tens of vibrational modes) about the target molecule (Han et al., 2009). Owing to the narrow full width at half maximum (FWHM) of a Raman band, SERS can differentiate similar chemicals even in a complex mixture based on the unique patterns of their Raman bands (Zavaleta et al., 2009; Dougan and Faulds, 2012). Despite the above-mentioned unique advantages, SERS also share some common advantages with other optical spectroscopy. First, SERS spectra are almost instantly collected, thus enabling rapid and even real-time analysis. Second, technologies for Raman spectrometer miniaturization have been evolving fast, which pushes many handheld Raman spectrometers into the market and drives down the price significantly. The availability of the portable Raman spectrometers paves the way for field-deployable SERS analysis of water pollutants.

This review paper, for the first time, summarizes the recent progress on SERS analysis of typical ECs in drinking water supplies. It serves the researchers in environmental science and engineering communities who are looking for rapid and inexpensive methods for emerging

contaminant quantification. It also provides insights in the design, optimization, and implementation of SERS-based sensors based on the unique physicochemical properties of different emerging contaminants. This paper will be exclusively focused on drinking water matrices because 1) the regulations on emerging contaminants are the most common and stringent in drinking water supplies, making it easy to place the discussions on SERS sensors in the context of EC regulation policies; 2) drinking water is relatively clean compared to other water matrices (e.g., landfill leachate), which provides opportunities for the development of in-line SERS sensors without water sample pretreatment. In the following sections, we will first compare SERS and traditional analytical methods in the perspective of EC analysis. Subsequently, we will elaborate the technological advances of SERS sensors for the detection of PFAS, novel pesticides, pharmaceuticals, EDCs, and microplastics, respectively. Finally, we will discuss future research opportunities and challenges that need to be overcome in order to be in compliance with the EC regulations in drinking water supplies.

2. Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy

Direct vs Indirect SERS. Based on the source of the SERS signal, SERS can be categorized into direct and indirect SERS. While direct SERS directly measure analytes in proximity with the SERS substrates, indirect SERS estimate analytes based on the SERS signal of Raman reporter attached to SERS tag. SERS tag is engineered to trap target analytes onto substrates, which would then be conjugated to both SERS substrates and SERS tags with recognition elements. Subsequently, the unattached tags would be washed away, and the target sandwiched between the substrates and tags can be indirectly quantified from the Raman reporter signal. The relatively large Raman cross-section of Raman reporter dye allows detection of target with small Raman cross-section, such as biomolecules and hydrogen ions with high sensitivity (Wei et al., 2018b; Pilot et al., 2019). Despite

this advantage, indirect SERS protocols have limited selectivity since recognition element in SERS tags attracts false positives. On the contrary, the fingerprinting ability of direct SERS allows selective target analysis as well as multi-target analysis (Wei and Cho, 2022). We will thus focus the scope of this review to direct SERS analysis of water pollutants but will not limit it to direct SERS since PFAS can only be analyzed using indirect SERS with the current technology (Fang et al., 2016; Bai et al., 2022).

SERS vs. LC-MS/MS. In order to justify the use of SERS for water pollutant analysis, it is imperative to elaborate on its advantages and disadvantages over the standard analytical methods. For ECs with high water solubility (the primary targets of this study), the standard methods established by US EPA are predominantly based on liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS), e.g., Method 537.1 for PFAS analysis in drinking water (Shoemaker and Tettenhorst, 2020). Despite the high sensitivity and precision of these standard methods, they are also very expensive and time-consuming (Ferrer and Thurman, 2003; Richardson, 2009). First, the collected water samples will be transported back to a specialized laboratory, prefiltered, and preconcentrated by solid phase extraction and organic solvent elution. Subsequently, isotopic internal/surrogate standards will be added to the pretreated water samples before they are injected into the LC-MS/MS for analysis. In addition, the operation of LC-MS/MS requires well-trained personnel and highly specialized laboratories, which restrains its accessibility to ordinary people (Jansen et al., 2005).



Figure 2. Schematic of the working principle of a typical SERS sensor for EC analysis.

As mentioned above, SERS provides an alternative option for emerging contaminant analysis that can potentially overcome the disadvantages of LC-MS/MS (Fang et al., 2016; Gao et al., 2021). SERS is a simple, rapid, and nondestructive technique that allows pollutant analysis both in laboratory and field settings (Halvorson and Vikesland, 2010; Zhou et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021b). The schematic for conducting a typical SERS analysis is shown in Fig. 2. First, water samples containing ECs will be deposited onto a SERS substrate to ensure the contact of pollutants with plasmonic nanoparticles (Cho et al., 2012; Ouyang et al., 2017). Subsequently, a laser is irradiated on the SERS substrate and then the Raman scatterings will be collected, dispersed, and detected. This "light in and light out" paradigm significantly reduces the complexity of water sample pretreatment and time for the analysis (Halvorson and Vikesland, 2010; Hakonen et al., 2018). The cost for SERS analysis is also substantially lower than that for LC-MS/MS because it

does not need organic solvents and isotopic internal standards. The small size of a Raman spectrometer also makes it possible to conduct SERS analysis in field (Gahlaut et al., 2020). However, the limit of detection (LOD) of ECs that SERS can achieve is usually higher than LC-MS/MS. For example, the LOD of perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) is 11 ppb, while that of the LC-MS/MS can go as low as sub-ppt level (Bai et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2023). In addition, the surface affinity between SERS substrates and analytes (Wei and Vikesland, 2015; Fang et al., 2016) and the complex water sample matrices (Pérez-Jiménez et al., 2020) sometimes compromise the sensitivity and selectivity of SERS for EC analysis, although many research effort has been devoted to overcoming these disadvantages (Oakley et al., 2012; Yaseen et al., 2018). The comparisons between SERS and LC-MS/MS are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. A summary of the pros and cons of SERS and LC-MS/MS

Analytical method	Advantages	Disadvantages
SERS	• Simple sample pretreatment • Rapid and non-destructive sample analysis • On-site contaminant analysis • Lower measurement cost ($7/h) • Lower instrumental cost (~10 – 30 k)	• Higher LOD • Limited to analytes with high affinity to plasmonic nanoparticles • Mediocre reproducibility • Interference by complex water matrices
LC-MS/MS	• Lower LOD • High precision • Standard methods published by the environmental authorities	• Time-consuming sample pretreatment & analysis • Requiring well-trained personnel • Higher measurement cost ($X) • Higher instrumental cost (~1,000 k)

3. SERS analysis of emerging contaminants

In this section, we will summarize the recent progress on SERS analysis of typical emerging contaminants in drinking water, including PFAS, novel pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and endocrine-disrupting chemicals (Fig. 2). We will focus on the peer-reviewed publications after

2015 and frame our discussions on the sensitivity, reproducibility, and selectivity of SERS and if they can meet EC regulations or health advisories in drinking water.

