# MOLEKUL

www.jmolekul.com

https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jm.2021.16.2.727

# Chemical Sensor for Detection of Lead Levels in Herbal Medicine

Ani Mulyasuryani\*, Yuniar Ponco Prananto, Elvian Eka Krisnaniningrum

Department of Chemistry, Brawijaya University, Jl. Veteran 01, Malang, 65145, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author email: mulyasuryani@ub.ac.id

Received November 12, 2020; Accepted May 07, 2021; Available online July 20, 2021

**ABSTRACT.** A new tube type  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor made from two types of mixtures, namely clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub> and chitosan-Pbl<sub>2</sub> were prepared. An electromotive force (EMF) with Ag/AgCl as the reference electrode was used as the output signal. The highest performance of the  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor from clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub> was obtained at  $Pb^{2+}$  solutions in HNO<sub>3</sub> and pH 3 with sensor sensitivity of 20.67 mV/decade. The highest performance of the  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor from chitosan-Pbl<sub>2</sub> was obtained at  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor from chitosan-Pbl<sub>2</sub> was obtained at  $Pb^{2+}$  solutions in demineralized water with sensor sensitivity of 32.49 mV / decade. Application of the two sensors on several commercial herbal samples resulted in an average recovery of 85.62% and 94.10% for sensor from chitosan-Pbl<sub>2</sub> and clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub>, respectively.

**Keywords**: herbal medicine; Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor; chitosan; clay.

## INTRODUCTION

In accordance to the Indonesia Regulation of the Food and Drug Administration No. 32 of 2019, limit of lead metal contamination in herbal medicines is 10 ppm (BPOM RI, 2019). Lead poisoning can cause disturbances in children's intelligence, accumulation in bones, anaemia, blood, soft tissues (kidneys, bone marrow, liver, brain). Theses dangerous effects of lead contamination in the body is the reason for this study (Wai, Mar, Kosaka, & Watanabe, 2017; Rocha & Trujillo, 2019). Metal contamination has been found in many traditional medicines due to nonstandard process, unsafe storage and packaging conditions that may lead to poisoning. This high metal contamination can occur due to the environmental degradation on soil, water, and air. The presence of heavy metal contamination can cause health effects for humans depends on the metal-bound body parts. These heavy metals are indestructible and can enter the human body through food, drinking water, or air. Heavy metals that are toxic in the body will cause health issue, in some cases can cause death 2016). (Vorvolakos, Arseniou, & Samakouri, Therefore, it is very important to conduct the assessment of Pb levels in herbal medicines on the market.

Several studies have been carried out in the manufacture of electrochemical sensors for Pb<sup>2+</sup> detection (Bhat,Ijeri, & Srivastava., 2018; Kaur & Aulakh, 2016; Golc, Horvath, Huszthy and Toth 2018; Mausavi, et.al, 2018; Shojaei & Zanganeh, 2019). However, most of these studies used synthetic materials which are not easy to find and expensive. A chemical sensor prototype has been developed to detect Pb<sup>2+</sup> based on chitosan-PbS composites, in

which the sensor has a detection limit of 0.032 ppm in the linear concentration range of 0.032-0.332 ppm. (Novitasari, et al., 2016). In order to prepare an easyto-manufacture  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor and can be used repeatedly, it is necessary to modify the design and supporting materials.

Chitosan is a biopolymer that can be applied in various aspects of life because of its special chemical properties. Chitosan dissolves easily in an acidic solution of pH < 6.0, where the -NH<sub>2</sub> group will be protonated and forms  $-NH_3^+$  (pK<sub>a</sub> = 6.3) (Jiménez-Gómez & Cecilia, 2020). The amine group in chitosan is advantageous, because it is easily modified by a cross-linking reaction process, one of which is glutaraldehyde as an efficient crosslinking agent (Akakuru, et.al., 2017; Mulyasuryani, Haryanto, Sulistyarti, & Rumhayati, 2018; Nair, Best & Cameron, 2020). The cross-linked chitosan forms a hydrogel that can be used as a supporting membrane in the development of Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensors (Novitasari, et al., 2016). Meanwhile, clay is a mineral with the main content of  $SiO_2$  and  $Al_2O_3$ , in which the outer surface layer binds the Na^+, K^+ and NH\_4^+ ions (Yahaya, Jikan, Badarulzaman, & Adamu, 2017; Garcia-Valles, Alfonso, Martinez, & Roca, 2020). The cations in the outer layer cause the clay to act as a cation exchanger, thus it has a capacitor layer and is conductive (Fatnasi, Solterbeck, & Es-Souni, 2014). Based on such character, the conductive clay can be used as a modifier for carbon paste electrodes for the development of electrochemical sensors (Gómez, Fernandez, Borras, Mostany, & Scharifker, 2011; Akanji, Arotiba & Nkosi, 2019).

Furthermore,  $Pbl_2$  can be used as a recognition agent which has a solubility constant of 4.41 x  $10^{-9}$ .

