Published in final edited form as:

Chemosphere. 2013 August ; 92(8): 905–910. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.02.051.

Cyclic siloxanes in air, including identification of high levels in Chicago and distinct diurnal variation

Rachel A. Yucuis^a, Charles O. Stanier^b, and Keri C. Hornbuckle^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Civil & Environmental Engineering, IIHR–Hydroscience and Engineering, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA

^bDepartment of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, IIHR Hydroscience and Engineering, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA

Abstract

The organosilicon compounds octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4), decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D5), and dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane (D6) are high production volume chemicals that are widely used in household goods and personal care products. Due to their prevalence and chemical characteristics, cyclic siloxanes are being assessed as possible persistent organic pollutants. D4, D5, and D6 were measured in indoor and outdoor air to quantify and compare siloxane concentrations and compound ratios depending on location type. Indoor air samples had a median concentration of 2200 ng m⁻³ for the sum of D4, D5, and D6. Outdoor sampling locations included downtown Chicago, Cedar Rapids, IA, and West Branch, IA, and had median sum siloxane levels of 280, 73, and 29 ng m⁻³ respectively. A diurnal trend is apparent in the samples taken in downtown Chicago. Nighttime samples had a median 2.7 times higher on average than daytime samples, which is due, in part, to the fluctuations of the planetary boundary layer. D5 was the dominant siloxane in both indoor and outdoor air. Ratios of D5 to D4 averaged 91 and 3.2 for indoor and outdoor air respectively.

Keywords

Cyclic siloxane; Personal care products; D4, D5 and D6; Indoor air; Chicago

1. Introduction

Siloxanes are anthropogenic chemicals used in personal care and household products, and in the production of the silicon polymer polydimethylsiloxane (Hori and Kannan, 2008). Siloxanes in cyclic, linear, and/or polymer forms are used in an extremely wide range of applications. They are commonly found in antifoaming agents, in automotive care products, as coatings and sealants in construction, and as main ingredients in personal care products (Kaj et al., 2005). The cyclic siloxane compounds (commercial name cyclomethicone) are valued as solvents or carriers in personal care products because of their inert, odorless, and colorless qualities in addition to their volatility and smooth feel. In a recent survey of siloxanes in personal care and household products octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4), decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D5), and dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane (D6) were found in more than 50% of the items analyzed (Hori and Kannan, 2008). In a similar study that measured siloxane levels in personal care products only, cyclic siloxanes made up as much

as 68% of the total product mass (Wang et al., 2009). D4, D5, and D6 are categorized as high production volume chemicals (greater than 1 million pounds produced or imported annually in the U.S.) (Canada, 2008a,b,c).

Cyclic siloxanes are of concern because of their high rate of use and their physical properties (Howard and Muir, 2010). They are extremely volatile, have a relatively long half-life in air (6–11 d), and a high K_{ow} (Kaj et al., 2005). Accordingly, D4, D5, and D6 were recently identified as substances requiring further study because of their potential for long range transport and bioaccumulation (Howard and Muir, 2010). Environmental risk assessments have been conducted for cyclic siloxanes in Canada (Canada, 2008a,b,c), the UK (Brooke et al., 2009a,b), Sweden (Kaj et al., 2004), and for a consortium of Nordic countries (Kaj et al., 2005). The assessment of siloxanes in the Nordic environment focused on measurements of siloxane concentrations in a number of different media. Siloxanes were found to be ubiquitous in the environment, with measurable amounts in nearly all media analyzed, including air, water, sediment, sludge, and biota, with D5 found predominantly (Kaj et al., 2005). The screening assessment conducted by Environment Canada did not include environmental concentrations, but based on fugacity modeling and a review of studies relating to environmental toxicology, they concluded that D4 and D5 are "...entering or may be entering the environment in a quantity or concentration or under conditions that have or may have an immediate or long-term harmful effect on the environment or its biological diversity" (Canada, 2008a,c). Furthermore, D4 was recently included in a list of 18 chemicals to be reviewed by the U.S. EPA in 2013 and 2014 (C and EN, 2012). The evaluation will determine whether or not the compound should be regulated under the Toxic Substances Control Act (C and EN, 2012).