PFAS. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances are one type of emerging contaminants that have received the most public awareness due to their ubiquity, persistency, and toxicity (Cousins et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020a; Fenton et al., 2021). The unique hydrophobicity and lipophobicity make PFAS popular ingredients in industrial and consumer products such as food packaging, non-stick cookware, waterproof apparel, lubricants, and firefighting foams. Known as the "forever chemicals", PFAS can remain in natural environments for many years due to their extremely strong carbon-fluorine backbone and a lack of microbial metabolic pathways to efficiently decompose these man-made chemicals (Fang et al., 2016; Cousins et al., 2020; Evich et al., 2022). After being used for over 70 years, PFAS have reached every corner of the world and raised enormous public health concerns, e.g., deleterious immune, metabolic, and reproductive effects and increased risks of cancer (Blake and Fenton, 2020). US EPA Method 537.1 describes the standard steps that need to be adopted to detect 18 PFAS in potable water based on solid phase extraction plus LC-MS/MS (Shoemaker and Tettenhorst, 2020). Despite its high sensitivity and reliability, the standard method has limitations in high cost, time-consuming pretreatment steps, and inaptness for onsite measurement (Bai et al., 2022).

SERS were recently employed in order to overcome these limitations (Fang et al., 2016; Bai et al., 2022). Among myriads of PFAS congeners, perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS), and 6:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2 FTS) were selected for SERS analysis (Fang et al., 2016). Individual PFAS was first conjugated with a cationic dye (i.e., ethyl violet, EV) to form an ion pair, which was subsequently deposited onto Ag nanoparticle-graphene oxide (AgNP-GO) nanocomposites. Both the reduced aqueous solubility of the ion pair

and the hydrophobicity of the GO enhanced the loading amount of EV to AgNPs. Therefore, the concentrations of PFAS were quantified based on the induced enhancement of SERS intensities of EV. This method achieved the best LOD, 50 parts per billion (ppb), for PFOA. A similar method achieved a LOD of 11 ppb for PFOA using crystal violet (CV) as the cationic dye and a Ag superstructure array as the SERS substrate (Bai et al., 2022). Both methods can only detect PFOA at a low-ppb level, which is still 6-7 orders of magnitude higher than its health advisory level (HAL) recently issued by the US EPA (i.e., 0.004 parts per trillion, ppt) (EPA, 2022b). In addition, these indirect SERS methods measured the Raman signals from the dyes instead of PFAS, so the co-existing non-fluorinated surfactants can produce significant interferences to PFAS quantification. Therefore, a label-free and ultrasensitive method is highly desired to advance SERS analysis of PFAS in drinking water (Ong et al., 2020).

Novel pesticides. Pesticides play an important role in optimizing landscape configuration and promoting agricultural production. While the legacy pesticides, such as DDT and atrazine, have either been banned or limited for use, many novel pesticides have been increasingly used and detected in drinking water. These novel pesticides have not been regulated yet, but their long-term influence on human health should not be overlooked. In this section, we will primarily focus on neonicotinoids to illustrate how SERS advances pesticide analysis in drinking water. Neonicotinoids were introduced into the market in 1991 and now are one of the most widely used classes of insecticides (Bass et al., 2015). Chemically resembling nicotine, neonicotinoids bind with nicotinic acetylcholine receptors in the central nervous system of insects, which makes them active against a wide range of insects and selectively toxic to the pests (Bass et al., 2015; Hladik et al., 2018). The high water solubility of neonicotinoids makes them easily be taken up by plant roots and distributed throughout the stem, leaves, flowers, and fruits of the plants (Wood and

Goulson, 2017). The systemic nature of neonicotinoids allows the versatile use in the form of seed coatings, soil drench, and foliar sprays (Goulson, 2013). Despite the advantages, their potentially high toxicities to non-targeted organisms, such as honeybees and bumblebees, pose a significant risk to our ecosystem (Blacquière et al., 2012).

Conventionally, neonicotinoid detection consists of two steps: sample pretreatment and analysis. Liquid-liquid extraction, solid-phase extraction, and their derivatives have been used for neonicotinoid preconcentration followed by gas chromatography and liquid chromatography-based analysis (Selahle et al., 2021). As elaborated previously, SERS is much faster and cheaper than these standard methods (Selahle et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021). Among different types of neonicotinoids, N-nitroguanidines (imidacloprid, thiamethoxam, and clothianidin), N-cyanoamidines (acetamiprid and thiacloprid), and nitromethylene (nitenpyram) were used for SERS analysis (Dowgiallo and Guenther, 2019; Creedon et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2021; Puente et al., 2022). These studies predominantly targeted to analyze neonicotinoid residues on fruits (apples and peaches), vegetables (cabbage, spinach, and corn), tea leaves (green tea), and grains (wheat) using a variety of SERS substrates listed in Table 2. We believe that the strategies that were used for SERS analysis of neonicotinoids in the extracts of agricultural products will provide useful guidance for their analysis in drinking water.



Figure 3. SERS spectra of clothianidin and imidacloprid that were collected after deposition of their methanol-water solutions (1 ppb) onto the Ag film@PVDF SERS substrate. Reprinted (adapted) with permission from Creedon N, Lovera P, Moreno J G, Nolan M, O'riordan A (2020). Highly sensitive SERS detection of neonicotinoid pesticides. Complete Raman spectral assignment of clothianidin and imidacloprid. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 124(36): 7238-7247. Copyright 2020 American Chemical Society.

Citrate-coated AuNP colloidal SERS substrates were used for the analysis of 21 pesticides, including neonicotinoids, organothiophosphates, fungicides, insect repellents, and so on (Dowgiallo and Guenther, 2019). A large range of LOD from 0.001 – 10 ppm was achieved, which can be attributed to the different Raman cross sections of the pesticides and their different affinities toward AuNP surfaces. However, many of the measurements were conducted in the presence of organic solvents (acetone for acetamiprid, imidacloprid, and thiamethoxam; methanol for clothianidin), which generated strong interferences that can limit the further LOD reduction. Creedon et al. developed a SERS substrate by depositing a silver film onto a nanostructured polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) film and applied it for imidacloprid and clothianidin analysis (Creedon et al., 2020). Raman spectra were acquired following drop coating the methanol-DI water (1:1) solutions of imidacloprid and clothianidin onto the SERS substrate. As shown in Fig. 3, low-concentration imidacloprid and clothianidin (1 ppb) solutions both exhibited well-resolved features in their Raman spectra, indicating that SERS is extremely sensitive for neonicotinoid analysis. However, apparent discrepancies between Raman spectra of low-concentration samples and those of high-concentration or bulk samples were observed, which was attributed to the different orientations of the molecules adsorbed onto silver surfaces. Further improvement of analysis sensitivity can be achieved by water sample preconcentration. For example, Gao et al.

concentrated the analytes in a water sample droplet into a tiny spot by photothermally heating the droplet on a superhydrophobic surface and achieved a LOD of femtomolar level for clothianidin, thiamethoxam, imidacloprid, and acetamiprid.(Gao et al., 2021) The significantly lower detection limits of pesticides compared to the US EPA drinking water levels of comparison (DWLOC) and the health guidance in Minnesota suggest that SERS is a sensitive tool for monitoring pesticides in drinking water (Table 2).