The low solubility value causes the equilibrium reaction quickly take place and can react with very small concentrations of Pb<sup>2+</sup>. The change in concentration in the analyte solution causes a shift in the equilibrium which resulted in a potential difference which can be detected by a potentiometer (Mulyasuryani, 2011). In addition, the concentration of the recognition agent affects the equilibrium and ion density in the membrane, which resulted in ion diffusion power and measured cell potential value. The sensitivity of the electrodes is also affected by the pH of the solution, in which the pH of the solution (in this case is the H<sup>+</sup> ion activity) affects the Nernst value of the electrode (Novitasari, et. al., 2016; Chen, et. al., 2018). The quantitative relationship between the concentration and the signal is stated in the following equation:

# $E_{cell} = K - 0.0296 \log[Pb^{2+}]$

Note:  $E_{\mbox{\tiny cell}}$  is the reading signal (electromotive force, EMF) and K is the cell constant.

## EXPERIMENTAL SECTION Materials

Materials used in this research were lead(II) acetate (Sigma Aldrich), lead(II) iodide (Sigma), acetate buffer (PB) solution (pH 4; 0.01M), glutaraldehyde (Sigma Aldrich), acetic acid (Merck), chitosan and clay (local product), nitric acid (Merck), and herbal samples.

Instruments used in this research were mini tubes (5 mm OD, 50  $\mu$ L), mini Ag/AgCl reference electrode IPPG junction, 4.5mm OD, 52 $\mu$ L (Achema, RE-1S), 0.2 mm carbon electrode (local product), digital multimeter phorex MY-60 (local product), glassy

carbon electrode of 0.5 mm (Metrohm RDE.GC50) with electrode shaft, potentiostat galvanostat (Autolab PGSTAT204), pH meter Senz TI-13MO597, Yenaco YNC-OV oven 30L, shaker and general laboratory glassware.

## Membrane Preparation

Chitosan was firstly treated by mixing 0.4 g of chitosan with 3 mL of glacial acetic acid and 9 mL of distilled water, stirred for overnight. chitosan-Pbl<sub>2</sub> was prepared from 0.1 g of Pbl<sub>2</sub>, 2 mL of the chitosan, and 0.1% glutaraldehyde (**Table 1**). The mixture was stirred for 6 hours at room temperature, then a small amount of chitosan-Pbl<sub>2</sub> is attached to a small hole at the end of the mini tube (**Figure 1**).

The clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub> membrane was made from a mixture of clay and Pbl<sub>2</sub> with the mass ratio according to **Table 1**. The mixture was added with a few drops of distilled water (demineralized water) so that a thin plate can be formed. The thin plate was then attached to the bottom of the tube which has a small hole (**Figure 1**).

## Manufacture of Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensors

The Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor was made according to the design in **Figure 1**. The sensor body was made of a mini glass tube, in which the bottom of the tube was filled with a membrane material, and then it was dried at 60°C for 2 hours. The glass tube was filled with 200  $\mu$ L 1 M lead(II) acetate as an internal solution. The carbon rod was connected to the cable through the banana jack, then inserted into the tube that already contains the internal solution. Next, the banana jack was glued to the tube so that it was airtight.

Table 1. Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensors prepared in various membrane compositions and sample solutions

		Composition				
Sensor	Code Sensor	Pbl <sub>2</sub> (g)	Clay (g)	Chitosan (mL)	Glutaraldehyde (mL)	Solution *)
Ι	Clay_Pbl <sub>2</sub> _1	0.1	0.3	-	-	A, B, C
II	Clay_Pbl2_2	0.1	0.5	-	-	A, D
III	Chit_Pbl <sub>2</sub> _1	0.1	-	2	0.05	A, B, C
IV	Chit_Pbl <sub>2</sub> _2	0.1	-	2	0.50	A, D

\*) Solution A:  $Pb^{2+}$  in demineralized water; Solution B:  $Pb^{2+}$  in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 4; Solution C:  $Pb^{2+}$  in acetate buffer pH 4; Solution D:  $Pb^{2+}$  in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3.



Figure 1. Design of Pb2+ sensor

#### EMF measurement procedure

A series of  $Pb^{2+}$  solutions with a concentration range of  $10^{-8}$  to  $10^{-1}$  M was prepared. The  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor is connected to the negative pole (-) on the digital multimeter, and the positive pole (+) is connected to Ag / AgCl as a reference. Both were put in 5 mL of Pb<sup>2+</sup> solution, the EMF value was recorded after two minutes. The linear regression equation is generated from the relationship between log [Pb<sup>2+</sup>] and EMF. The sensor sensitivity is the slope of the linear regression equation. Measurement of the sample solution is carried out in the same way as above, where the sample is digested in HNO<sub>3</sub>.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION The Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor from Clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub>