If regulation is to be considered, then it is important to learn more about the sources and distribution of siloxanes in the environment. Publications of indoor air measurements which could aid in source identification are especially lacking. Currently, one indoor (Shields et al., 1996) and six outdoor air studies have been published (Wang et al., 2001; Kierkegaard and McLachlan, 2010; McLachlan et al., 2010; Cheng et al., 2011; Genualdi et al., 2011; Krogseth et al., 2012). Several studies have been conducted that have modeled concentration distributions of one or more of the cyclic siloxanes (Mueller et al., 1995; McLachlan et al., 2010; Navea et al., 2011). However, increased monitoring is necessary in order to more accurately assess the influence siloxanes may have on humans and the environment. This is especially key in areas of high population density (i.e. Chicago) where emissions of anthropogenic compounds are much higher, and therefore the probable impact on the local population and environment will be correspondingly high (i.e. Lake Michigan). The purpose of this work is to measure and compare concentrations of D4, D5, and D6 in outdoor air in areas with varying population densities, as well as determine indoor concentrations and provide an estimate for per-person emissions of cyclic siloxanes. Concentrations, emissions, and compound ratios will be contextualized through a discussion of current modeling and measurement data for siloxanes in air.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials

Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane, decamethylcyclopentasiloxane, and dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane (>98%) were purchased from TCI America Portland, OR. Tetrakis(trimethylsiloxy)silane was purchased from Gelest Inc. in Morrisville, PA. Solvents dichloromethane, methanol, acetone, and n-hexane (all pesticide grade) were purchased from Fischer Scientific Pittsburgh, PA. 10 mg Isolute ENV+ cartridges (Biotage AB) were employed for all samples.

2.2. Sampling locations

Indoor samples were collected in the Seamans Center for the Engineering Arts and Sciences at the University of Iowa: ten samples in one laboratory, one in a student office (Office A), and three in a second office (Office B). Both offices are used during regular daytime work hours (between 9 am and 5 pm) by up to ten people. The laboratory has between one and seven occupants during daytime hours. Eight of the samples ran overnight and five samples ran during the day. The laboratory ventilation flow rate varies between 775 and 2270 cubic feet per minute depending on laboratory hood use and heating or cooling requirements. Additional details can be found in the Supplemental information.

Two outdoor locations in Iowa were chosen as representative of medium and low population density sites. The rural site is approximately three miles north of West Branch, IA (population 2400) at the base of a NOAA tall tower for carbon cycle gas sampling (Andrews et al., 2013). The mid-sized city selected for the transition site was Cedar Rapids, IA (population 122000) at the Linn County Public Health Department's air quality monitoring station. The urban samples were taken at the EPA's Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IADN) site at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) campus in Chicago.

2.3. Sampling and extraction method

Air sampling was conducted by drawing air through an extraction cartridge using a diaphragm pump (GAST MAA-V109-HD) connected with polyethylene tubing (Watts 1/4" OD, .170" ID) (Kierkegaard and McLachlan, 2010). Two lines were used in order to have duplicates for each sampling period, and the flow rates for each line were measured separately. Flow rates varied from 3 to 6 liters per minute and were measured with Toptrak mass flow meters (822-2-OV1-V1 and 822-2-OV1-PV1-V1). One flow meter did not include a volume totalizer, so flow rate and time were recorded with a USB data logger from Lascar Electronics (EL-USB-3). The SPE cartridges were installed with the open side down and were shielded from the elements with funnel attachments. Sampling times varied depending on the concentration ranges expected at each site. Indoor samples and samples taken at IIT were run for 12–16 h. Cedar Rapids samples were collected over 24 h and West Branch about 36 h in order to ensure that detectable masses accumulated. After sampling, the cartridges were wrapped in aluminum foil and stored in glass amber jars in a cooler or freezer until extracted. The extraction process involved running approximately 1.5 mL of n-hexane through the SPE cartridge directly into a GC vial. Internal standard tetrakis trimethyl-siloxysilane (M4Q, 100 ng) was then added to each vial.