Pharmaceuticals. A survey from a Gemany's research project on pharmaceutical residue in drinking water reported that 23% of the liquid pharmaceuticals and 7% of tablets are discarded by the consumers as household garbage or flushed away via toilets (Organization, 2012). As indicated, a tremendous amount of pharmaceuticals ends up in landfill leachate and sewage, which eventually gather in wastewater treatment plants. Both wastewater treatment and drinking water treatment plants are not designed to remove these pharmaceuticals, so they are ubiquitously detected in drinking water sources and finished drinking waters (Jelić et al., 2012; Simazaki et al., 2015; Sun et al., 2015; Aus der Beek et al., 2016). In this section, we select three of the most frequently detected pharmaceuticals in various natural and engineered water systems, i.e.,

sulfamethoxazole, carbamazepine, and diclofenac, as examples to elucidate the strategies that have been adopted to advance their SERS analysis (Alula et al., 2018).



Figure 4. Raman spectra of carbamazepine collected from a AuNP/bacterial cellulose SERS substrate under pH of 2.0, 3.0, and 6.0 (Wei and Vikesland, 2015). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC BY license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Sulfamethoxazole at a 20-ppb level was detected by filtering a 2-mL solution (pH=1.8) through a AgNP-decorated membrane (Hu et al., 2022). The membrane skeleton consisting of sepiolite and chitosan efficiently concentrated sulfamethoxazole and improved the sensitivity of SERS analysis. Patze et al. integrated a microfluidic device with a silver-coated nanostructured quartz wafer and achieved a LOD of 0.05 and 0.6 ppb for DI water and lake/river/tap water matrices, respectively (Patze et al., 2017). Sulfamethoxazole solution was continuously fed to the SERS substrate, thus avoiding the overheating of the SERS substrate, and ensuring a highly reproducible environment for Raman spectrum collection. Sulfamethoxazole has two p*K*a values

of 1.6 and 5.7 for its amine groups, indicating that it exhibits relatively low affinity to mostly negatively charged plasmonic nanoparticles under circumneutral pH (Boreen et al., 2004).

This situation aggravates for molecules with even lower pK_a values. Carbamazepine has a very low pKa (2.3), making it a neutral molecule that weakly associates with citrate-coated AuNPs. Therefore, the SERS intensities of carbamazepine bands were very low under circumneutral pH. To circumvent this issue, Wei et al. adjusted the pH of the carbamazepine solution to 2.0 before mixing it with AuNP colloid (Wei and Vikesland, 2015). The electrostatic attraction between the positively charged carbamazepine and negatively charged citrate significantly enhanced the affinity between them and achieved a LOD of 2 ppb (Fig. 4). In addition to adjusting pH, electrostatic forces can be regulated by surface functionalization of the plasmonic nanoparticles. Citrate- and hydroxylamine-coated AgNPs were functionalized with thiocholine, whose quaternary amine groups provided strong positive charges even under alkaline solutions (Stewart et al., 2015). In this way, the anionic pharmaceutical – diclofenac was detected using SERS with a LOD of 6,000 ppb. This much higher LOD than carbamazepine and sulfamethoxazole can be attributed to the competitive adsorption of co-existing anions with diclofenac. The use of recognition elements can also enhance the affinity of diclofenac to SERS substrates. As shown in Fig. 5a, Cho et al. recently developed a monolithic gold nanogrid SERS substrate consisting of crossed gold nanowires (Cho et al., 2020). After functionalization of the gold nanogrid with a diclofenac-targeting aptamer, this substrate can capture diclofenac to its surface and detect it down to 3×10^{-4} ppb. Numerous attempts to enhance the sensitivity of SERS sensors for pharmaceutical analysis have lowered the LOD below the Minnesota Department of Health guidance by up to three orders of magnitude (Table 2).

316 **Endocrine-disrupting chemicals.** Many synthetic chemicals can disrupt the endocrine
317 system of humans via mimicking, stimulating, or inhibiting natural hormones. EDCs have been
318 frequently detected in drinking water and its chronic exposure could be linked to developmental
319 and reproductive anomalies (Benotti et al., 2009; Wee and Aris, 2017; Liu et al., 2021). Many
320 synthetic chemicals demonstrate endocrine-disrupting effects, such as atrazine, bisphenol A,
321 nonylphenol, and 17β-estradiol (E2). The strategies to detect triazine-containing or aromatic EDCs
322 are similar to what were discussed before, so we will only focus on 17β-estradiol in this section
323 because of its unique molecular structure.



Figure 5. Schematics of (a) aptamer functionalization on a gold nanogrid SERS substrate and (b) strategy for labeled SERS analysis of 17β-estradiol (Pu et al., 2019; Cho et al., 2020). Reprinted with permission from Yeon Sik Jung, Hyungjoon Park, Minjoon Kim et al. (2020). Selective, quantitative, and multiplexed surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy using aptamer-functionalized monolithic plasmonic nanogrids derived from cross-point nano-welding. *Advanced Functional Materials,* 30: 2000612. Copyright 2020 John Wiley and Sons. Reprinted with permission from Hongbin Pu, Xiaohui Xie, Dawen Sun et al. (2019). Double-strand DNA functionalized Au@Ag NPs for ultrasensitive detection of 17*β*-estradiol using surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. *Talanta,* 195: 419-425. Copyright 2019 Elsevier.

Given its low Raman cross section, 17β-estradiol was primarily detected by SERS with the assistance of a highly Raman effective label. As shown in Fig. 5b, Au@Ag core-shell nanoparticles were first functionalized with a single-stranded DNA that is complementary to the E2-targeting aptamer (Pu et al., 2019). After adding the E2-targeting aptamer, the core-shell NPs aggregated as a result of DNA hybridization while the Cy3 label that was pre-attached to the aptamer gave rise to a strong SERS signal. However, when 17β-estradiol was added, the strong interaction between 17β-estradiol and the aptamer removed the aptamer from NP surfaces, thus reducing the SERS intensity of Cy3 substantially. This detection strategy achieved an extremely low LOD of 3×10^{-4} ppb. A similar competition strategy achieved a LOD of 7×10^{-4} ppb for 17*β*-estradiol analysis using an antibody as the recognition element and malachite green-isothiocyanate (MGITC) as the SERS label (Wang et al., 2016). Recently, a SERS strategy was reported to analyze the total steroid estrogens (TE), including 17*β*-estradiol, estrone (TE1), and ethinyl estradiol (TEE2) (Liu et al., 2019). The TE-targeting aptamer exhibited a similar binding affinity with the three individual steroid estrogens. Two batches of Au@Ag core-shell nanoparticles were functionalized with the

TE-targeting aptamer and the complementary DNA, respectively. Dimers were formed after mixing them together because of DNA hybridization. Subsequently, the Raman label – 4-mercaptobenzoic acid (4-MBA) was coated on the surfaces of both nanoparticles. Whenever any of the three steroid estrogens were present either individually or as a mixture, the strong interactions between the aptamer and the steroid estrogens reduced the distance between the nanoparticles and created SERS hot spots. This strategy achieved a LOD down to 10^{-3} ppb in multiple environmental waters. As shown in Table 2, SERS can achieve LOD of steroid estrogens that are well below the maximum recommended concentrations (MRCs) in drinking water in Japan with the assistance of SERS labels and recognition elements.