2.4. Instrumental analysis

The samples were analyzed on a Hewlett Packard gas chromatograph mass spectrometer (HP 5973) in select ion monitoring mode. The column used was a Restek RTX-5MS. The injector temperature was 200 °C. Injection volume was 2 µL. The flow rate of helium gas was held at 1.0 mL/min. The temperature gradient was: 60 °C (2 min), to 150 °C at 10 °C/min, to 300 °C at 30 °C/min (2 min), with a detector temperature of 250 °C. The ions monitored were m/z 281 (D4 and M4Q), 355 (D5), and 341 (D6). The samples were quantified by the internal standard method. A 500 ng/mL standard containing D4, D5, D6, and M4Q was used to calculate the relative response factors for each run.

2.5. Quality assurance/quality control

All glassware was combusted overnight at 450 °C before use. Temperature-sensitive sampling components were triple-rinsed with pesticide grade methanol, hexane, and acetone. SPE cartridge cleaning practices entailed soaking the cartridges overnight in n-hexane followed by a run-through three times with dichloromethane and three times with n-hexane

before drying with a nitrogen stream. Cartridges were then wrapped in aluminum foil and frozen. Use of siloxane-containing products was avoided on days when lab or field work was conducted.

Cartridge performance was measured by sampling through two cartridges in series. Less than 1% of each D4, D5, and D6 was found on the second cartridge. Extraction efficiency was evaluated by spiking the top frit of a cartridge. Average recoveries were 99, 114, and 110 percent for D4, D5, and D6, respectively.

Field blanks and duplicates were included with all the samples except for the five indoor air samples taken in 2011 (Lab1–Lab4 and Office A). All outdoor air samples and the remaining indoor air samples had a field blank attached to a capped length of tubing installed alongside the sample cartridges for the duration of each sampling period. The overall average field blank mass for indoor and outdoor air was 3.2, 10, and 12 ng per cartridge for D4, D5, and D6 respectively. A field blank concentration was determined by dividing the mass of the field blanks for each site by the average volume sampled at each site. The average sampling volumes were 9.4, 7.1, 3.2, and 2.7 m³ for West Branch, Cedar Rapids, Chicago, and indoors respectively. A specific limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ) was then calculated for each combination of site and compound. The LOD was determined by the average of the field blank concentration plus three times the standard deviation, and the LOQ is the average plus ten times the standard deviation. Duplicate samples exhibit an average relative percent difference of 13% for 34 sample pairs. The results were not blank corrected.

We found little evidence of decay or loss during storage. Krogseth et al. (2012) reported that D5 may convert to D4 within the cartridge during storage. We found that D4 concentrations were positively correlated with storage time ($p = .023$), but that D5 concentrations were not. There was no correlation between storage time and the ratio of D5/D4. Therefore, no corrections were made for storage, although we recognize that some D4 may be present due to transformation after sampling.

2.6. Boundary layer height

The atmospheric boundary height during each of the Chicago sampling periods were retrieved from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) archived meteorological simulations for the latitude and longitude of the Illinois Institute of Technology (41°50'4.10" N; 87°37'25.59" W). The North American Mesoscale (NAM) model 12 km Forecast Data Archive product (boundary layer depth variable) was used and was accessed at <http://ready.arl.noaa.gov/READYamet.php>. This product has 3 h time resolution. To produce an average height during a sampling period, the heights were linearly interpolated to a 15 min time basis, and then averaged. Since the conceptual model we are working with is that emissions are diluted throughout and well-mixed within the boundary layer, we utilize an inverse weighted mean boundary layer height $\overline{h^I} = \Delta t [\int h(t)^{-1} dt]^{-1}$ which has the useful property that $\overline{h^I} \overline{C} = \overline{h(t) \cdot c(t)}$ under the assumption of a constant loading of pollutant under the boundary layer. In these formulas $h(t)$ is the time varying boundary layer height, Δt is the sampling interval, $c(t)$ is the time varying concentration, and $\overline{c}$ is the time averaged sample concentration measured in this work. $\overline{h^I}$ is lower than the arithmetic mean boundary layer height.

As an example, if the boundary layer height was 100 m for 1 h and 1000 m for 1 h, the simple arithmetic mean boundary layer height would be 550 m while $\overline{h^I}$ would be 182 m. A well-mixed pollutant with loading within the boundary layer of 1000 mg m⁻² would have concentration 10mg m⁻³ during the first hour and 1 mg m⁻³ during the second hour, and $\overline{c}$ of

5.5 mg m⁻³. The column loading of 1000 mg m⁻² can be recovered by 5.5 mg m⁻³ times $\overline{h}t$ but would be overestimated by multiplying $\overline{c}$ by the arithmetic mean boundary layer height. This is of course an extremely simplified model of the boundary layer processes, but it is suitable for the purposes of this paper, which are to contrast daytime and nighttime concentration measurements with an adjustment for the effect of the changes in boundary layer height.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Indoor air concentrations

Indoor concentrations of individual cyclic siloxanes ranged from not detected (D6), to as much as 56000 ng m⁻³ for D5 (Table 1). High indoor air concentrations were expected because of the prevalence of siloxane-containing products and their subsequent accumulation in small indoor areas. Concentrations of D4 and D5 have been shown previously to be reflective of occupant density (Shields et al., 1996). The influence of occupancy is best illustrated by the variation in D5 concentrations depending on the time of day the sample was taken (Fig. 1).

D5 is the dominant cyclic siloxane in indoor air, accounting for an average of 97% of the mass found in the fourteen samples. Interestingly, the only previous study of indoor air (conducted in 1991) reported levels of D4 that were on the same order of magnitude as D5 (Shields et al., 1996). This difference from our study may be a reflection of formulation changes in personal care products over the last 20 years. Two recent studies of cyclic and linear siloxanes in common products report that D5 was the largest contributor to siloxane mass in the personal care items surveyed (Horii and Kannan, 2008; Wang et al., 2009). Based on product use profiles for women in the U.S., and the concentrations measured, Horii and Kannan estimated that the average use rate of D5 is 233 mg (person-day)⁻¹ (2008). Wang et al. estimated a D5 exposure of 306 mg (person-day)⁻¹ from body lotion alone also using data for use rates of lotion for women in U.S. (2009).

3.2. Outdoor air concentrations

For outdoor air, the median concentrations of the cyclic siloxanes increased with population density (Table 2). The lowest concentrations were found in West Branch, IA with a median of 29 ng m⁻³. Siloxane levels were slightly higher in Cedar Rapids at 73 ng m⁻³, and the IIT concentrations were 280 ng m⁻³. Average sum concentrations were significantly different in Chicago compared to both Cedar Rapids and West Branch (*p*-value = .005 and .012), with the Chicago median 4 and 10 times greater than Cedar Rapids and West Branch respectively.

A diurnal trend is apparent in the samples collected at the IIT site in Chicago. The samples were collected over consecutive 12-h periods with cartridges exchanged at approximately 7 am and 7 pm daily. The trend is most clearly illustrated by the fluctuations in the compound with the highest concentrations, D5 (Fig. 2). D5 concentrations were significantly different during the day versus the night (*p* = .0014) with a median concentration of 138 ng m⁻³ in the daytime, and 338 ng m⁻³ at night. D4 day and nighttime concentrations were also significantly different (*p* = .024), and the D6 concentrations were generally above the LOQ during the day, and below the LOD at night. This is contrary to what we would expect if the majority of the siloxane concentration comes from volatilization during morning or daytime personal care product use. The major degradation pathway for siloxanes is by hydroxyl radical (OH) attack, and concentrations of OH are higher in the presence of sunlight, which could explain, in part, the diurnal variation (Navea et al., 2011). However, the predicted magnitude of the OH effect is small, ±10% of the mean concentration.