Micro- and nanoplastics. Since their commercial production in 1950s, plastics have penetrated in our lives not just in the form of daily products such as plastic water bottles and food containers but also in the form of small plastic debris, i.e., micro- (<5 mm) and nanoplastics (<100 nm) (Thompson et al., 2004; Hale et al., 2020). Such small plastic particles are produced either directly or indirectly from industrial plastic production. Primary microplastics are microscopic plastics produced for daily products. Microbeads in cosmetics and personal care products are some examples, however, the production of microbeads is now banned in the U.S. by Microbead-Free Waters Act of 2015. (van Wezel et al., 2016). The major source of plastic particles are secondary microplastics from the physiochemical degradation of plastic wastes and washing of synthetic garments. Owing to their light weight, as produced plastic particles are transported by atmosphere and water and enter our environment (Qiu et al., 2020).

The environmentally released microplastics pose direct threat to both humans and ecosystems as well as indirect threat that is caused by the pollutants adsorbed to the microplastics. (Wang et al., 2021a) Microplastics have a high adsorption capacity which makes them retain

number of organic and inorganic pollutants and biofilms formed on microplastics further attracts pathogenic microorganisms such as algae (He et al., 2022). The plastic particles in surface water are consumed as food and drinking water and act as neurotoxins and exert oxidative stress to humans, aquatic and soil organisms and cause developmental and reproductive problems (Lei et al., 2018; Qin et al., 2021). In addition to the toxicity of microplastics, their bioaccumulative properties makes them reside in the bodies of organisms for a prolonged period.



Figure 6. Schematics of (a) Klarite and (b) a bifunctional silver nanowire membrane. Reprinted (adapted) with permission from Yang Q, Zhang S, Su J, Li S, Lv X, Chen J, Lai Y, Zhan J (2022). Identification of Trace Polystyrene Nanoplastics Down to 50 nm by the Hyphenated Method of Filtration and Surface-Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy Based on Silver Nanowire Membranes. Environmental Science & Technology, 56(15): 10818-10828. Copyright 2022 American Chemical Society. Reprinted (adapted) with permission from Xu G, Cheng H, Jones R, Feng Y, Gong K, Li K, Fang X, Tahir M A, Valev V K, Zhang L (2020). Surface-Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy Facilitates the Detection of Microplastics <1 μm in the Environment. Environmental Science & Technology, 54(24): 15594-15603. Copyright 2020 American Chemical Society.

Numerous studies have been conducted in order to detect and quantify microplastics in different environmental and drinking water matrices including tap water, rainwater, snow water, river water, and sea water (Yin et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2022). Different sizes and types, i.e., polystyrene (PS), polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA), polyethylene (PE), Polyvinyl chloride (PVC), polypropylene (PP), polycarbonates (PC), and Polyethylene terephthalate (PET), of plastic particles have been analyzed using gold and silver SERS substrates. Xu et al. utilized Klarite, a commercially produced inverted pyramid nanostructure coated with gold, as a SERS substrate to detect a single PS and PMMA microplastic, sizes down to 360 nm (Xu et al., 2020). The single particle detected is allowed due to the SERS mapping technique combined with the strong hotspots generated from the pyramid pits of Klarite. Yang et al. on the other hand, used a silver nanowire membrane as SERS substrates to both concentrate and detect PS nanoplastics (Yang et al., 2022). The dual function allowed the detection of the nanoplastic sizes down to 50 nm.

Table 2. SERS-based sensors for emerging contaminant analysis

EC categories	ECs	SERS substrates/labels	Water matrices	LOD (ppb)	Regulations/Advisories	Ref.
PFAS	PFOA, PFOS, and 6:2 FTS	AgNP-graphene oxide/ethyl violet	Groundwater	50	US EPA HAL: PFOA 0.004 ppt and PFOS 0.02 ppt in drinking water	(Fang et al., 2016)
	PFOA	Ag nanoclusters on silica microspheres/crystal violet	DI water	11		(Bai et al., 2022)
Novel pesticides	Acetamiprid	Au and Ag nanostructures covered on SiO_2	DI water	9	US EPA DWLOC: 80 ppb (chronic exposure for children 1-6 years old)	(Atanasov et al., 2020)
		AuNPs on Ti_3C_2/SiO_2/PDMS surface	DI water	2×10^{-6}		(Gao et al., 2021)
		Colloidal AuNPs	Acetone	10		(Dowgiallo and Guenther, 2019)
	Clothianidin	Ag layer on nanostructured PVDF film	Methanol-DI water (1:1)	1	Minnesota Department of Health guidance: 200 ppb	(Creedon et al., 2020)
		AuNPs on Ti_3C_2/SiO_2/PDMS surface	DI Water	2×10^{-6}		(Gao et al., 2021)
		Colloidal AuNPs	Methanol	10^3		(Dowgiallo and Guenther, 2019)
		Silver dendrite/electropolymerized molecular identifier/AgNP sandwich hybrids	Ethanol	0.03		(Zhao et al., 2020b)
	Imidacloprid	Ag layer on nanostructured PVDF film	Methanol-DI water (1:1)	1	Minnesota Department of Health guidance: 2 ppb	(Creedon et al., 2020)
		Citrate-coated AuNP colloid	Methanol-DI Water (1:1)	5		(Hou et al., 2015)
		AuNPs on Ti_3C_2/SiO_2/PDMS surface	DI water	1×10^{-6}		(Gao et al., 2021)

		Colloidal AuNP	Acetone	100		(Dowgiallo and Guenther, 2019)
	Nitenpyram	Fern-like Ag dendrites on filter paper	Apple surface	0.3	None	(Wang et al., 2019)
		Ag nanospheres and nanocubes	Acetone	3×10^{5}		(Puente et al., 2022)
	Thiacloprid	Ag and Au nanostructures on alumina ceramic	DI water	10^{5}	US EPA DWLOC: 38 ppb	(Atanasov et al., 2019)
		Cysteamine-modified silver-coated gold nanoparticles	Liquid milk	23		(Hussain et al., 2020)
	Thiamethoxam	AuNPs on Ti_3C_2/SiO_2/PDMS surface	DI water	2×10^{-6}	Minnesota Department of Health guidance: 200 ppb	(Gao et al., 2021)
		Colloidal AuNP	Acetone	100		(Dowgiallo and Guenther, 2019)
	Sulfamethoxazole	Sepiolite/chitosan/ AgNPs	DI water	20	Minnesota Department of Health guidance: 100 ppb	(Hu et al., 2022)
		Ag layer on a nanostructured quartz wafer	DI water/lake, river, tap water	0.05/0.6		(Patze et al., 2017)
		Hydroxylamine-coated AgNP colloid	Human urine	2×10^{3}		(Markina et al., 2020)
Pharmaceuticals	Diclofenac	Thiocholine-functionalized AgNP colloid	DI water	6×10^{3}	None	(Stewart et al., 2015)
		Au nanogrid	DI water	3×10^{-4}		(Cho et al., 2020)
	Carbamazepine	AuNPs within bacterial cellulose mat	DI water	2	Minnesota Department of Health guidance: 40 ppb	(Wei and Vikesland, 2015)
		Au@Ag core-shell NP colloid	Saliva	0.3		(Chen et al., 2021)