We investigated the effect of the variation in the average planetary boundary layer height on the day and nighttime concentrations with a regression analysis. D5 concentration was found to be significantly correlated with boundary layer height ($p = .003$, $R^2 = 0.49$). D4 concentrations were not significantly correlated with the height of the boundary layer, and the correlation of D6 concentrations with boundary layer height were not analyzed because of the number of samples that were below the LOQ. This analysis included all samples except for IIT6. No obvious explanation is apparent for the high concentrations found in sample 6, as the NAM boundary layer height was not particularly low for that nighttime sampling period, nor was any unusual activity observed that could have caused a spike in siloxane concentration. Nevertheless, sample 6 is an outlier, with a standardized residual of 3.52 so was removed from the data set for the analysis.

A rough estimate of column abundance in the mixed layer was calculated by multiplying the sample concentrations by the boundary layer heights with the temporal averaging of boundary layer heights as described above. The daytime column abundances of D4 and D5 are higher than their nighttime abundances, with day/night ratios of 1.9 and 1.4, respectively. But the differences are not consistent enough to be statistically significant given the small sample size. Our interpretation of this is that emissions occur throughout both the day and nighttime sampling periods; that the relative day and night emission rates remain uncertain; and that there is inconclusive evidence that daytime emission rates are larger than nighttime emissions.

3.3. Emissions from indoor air

Emissions were calculated using the data from the laboratory because sufficient information about the ventilation systems for Office B was not available. The laboratory however, is ventilated directly from an HVAC system that receives 100% outside air. Per-person mass emission rates are therefore given by

$$E = (C_{\text{indoor}} - C_{\text{outdoor}}) * \frac{Q}{n} \quad (1)$$

where E is the emission rate per person-day, Q is the volumetric flow rate of the ventilation system, and n is the number of occupants of the lab. Building design data constrain Q to between 775 and 2270 cubic feet per minute depending on laboratory hood use and heating or cooling requirements, and n ranges from 1 to 7 people. The flow rate and number of people, while not known exactly during the sampling periods, are varied across these bounds to give minimum and maximum values for E . As we do not have simultaneous measurement of C_{indoor} and C_{outdoor} , we approximate the C_{outdoor} by the indoor nighttime concentration, when the room is not occupied and the indoor and outdoor concentrations should be equal.

Per-person emissions were calculated using Eq. (1) and the average day and nighttime concentrations found in the laboratory air. The minimum emission rate, using seven people and a flow rate of $22 \text{ m}^3 \text{ min}^{-1}$ for D4 and D5 is 0.0090 and $29 \text{ mg (person-day)}^{-1}$ respectively. The maximum emissions rate (1 person and $64 \text{ m}^3 \text{ min}^{-1}$) is 0.027 and $590 \text{ mg (person-day)}^{-1}$ for D4 and D5. Because the sample involved a small n , it is not meant to be representative of population averaged emission rates. However, due to the potential for wider applicability of the method (using indoor air mass balance approaches to estimate emission rates) and the scarcity of per capita emission data, we report and compare the values here. The measured D5 emission rate ($590 \text{ mg (person-day)}^{-1}$) is within a factor of 3 of the value found by Horii and Kannan (230) and larger than the value used in modeling by Navea et al. (140). This seems consistent with the higher outdoor measured concentrations ($18\text{--}210 \text{ ng m}^{-3}$) in this study when compared with the modeled concentrations by Navea et al. ($3\text{--}45 \text{ ng m}^{-3}$) – which will be discussed further in Section 3.4.

For D4, the conclusions to draw from comparison of this work with Horii and Kannan and Navea et al. are perhaps more intriguing and worthy of future research. Both the mass emission rate from this work ($<0.027 \text{ mg (person-day)}^{-1}$) and the value reported by Horii and Kannan based on personal care product usage ($1.1 \text{ mg(person-day)}^{-1}$) are much lower than the value used by Navea et al. in modeling ($90 \text{ mg (person-day)}^{-1}$). However, as discussed in the section below, the Navea et al. D4 emission rate better explains observed atmospheric measurements.