		Au@Ag core-shell NP colloid/Cy3	DI water	3×10^{-4}		(Pu et al., 2019)
Endocrine-disrupting chemicals	17β-estradiol	AuNPs on a magnetic bead/MGITC	Human serum	7×10^{-4}	Japan MRC: 0.08 ppb (E2) and 0.02 ppb (17α-ethinylestradiol)	(Wang et al., 2016)
	Total steroid estrogens	Au@Ag core-shell NP colloid/4-MBA	Multiple surface waters	10^{-3}		(Liu et al., 2019)
	PS micro- and nanoplastics (50 – 1,000 nm)	Ag nanowires	KI solution	0.1		(Yang et al., 2022)
	PS and PMMA micro- and nanoplastics (360 – 5,000 nm)	Klarite	DI water	2.625×10^{4}		(Xu et al., 2020)
	PS, PE, and PP micro- and nanoplastics (100 nm)	AgNPs	Pure water and sea water	4×10^{4}		(Lv et al., 2020)
Micro- and nanoplastics	PET, PE, PVC, PP, PS, and PC microplastics (80 – 150 μm)	Sponge supported AuNPs	Ultrapure water, sea water, rainwater, river water, snow water, and tap water	1×10^{3}	California SDWA	(Yin et al., 2021)
	PET microplastics	AuNP doped filter paper	water	10^{5}		(Xu et al., 2022)
	PS sub-micro- (161 nm) and nanoplastics (33 nm)	AuNPs (46 nm and 14 nm)	SDS and KPS solution (solution obtained from milling)	$10^{4}/2\times10^{4}$		(Caldwell et al., 2021)
	PS and PMMA microspheres	AuNPs@V-shaped anodized aluminum oxide (AAO) substrate	DI water	5×10^{7}		(Liu et al., 2022)
	PS nanoplastics (~50 nm)	AgNPs	River water	5×10^{3}		(Zhou et al., 2021)
	PS sub-microplastics (600 nm)	Au nanourchins	DI water	1 – 5 particles		(Lee and Fang, 2022)

	PS nanoplastics (500 nm)	Ag nanowire membrane	Seafood market water and seawater	1	(Yang et al., 2022)

4. Conclusions and Perspectives

This review article summarizes the latest progress on the development of SERS sensors targeting four groups of emerging contaminants (ECs) — per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), novel pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs). ECs in drinking water are first defined based on their ubiquitous occurrence and uncertain health effects after long-term human exposure. The routes of ECs to drinking water supplies are briefly summarized. Following the introduction of advantages and disadvantages of SERS compared with standard EC analytical tools, recent research progress on SERS sensor design for EC analysis is discussed in terms of both technological advancements but also drinking water regulatory compliance.

While SERS allows inexpensive and rapid detection of ECs, most of the studies were performed in DI water and the reported LOD values were based on the extrapolations from the experimental data. Although the insights in sensor design provided by these studies can be easily translated to other water matrices, further research is needed to evaluate the performance of these SERS sensors in drinking water and validate the LOD values experimentally. There is no "one-fit-for-all" strategy for EC analysis using SERS. SERS substrates should be tailored to accommodate different targeting analytes based on their chemical structures. It is relatively easy to achieve a low LOD for ECs with moieties that can either bind strongly with plasmonic nanoparticle surfaces or exhibit high Raman cross sections. While for the ECs with either low Raman cross sections or low affinity to sensor surfaces, i.e., PFAS and steroid estrogens, SERS labels are usually needed to achieve a high detection sensitivity.

In addition to the efforts to maximize SERS hot spot density, strategies to place the targeting ECs into the hot spots are highly desired. The orientational variation of ECs on SERS sensor surfaces as a function of their concentrations impedes the quantitative analysis. It is important to further improve the reproducibility of SERS analysis, especially when the concentrations of ECs are low. So far, the sensitivity and precision of SERS sensors for EC analysis are still not on par with the standard analytical methods, such as GC-MS/MS and LC-MS/MS. However, this can be potentially improved by integrating SERS with sample pretreatment steps, e.g., liquid chromatography and microfluidic device, and advanced data analytics, e.g., multivariate statistics and machine learning. In summary, the low cost, (near) real-time data collection, and potential for onsite analysis make SERS a promising tool for EC monitoring in drinking water.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the startup fund from the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (OVCRGE) at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) for the support of this study. Additional support was provided by the National Science Foundation (2132026).

Reference

Alula M T, Mengesha Z T, Mwenesongole E (2018). Advances in surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy for analysis of pharmaceuticals: A review. Vibrational Spectroscopy, 98: 50-63

Atanasov P A, Nedyalkov N N, Fukata N, Jevasuwan W (2020). Ag and Au nanostructures for surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy of Mospilan 20 SP (acetamiprid). Journal of Raman Spectroscopy, 51(12): 2398-2407

Atanasov P A, Nedyalkov N N, Fukata N, Jevasuwan W, Subramani T (2019). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy (SERS) of neonicotinoid insecticide thiacloprid assisted by silver and gold nanostructures. Applied Spectroscopy, 74(3): 357-364

Aus Der Beek T, Weber F A, Bergmann A, Hickmann S, Ebert I, Hein A, Küster A (2016). Pharmaceuticals in the environment—Global occurrences and perspectives. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 35(4): 823-835

Bai S, Hu A, Hu Y, Ma Y, Obata K, Sugioka K (2022). Plasmonic superstructure arrays fabricated by laser near-field reduction for wide-range SERS analysis of fluorescent materials. Nanomaterials, 12(6)

Bass C, Denholm I, Williamson M S, Nauen R (2015). The global status of insect resistance to neonicotinoid insecticides. Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology, 121: 78-87

Benotti M J, Trenholm R A, Vanderford B J, Holady J C, Stanford B D, Snyder S A (2009). Pharmaceuticals and endocrine disrupting compounds in US drinking water. Environmental Science & Technology, 43(3): 597-603

Blacquière T, Smagghe G, Van Gestel C a M, Mommaerts V (2012). Neonicotinoids in bees: a review on concentrations, side-effects and risk assessment. Ecotoxicology, 21(4): 973-992

Blake B E, Fenton S E (2020). Early life exposure to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and latent health outcomes: A review including the placenta as a target tissue and possible driver of peri- and postnatal effects. Toxicology, 443: 152565-152565