3.4. Comparison of measured and modeled concentrations and D5/D4 ratios

The D4 concentrations found in our study and a measurement study by Genauldi et al. fall within a factor of two when compared to Navea et al.'s predictions in high and medium population density locations (Table 3). On the other hand, the measured concentrations of D5 in this work are five to ten times higher than those predicted by Navea et al. As the ambient measurements are the strongest constraint on emissions, this suggests that the per person emission rate of D4 reported in this work and the emission rate of Horii and Kannan are not representative of the average per capita emission rate from all sources. This further suggests that the emission rates measured in this work and the per-person per-day usage estimates (from personal care products) of Horii and Kannan for D5 are likely more accurate than the $140 \text{ mg (person-day)}^{-1}$ value used in the Navea simulations.

It is interesting to note the variations in the measured and modeled D5/D4 ratio between the urban, suburban, and rural locations. The measured average ratio is 4.5, 3.1, and 2.1 for Chicago, Cedar Rapids, and West Branch respectively. Half-lives of D4 and D5 with respect to atmospheric oxidation are (under average conditions) 11 and 7 d, respectively. Because of this, D5/D4 ratios will be highest at the points of common emission of the two chemicals, and will decrease as air masses move away from source regions and undergo oxidative aging. Evidence of this phenomenon is apparent in the measured data, although the difference is statistically significant only between West Branch and Chicago ($p\text{-value} = .002$). This is also predicted in the Navea model, although with much smaller variation than that measured in this study. The modeling assumption in Navea et al. – that the majority of airflow was coming from a remote background- is likely not correct for the Midwestern United States. Future work utilizing 3D chemical transport modeling of D4 and D5, and comparison to other similar “chemical clock” ratios such as the benzene to toluene ratio (Warneke et al., 2007), could be used to explore and exploit geographic patterns in siloxane ratios.

4. Conclusions

In this study we found that cyclic siloxane concentrations in outdoor air to be in the ng m^{-3} range and to vary diurnally. Concentrations in the indoor environments reached into the $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ range, demonstrating that emissions from indoor air can be a significant contributor to outdoor air concentrations. The dominance of D5 mass (which is especially notable in indoor air) indicates that personal care product use is one of the primary sources of cyclic siloxanes to the environment. Comparisons between this study and others support the conclusion that the major aspects of degradation and transport of siloxanes in air are well understood. However, significant sources of uncertainty remain in the magnitudes, diurnal pattern, and compound ratios in emissions estimates, which is an area for further study.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Professor Ronald A. Hites at Indiana University and IADN for support for sampling assistance at the IIT site in Chicago; Chandler Minner and Professor Kate Cowles at the University of Iowa for statistical support; Nate Janecek for help with the boundary layer height determinations; and the Iowa Superfund Basic Research Program (NIEHS, P42ES013661) for laboratory support. Funding was provided by the EPA GLNPO, Todd Nettesheim Project Manager (GL-00E00515-0) and The University of Iowa Center for Health Effects of Environmental Contamination (CHEEC).

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.02.051>.