462 Boreen A L, Arnold W A, Mcneill K (2004). Photochemical fate of sulfa drugs in the aquatic
463 environment: sulfa drugs containing five-membered heterocyclic groups. Environmental Science
464 & Technology, 38(14): 3933-3940
465 Bu Q, Shi X, Yu G, Huang J, Wang B (2016). Assessing the persistence of pharmaceuticals in the
466 aquatic environment: Challenges and needs. Emerging Contaminants, 2(3): 145-147
467 Caldwell J, Taladriz-Blanco P, Rothen-Rutishauser B, Petri-Fink A (2021). Detection of Sub-
468 Micro- and Nanoplastic Particles on Gold Nanoparticle-Based Substrates through Surface-
469 Enhanced Raman Scattering (SERS) Spectroscopy. Nanomaterials, 11(5)
470 Camden J P, Dieringer J A, Wang Y, Masiello D J, Marks L D, Schatz G C, Van Duyne R P (2008).
471 Probing the structure of single-molecule surface-enhanced Raman scattering hot spots. Journal of
472 the American Chemical Society, 130(38): 12616-12617
473 Chen N, Yuan Y, Lu P, Wang L, Zhang X, Chen H, Ma P (2021). Detection of carbamazepine in
474 saliva based on surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Biomedical Optics Express, 12(12): 7673-
475 7688
476 Cho S H, Baek K M, Han H J, Kim M, Park H, Jung Y S (2020). Selective, quantitative, and
477 multiplexed surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy using aptamer-functionalized monolithic
478 plasmonic nanogrids derived from cross-point nano-welding. Advanced Functional Materials,
479 30(19): 2000612
480 Cho W J, Kim Y, Kim J K (2012). Ultrahigh-density array of silver nanoclusters for SERS
481 substrate with high sensitivity and excellent reproducibility. ACS nano, 6(1): 249-255
482 Cousins I T, Dewitt J C, Glüge J, Goldenman G, Herzke D, Lohmann R, Ng C A, Scheringer M,
483 Wang Z (2020). The high persistence of PFAS is sufficient for their management as a chemical
484 class. Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 22(12): 2307-2312

485 Creedon N, Lovera P, Moreno J G, Nolan M, O'riordan A (2020). Highly sensitive SERS detection
486 of neonicotinoid pesticides. Complete Raman spectral assignment of clothianidin and imidacloprid.
487 The Journal of Physical Chemistry A, 124(36): 7238-7247
488 Dougan J A, Faulds K (2012). Surface enhanced Raman scattering for multiplexed detection.
489 Analyst, 137(3): 545-554
490 Dowgiallo A, Guenther D (2019). Determination of the limit of detection of multiple pesticides
491 utilizing gold nanoparticles and surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. J Agric Food Chem,
492 67(46): 12642-12651
493 Epa U (2022a). Contaminants of Emerging Concern Including Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care
494 Products
495 Epa U (2022b). Drinking Water Health Advisories for Four Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances
496 (PFAS) PFOA, PFOS, GenX chemicals, and PFBS
497 Evich M G, Davis M J B, Mccord J P, Acrey B, Awkerman J A, Knappe D R U, Lindstrom A B,
498 Speth T F, Tebes-Stevens C, Strynar M J, Wang Z, Weber E J, Henderson W M, Washington J W
499 (2022). Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances in the environment. Science, 375(6580): eabg9065
500 Fang C, Megharaj M, Naidu R (2016). Surface-enhanced Raman scattering (SERS) detection of
501 fluorosurfactants in firefighting foams. RSC Advances, 6(14): 11140-11145
502 Fawell J, Ong C N (2012). Emerging contaminants and the implications for drinking water.
503 International Journal of Water Resources Development, 28(2): 247-263
504 Fenton S E, Ducatman A, Boobis A, Dewitt J C, Lau C, Ng C, Smith J S, Roberts S M (2021).
505 Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substance toxicity and human health review: Current state of knowledge
506 and strategies for informing future research. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 40(3):
507 606-630

508 Ferrer I, Thurman E M (2003). Liquid chromatography/time-of-flight/mass spectrometry
509 (LC/TOF/MS) for the analysis of emerging contaminants. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry,
510 22(10): 750-756
511 Gahlaut S, Savargaonkar D, Sharan C, Yadav S, Mishra P, Singh J (2020). SERS platform for
512 dengue diagnosis from clinical samples employing a hand held Raman spectrometer. Analytical
513 chemistry, 92(3): 2527-2534
514 Gao Z F, Li Y X, Dong L M, Zheng L L, Li J Z, Shen Y, Xia F (2021). Photothermal-induced
515 partial Leidenfrost superhydrophobic surface as ultrasensitive surface-enhanced Raman scattering
516 platform for the detection of neonicotinoid insecticides. Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical, 348:
517 130728
518 Goulson D (2013). REVIEW: An overview of the environmental risks posed by neonicotinoid
519 insecticides. Journal of Applied Ecology, 50(4): 977-987
520 Hakonen A, Wu K, Stenbæk Schmidt M, Andersson P O, Boisen A, Rindzevicius T (2018).
521 Detecting forensic substances using commercially available SERS substrates and handheld Raman
522 spectrometers. Talanta, 189: 649-652
523 Hale R C, Seeley M E, La Guardia M J, Mai L, Zeng E Y (2020). A Global Perspective on
524 Microplastics. Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 125(1): e2018JC014719
525 Halvorson R A, Vikesland P J (2010). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy (SERS) for
526 environmental analyses. Environmental Science & Technology, 44(20): 7749-7755
527 Han X X, Zhao B, Ozaki Y (2009). Surface-enhanced Raman scattering for protein detection.
528 Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry, 394(7): 1719-1727
529 Haynes C L, Mcfarland A D, Van Duyne R P (2005). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy:
530 ACS Publications

He S, Jia M, Xiang Y, Song B, Xiong W, Cao J, Peng H, Yang Y, Wang W, Yang Z, Zeng G (2022). Biofilm on microplastics in aqueous environment: Physicochemical properties and environmental implications. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 424: 127286

Hladik M L, Main A R, Goulson D (2018). Environmental risks and challenges associated with neonicotinoid insecticides. Environmental Science & Technology, 52(6): 3329-3335

Hou R, Pang S, He L (2015). In situ SERS detection of multi-class insecticides on plant surfaces. Analytical Methods, 7(15): 6325-6330

Houtman C J (2010). Emerging contaminants in surface waters and their relevance for the production of drinking water in Europe. Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences, 7(4): 271-295

Hu W, Chen Y, Xia L, Hu Y, Li G (2022). Flexible membrane composite based on sepiolite/chitosan/(silver nanoparticles) for enrichment and surface-enhanced Raman scattering determination of sulfamethoxazole in animal-derived food. Microchimica Acta, 189(5): 1-12

Hussain A, Pu H, Sun D-W (2020). Cysteamine modified core-shell nanoparticles for rapid assessment of oxamyl and thiacloprid pesticides in milk using SERS. Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization, 14(4): 2021-2029