References

- Andrews AE, Kofler JD, Trudeau ME, Williams JC, Neff DH, Masarie KA, Chao DY, Kitzis DR, Novelli PC, Zhao CL, Dlugokencky EJ, Lang PM, Crotwell MJ, Fischer ML, Parker MJ, Lee JT, Baumann DD, Desai AR, Stanier CO, de Wekker SFJ, Wolfe DE, Munger JW, Tans PP. CO₂, CO and CH₄ measurements from the NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory's Tall Tower Greenhouse Gas Observing Network: instrumentation, uncertainty analysis and recommendations for future high-accuracy greenhouse gas monitoring efforts. *Atmos Meas Tech*. 2013; 6:1461–1553.
- Brooke, D.; Crookes, M.; Gray, D.; Robertson, S. Environmental Risk Assessment Report: Decamethylcyclotetrasiloxane. The Environment Agency, Environment Agency; Bristol, UK: 2009a.
- Brooke, D.; Crookes, M.; Gray, D.; Robertson, S. Environmental Risk Assessment Report: Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane. The Environment Agency, Environment Agency; Bristol, UK: 2009b.
- C&EN. Chemical & Engineering News. The American Chemical Society; 2012. EPA Targets 18 chemicals for review; p. 30
- Canada. Screening assessment for the challenge decamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D5). Environment Canada Health Canada; 2008a.
- Canada. Screening assessment for the challenge dodecamethylcyclohexasiloxane (D6). Environment Canada Health Canada; 2008b.
- Canada. Screening assessment for the challenge octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4). Environment Canada Health Canada; 2008c.
- Cheng Y, Shoeib M, Ahrens L, Harner T, Ma JM. Wastewater treatment plants and landfills emit volatile methyl siloxanes (VMSs) to the atmosphere: Investigations using a new passive air sampler. *Environ Pollut*. 2011; 159:2380–2386. [PubMed: 21784566]
- Genualdi S, Harner T, Cheng Y, MacLeod M, Hansen KM, van Egmond R, Shoeib M, Lee SC. Global distribution of linear and cyclic volatile methyl siloxanes in air. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2011; 45:3349–3354. [PubMed: 21438524]
- Horii Y, Kannan K. Survey of organosilicone compounds, including cyclic and linear siloxanes, in personal-care and household products. *Arch Environ Con Tox*. 2008; 55:701–710.
- Howard PH, Muir DCG. Identifying new persistent and bioaccumulative organics among chemicals in commerce. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2010; 44:2277–2285. [PubMed: 20163179]
- Kaj, L.; Andersson, J.; Cousins, A.; Remberger, M.; Brorstrom-Lunden, E.; Cato, I. Subreport 4: Siloxanes. IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute; Stockholm, Sweden: 2004. Results from the Swedish National Screening Programme.
- Kaj, L.; Schlabach, M.; Andersson, J.; Cousins, A.; Schmidbauer, N.; Brorstrom-Lunden, E. Siloxanes in the Nordic Environment. TemaNord, Nordic Council of Ministers; Copenhagen: 2005.
- Kierkegaard A, McLachlan MS. Determination of decamethylcyclotetrasiloxane in air using commercial solid phase extraction cartridges. *J Chromatogr A*. 2010; 1217:3557–3560. [PubMed: 20399438]

- Krogseth IS, Kierkegaard A, McLachlan MS, Breivik K, Hansen KM, Sclabach M. Occurrence and seasonality of cyclic volatile methyl siloxanes in arctic air. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2012;502–509. [PubMed: 23194257]
- McLachlan MS, Kierkegaard A, Hansen KM, van Egmond R, Christensen JH, Skjoth CA. Concentrations and fate of decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D(5)) in the atmosphere. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2010; 44:5365–5370. [PubMed: 20568739]
- Mueller JA, Ditoro DM, Maiello JA. Fate of octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (Omcts) in the atmosphere and in sewage-treatment plants as an estimation of aquatic exposure. *Environ Toxicol Chem*. 1995; 14:1657–1666.
- Navea JG, Young MA, Xu SH, Grassian VH, Stanier CO. The atmospheric lifetimes and concentrations of cyclic methylsiloxanes octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D(4)) and decamethylcyclopentasiloxane (D(5)) and the influence of heterogeneous uptake. *Atmos Environ*. 2011; 45:3181–3191.
- Shields HC, Fleischer DM, Weschler CJ. Comparisons among VOCs measured in three types of US commercial buildings with different occupant densities. *Indoor Air*. 1996; 6:2–17.
- Wang XM, Lee SC, Sheng GY, Chan LY, Fu JM, Li XD, Min YS, Chan CY. Cyclic organosilicon compounds in ambient air in Guangzhou, Macau and Nanhai, Pearl River Delta. *Appl Geochem*. 2001; 16:1447–1454.
- Wang R, Moody RP, Koniecki D, Zhu JP. Low molecular weight cyclic volatile methylsiloxanes in cosmetic products sold in Canada: implication for dermal exposure. *Environ Int*. 2009; 35:900–904. [PubMed: 19361861]
- Warneke C, McKeen SA, de Gouw JA, Goldan PD, Kuster WC, Holloway JS, Williams EJ, Lerner BM, Parrish DD, Trainer M, Fehsenfeld FC, Kato S, Atlas EL, Baker A, Blake DR. Determination of urban volatile organic compound emission ratios and comparison with an emissions database. *J Geophys Res-Atmos*. 2007; 112

HIGHLIGHTS

- Indoor and outdoor air concentrations of cyclic siloxanes were measured in rural, urban and indoor air.
- D5 was the dominant siloxane detected in indoor and outdoor air.
- A diurnal trend in siloxane concentrations in Chicago was identified.
- Concentrations of cyclic siloxanes are higher during night hours than in day in urban air.
- The relative magnitudes of D4, D5, and D6 differ between indoor and outdoor air.

Fig. 1. Indoor air concentrations of D5. Primary (P) and duplicate (D) concentrations are provided where available.

Fig. 2. Outdoor air concentrations for D5 at IIT in Chicago, IL along with average boundary layer heights for the corresponding sampling period. IIT1 was started on a Saturday morning, and all additional samples were taken at subsequent 12 h increments. Primary (P) and duplicate (D) concentrations are provided.

Table 1

Indoor air concentrations for D4, D5, and D6, and D5/D4 ratios.

	<u>Concentration (ng m⁻³)</u>			D5/D4
	D4	D5	D6	
Lab1	46	1300	<59	27
Lab2	51	1700	<59	33
Lab3	57	970	<59	17
Lab4	63	1900	<59	30
Office A	73	2300	<59	31
Lab5	23	8100	70	350
Lab6	47	970	<59	21
Lab7	58	14000	200	240
Lab8	31	1100	<59	36
Lab9	75	39000	220	520
Lab10	27	1000	nd	38
OfficeB1	340	53000	1600	160
OfficeB2	260	7600	314	29
OfficeB3	500	56000	2800	110

Table 2

Outdoor air concentrations for D4, D5, and D6, and D5/D4 ratios.

	<u>Concentration (ng m⁻³)</u>			D5/D4
	D4	D5	D6	
WB1	9.7	28	1.8	2.9
WB2	8.1	18	<1.4	2.2
WB3	14	17	2.2	1.2
WB4	12	29	2.3	2.4
WB5	5.6	10	<1.4	1.7
CR1	16	52	9.3	3.2
CR2	5.1	22	4.0	4.3
CR3	16	52	5.6	3.1
CR4	37	65	3.3	1.7
IIT1	45	190	8.7	4.1
IIT2	53	200	9.4	3.8
IIT3	23	100	<8.5	4.5
IIT4	72	400	21	5.5
IIT5	95	170	<8.5	1.8
IIT6	190	1100	50	5.8
IIT7	64	230	<8.5	3.5
IIT8	52	390	14	7.6
IIT9	51	130	<8.5	2.7
IIT10	57	310	13	5.4
IIT11	18	110	<8.5	6.0
IIT12	120	320	12	2.7
IIT13	44	140	nd	3.2
IIT14	55	320	15	5.9
IIT15	25	120	<8.5	4.9
IIT16	66	360	18	5.4

Results from a modeling study conducted by Navea et al. that reported modeled outdoor air concentrations for D4 and D5 in urban, suburban, and rural locations for July in the U.S., compared to the measured D4 and D5 concentrations from this study and the study by Genualdi et al.

Table 3

Reference	D4 (standard error) ng m ⁻³			D5 (standard error) ng m ⁻³		
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural
This study	54 (43)	17 (14)	9.7 (3.3)	210 (250)	52 (18)	18 (8.2)
Navea	30	16	2.4	45	22	3.0
Genualdi	18 (22)	N/A	13 (15)	130 (103)	N/A	4.6 (4.1)