Jansen R, Lachatre G, Marquet P (2005). LC-MS/MS systematic toxicological analysis: Comparison of MS/MS spectra obtained with different instruments and settings. Clinical Biochemistry, 38(4): 362-372

Jelić A, Petrović M, Barcelo D (2012). Pharmaceuticals in drinking water. Emerging organic contaminants and human health: 47-70

552 Jones-Lepp T L, Sanchez C, Alvarez D A, Wilson D C, Taniguchi-Fu R-L (2012). Point sources
553 of emerging contaminants along the Colorado River Basin: Source water for the arid Southwestern
554 United States. Science of The Total Environment, 430: 237-245
555 Khan S, Naushad M, Govarthanan M, Iqbal J, Alfadul S M (2022). Emerging contaminants of high
556 concern for the environment: Current trends and future research. Environmental Research, 207:
557 112609
558 Kneipp K, Wang Y, Kneipp H, Perelman L T, Itzkan I, Dasari R R, Feld M S (1997). Single
559 molecule detection using surface-enhanced Raman scattering (SERS). Physical review letters,
560 78(9): 1667
561 Langer J, Jimenez De Aberasturi D, Aizpurua J, Alvarez-Puebla R A, Auguié B, Baumberg J J,
562 Bazan G C, Bell S E, Boisen A, Brolo A G (2019). Present and future of surface-enhanced Raman
563 scattering. ACS nano, 14(1): 28-117
564 Le Ru E C, Etchegoin P G (2012). Single-molecule surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Annu.
565 Rev. Phys. Chem, 63(1): 65-87
566 Lee C-H, Fang J K-H (2022). The onset of surface-enhanced Raman scattering for single-particle
567 detection of submicroplastics. Journal of Environmental Sciences, 121: 58-64
568 Lei L, Liu M, Song Y, Lu S, Hu J, Cao C, Xie B, Shi H, He D (2018). Polystyrene
569 (nano)microplastics cause size-dependent neurotoxicity, oxidative damage and other adverse
570 effects in Caenorhabditis elegans. Environmental Science: Nano, 5(8): 2009-2020
571 Lin Y-M, Sun J-N, Yang X-W, Qin R-Y, Zhang Z-Q (2023). Fluorinated magnetic porous carbons
572 for dispersive solid-phase extraction of perfluorinated compounds. Talanta, 252: 123860

573 Liu J, Xu G, Ruan X, Li K, Zhang L (2022). V-shaped substrate for surface and volume enhanced
574 Raman spectroscopic analysis of microplastics. Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering,
575 16(11): 143
576 Liu S, Chen Y, Wang Y, Zhao G (2019). Group-targeting detection of total steroid estrogen using
577 surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Analytical chemistry, 91(12): 7639-7647
578 Liu Z-H, Dang Z, Liu Y (2021). Legislation against endocrine-disrupting compounds in drinking
579 water: essential but not enough to ensure water safety. Environmental Science and Pollution
580 Research, 28(15): 19505-19510
581 Long D A (1977). Raman spectroscopy. New York, 1
582 Lv L, He L, Jiang S, Chen J, Zhou C, Qu J, Lu Y, Hong P, Sun S, Li C (2020). In situ surface-
583 enhanced Raman spectroscopy for detecting microplastics and nanoplastics in aquatic
584 environments. Science of The Total Environment, 728: 138449
585 Markina N E, Markin A V, Weber K, Popp J, Cialla-May D (2020). Liquid-liquid extraction-
586 assisted SERS-based determination of sulfamethoxazole in spiked human urine. Analytica chimica
587 acta, 1109: 61-68
588 Moskovits M (2005). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy: a brief retrospective. Journal of
589 Raman Spectroscopy, 36(6-7): 485-496
590 Mulvaney S P, Keating C D (2000). Raman spectroscopy. Analytical chemistry, 72(12): 145-158
591 Oakley L H, Fabian D M, Mayhew H E, Svoboda S A, Wustholz K L (2012). Pretreatment
592 strategies for SERS analysis of indigo and prussian blue in aged painted surfaces. Analytical
593 chemistry, 84(18): 8006-8012

Ong T T X, Blanch E W, Jones O a H (2020). Surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy in environmental analysis, monitoring and assessment. Science of The Total Environment, 720: 137601

Organization W H (2012). Pharmaceuticals in drinking-water.

Ou F S, Hu M, Naumov I, Kim A, Wu W, Bratkovsky A M, Li X, Williams R S, Li Z (2011). Hot-spot engineering in polygonal nanofinger assemblies for surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Nano letters, 11(6): 2538-2542

Ouyang L, Ren W, Zhu L, Irudayaraj J (2017). Prosperity to challenges: Recent approaches in SERS substrate fabrication. Reviews in Analytical Chemistry, 36(1)

Patze S, Huebner U, Liebold F, Weber K, Cialla-May D, Popp J (2017). SERS as an analytical tool in environmental science: the detection of sulfamethoxazole in the nanomolar range by applying a microfluidic cartridge setup. Analytica chimica acta, 949: 1-7

Pérez-Jiménez A I, Lyu D, Lu Z, Liu G, Ren B (2020). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy: benefits, trade-offs and future developments. Chemical Science, 11(18): 4563-4577

Petrović M, Gonzalez S, Barceló D (2003). Analysis and removal of emerging contaminants in wastewater and drinking water. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 22(10): 685-696

Pilot R, Signorini R, Durante C, Orian L, Bhamidipati M, Fabris L (2019). A Review on Surface-Enhanced Raman Scattering. Biosensors (Basel), 9(2)

Pu H, Xie X, Sun D-W, Wei Q, Jiang Y (2019). Double strand DNA functionalized Au@ Ag Nps for ultrasensitive detection of 17β-estradiol using surface-enhanced raman spectroscopy. Talanta, 195: 419-425

Puente C, Brosseau C L, Lopez I (2022). Thiacloprid detection by silver nanocubes-based SERS sensor. IEEE Trans Nanobioscience, 21(1): 141-143

617 Qin L, Duan Z, Cheng H, Wang Y, Zhang H, Zhu Z, Wang L (2021). Size-dependent impact of
618 polystyrene microplastics on the toxicity of cadmium through altering neutrophil expression and
619 metabolic regulation in zebrafish larvae. Environmental Pollution, 291: 118169
620 Qiu R, Song Y, Zhang X, Xie B, He D (2020). Microplastics in Terrestrial Environments:
621 Emerging Contaminants and Major Challenges. He, D. and Luo, Y. (eds). Cham: Springer
622 International Publishing, 41-61
623 Richardson S D (2009). Water analysis: emerging contaminants and current issues. Analytical
624 chemistry, 81(12): 4645-4677
625 Schlücker S (2014). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy: Concepts and chemical applications.
626 Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 53(19): 4756-4795
627 Schriks M, Heringa M B, Van Der Kooi M M E, De Voogt P, Van Wezel A P (2010). Toxicological
628 relevance of emerging contaminants for drinking water quality. Water Research, 44(2): 461-476
629 Selahle S K, Mpupa A, Nomngongo P N (2021). A review of extraction, analytical, and advanced
630 methods for the determination of neonicotinoid insecticides in environmental water matrices.
631 Reviews in Analytical Chemistry, 40(1): 187-203
632 Shoemaker J A, Tettenhorst D R (2020). Method 537.1: Determination of Selected Per- and
633 Polyflourinated Alkyl Substances in Drinking Water by Solid Phase Extraction and Liquid
634 Chromatography/Tandem Mass Spectrometry (LC/MS/MS). Washington, DC
635 Simazaki D, Kubota R, Suzuki T, Akiba M, Nishimura T, Kunikane S (2015). Occurrence of
636 selected pharmaceuticals at drinking water purification plants in Japan and implications for human
637 health. Water Research, 76: 187-200
638 Stewart A, Murray S, Bell S (2015). Simple preparation of positively charged silver nanoparticles
639 for detection of anions by surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Analyst, 140(9): 2988-2994

640 Sun J, Luo Q, Wang D, Wang Z (2015). Occurrences of pharmaceuticals in drinking water sources
641 of major river watersheds, China. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 117: 132-140
642 Thompson R C, Olsen Y, Mitchell R P, Davis A, Rowland S J, John A W G, Mcgonigle D, Russell
643 A E (2004). Lost at Sea: Where Is All the Plastic? Science, 304(5672): 838-838
644 Usgs (2019). Emerging Contaminants
645 Van Wezel A, Caris I, Kools S a E (2016). Release of primary microplastics from consumer
646 products to wastewater in the Netherlands. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 35(7):
647 1627-1631
648 Wang C, Zhao J, Xing B (2021a). Environmental source, fate, and toxicity of microplastics.
649 Journal of Hazardous Materials, 407: 124357
650 Wang H, Wei H (2022). Controlled citrate oxidation on gold nanoparticle surfaces for improved
651 surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopic analysis of low-affinity organic micropollutants.
652 Langmuir, 38(16): 4958-4968
653 Wang K, Sun D-W, Pu H, Wei Q (2021b). Polymer multilayers enabled stable and flexible
654 Au@Ag nanoparticle array for nondestructive SERS detection of pesticide residues. Talanta, 223:
655 121782
656 Wang Q, Liu Y, Bai Y, Yao S, Wei Z, Zhang M, Wang L, Wang L (2019). Superhydrophobic
657 SERS substrates based on silver dendrite-decorated filter paper for trace detection of nitenpyram.
658 Analytica chimica acta, 1049: 170-178
659 Wang R, Chon H, Lee S, Cheng Z, Hong S H, Yoon Y H, Choo J (2016). Highly sensitive detection
660 of hormone estradiol E2 using surface-enhanced Raman scattering based immunoassays for the
661 clinical diagnosis of precocious puberty. ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces, 8(17): 10665-10672

662 Wee S Y, Aris A Z (2017). Endocrine disrupting compounds in drinking water supply system and
663 human health risk implication. Environment international, 106: 207-233
664 Wei H, Cho S W (2021). Emerging Nanotechnologies for Water Treatment, 30-47
665 Wei H, Cho S W (2022). Emerging Nanotechnologies for Water Treatment: The Royal Society of
666 Chemistry, 30-47
667 Wei H, Leng W, Song J, Willner M R, Marr L C, Zhou W, Vikesland P J (2018a). Improved
668 quantitative SERS enabled by surface plasmon enhanced elastic light scattering. Analytical
669 chemistry, 90(5): 3227-3237
670 Wei H, Vejerano E P, Leng W, Huang Q, Willner M R, Marr L C, Vikesland P J (2018b). Aerosol
671 microdroplets exhibit a stable pH gradient. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 115(28): 7272-7277
672 Wei H, Vikesland P J (2015). pH-triggered molecular alignment for reproducible SERS detection
673 via an AuNP/nanocellulose platform. Scientific reports, 5(1): 1-10
674 Wood T J, Goulson D (2017). The environmental risks of neonicotinoid pesticides: a review of the
675 evidence post 2013. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 24(21): 17285-17325
676 Xu D, Su W, Lu H, Luo Y, Yi T, Wu J, Wu H, Yin C, Chen B (2022). A gold nanoparticle doped
677 flexible substrate for microplastics SERS detection. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 24(19):
678 12036-12042
679 Xu G, Cheng H, Jones R, Feng Y, Gong K, Li K, Fang X, Tahir M A, Valev V K, Zhang L (2020).
680 Surface-Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy Facilitates the Detection of Microplastics <1 μm in the
681 Environment. Environmental Science & Technology, 54(24): 15594-15603
682 Yang Q, Zhang S, Su J, Li S, Lv X, Chen J, Lai Y, Zhan J (2022). Identification of Trace
683 Polystyrene Nanoplastics Down to 50 nm by the Hyphenated Method of Filtration and Surface-

684 Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy Based on Silver Nanowire Membranes. Environmental Science &
685 Technology, 56(15): 10818-10828
686 Yang Y, Creedon N, O'riordan A, Lovera P (2021). Surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy:
687 Applications in agriculture and food safety. Photonics, 8(12)
688 Yaseen T, Pu H, Sun D-W (2018). Functionalization techniques for improving SERS substrates
689 and their applications in food safety evaluation: A review of recent research trends. Trends in Food
690 Science & Technology, 72: 162-174
691 Yin R, Ge H, Chen H, Du J, Sun Z, Tan H, Wang S (2021). Sensitive and rapid detection of trace
692 microplastics concentrated through Au-nanoparticle-decorated sponge on the basis of surface-
693 enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Environmental Advances, 5: 100096
694 Zavaleta C L, Smith B R, Walton I, Doering W, Davis G, Shojaei B, Natan M J, Gambhir S S
695 (2009). Multiplexed imaging of surface enhanced Raman scattering nanotags in living mice using
696 noninvasive Raman spectroscopy. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106(32):
697 13511-13516
698 Zhao J, Hinton P, Chen J, Jiang J (2020a). Causal inference for the effect of environmental
699 chemicals on chronic kidney disease. Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal, 18:
700 93-99
701 Zhao P, Liu H, Zhang L, Zhu P, Ge S, Yu J (2020b). Paper-based SERS sensing platform based
702 on 3D silver dendrites and molecularly imprinted identifier sandwich hybrid for neonicotinoid
703 quantification. ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces, 12(7): 8845-8854
704 Zhou X-X, Liu R, Hao L-T, Liu J-F (2021). Identification of polystyrene nanoplastics using
705 surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy. Talanta, 221: 121552

706 Zhou X, Hu Z, Yang D, Xie S, Jiang Z, Niessner R, Haisch C, Zhou H, Sun P (2020). Bacteria
707 detection: From powerful SERS to Its advanced compatible techniques. Advanced Science, 7(23):
708 2001739

709