As mentioned earlier in the research method, the Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor made of clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub> has two compositions, namely 3:1 and 5:1 in mass ratio of clay:Pbl<sub>2</sub>. Clay  $Pbl_2$  1 is a  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor of 3:1 ratio, the sensor measures Pb<sup>2+</sup> (A; B; C) solutions in a concentration range of 1  $\mu$ M - 0.1 M. The results are given in **Figure** 2. Based on Figure 2, the quantitative relationship between the concentration and the signal is generated in the range  $10^{-6}$  -  $10^{-3}$  M for solutions A and B, while for solution C, it is only 10<sup>-5</sup> to 10<sup>-4</sup> M. The sensitivity of Clay Pbl<sub>2</sub> 1 in each solution is shown in **Table 2**. Based on Table 2, Clay Pbl<sub>2</sub> 1 is more sensitive at solution A. Because the sensitivity of the Clay Pbl<sub>2</sub> 1 sensor in solution C give the lowest value, the clay Pbl<sub>2</sub> 2 sensor does not used to measure solution C. Not only due to its low sensitivity, the clay Pbl<sub>2</sub> 1 sensor was also easily damaged.

The Clay-Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor is a Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor with a mass ratio of 5:1 (clay: Pbl<sub>2</sub>). The sensor measures solutions A and D at concentrations of  $10^{-6}$  -  $10^{-3}$  M.

The experimental results are shown in **Figure 3**. Based on **Figure 3**, the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 is more sensitive to solution D because it is more acidic than solution A, hence the solubility equilibrium of Pbl<sub>2</sub> on the sensor will be easier. As presented in **Table 2**, the highest sensitivity is generated by the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor, with a sensitivity of 20.67 mV / decade to solution D, in which in theory, the divalent sensor will have a sensitivity of 29.89 mV / decade at 25°C. As of the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensitivity to solution D, it has value that closer to theoretical. Although the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor was used in a high acidity solution, the sensor is not easily damaged (more robust and does not leak) and produces a more stable signal.

## The Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor from Chit-Pbl<sub>2</sub>

The Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 and Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensors have a difference in the volume of glutaraldehyde added as crosslinking agent. On the Chit-Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 sensor, the glutaraldehyde 0.1% volume was 0.05 mL. The sensor was used to measure A, B, and C solutions with Pb<sup>2+</sup> concentrations of of 1  $\mu$ M – 0.1 M. The experimental results are shown in **Figure 4**. Sensitivity and concentration range are shown in **Table 3**. Based on **Figure 4**, the quantitative concentration range is the same as the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 sensor, however for Pb<sup>2+</sup> solution in demineralized water, the Chit-Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 sensor is considerably insensitive, this is very different to that of the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 sensor. Thus, adjusting the pH of the solution greatly affects the performance of the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 sensor.

The Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor from Chit-Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 is a sensor with a glutaraldehyde 0.1% volume of 0.5 mL. The sensor was used to measure the Pb<sup>2+</sup> in the A and D solutions at concentrations of 1  $\mu$ M - 0.1 M.



**Figure2**. Correlation curve between log  $[Pb^{2+}]$  versus EMF, Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 sensor measures  $Pb^{2+}$  solution in demineralized water (A); in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 4 (B); and in acetate buffer pH 4 (C).

**Table 2.** Sensitivity of the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 and Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensors. The sensors measure  $Pb^{2+}$  solution in demineralized water (A); in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 4 (B); in acetate buffer pH 4 (C), and in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3 (D)

_	Clay_Pbl <sub>2</sub> _1		Clay_Pbl2_2		
Solution	Concentration	Sensitivity	Concentration	Sensitivity	
	range (M)	(mV/decade)	range (M)	(mV/decade)	
А	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	7.04	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	7.12	
В	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	6.30	-	-	
С	10 <sup>-5</sup> - 10 <sup>-4</sup>	5.30	-	-	
D	-	-	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	20.67	



**Figure 3.** Correlation curve between log  $[Pb^{2+}]$  versus EMF, Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor measures Pb<sup>2+</sup> solution in demineralized water (**A**); and in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3 (**D**)



**Figure 4.** Correlation curve between log  $[Pb^{2+}]$  versus EMF, Chit\_Pbl\_2\_1 sensor measures  $Pb^{2+}$  solution in demineralized water (**A**); in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 4 (**B**); and in acetate buffer pH 4 (**C**)



**Figure 5**. Correlation curve between log  $[Pb^{2+}]$  versus EMF, Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor measures  $Pb^{2+}$  solution in demineralized water (**A**); and in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3 (**D**)

**Table 3.** Sensitivity of the Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_1 and Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensors in a  $Pb^{2+}$  solution in demineralized water without pH adjustment (A); in HNO<sub>3</sub> at pH 4 (B); in acetate buffer pH 4 (C) and in HNO<sub>3</sub> at pH 3 (D)

Solution <sup>-</sup>	Chit_F	Pbl <sub>2</sub> _1	Chit_Pbl2_2		
	Concentration range (M)	Sensitivity (mV/decade)	Concentration range (M)	Sensitivity (mV/decade)	
А	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	3.24	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	32.49	
В	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	7.49	-	-	
С	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-4</sup>	7.03	-	-	
D	-	-	10 <sup>-6</sup> - 10 <sup>-3</sup>	19.25	

The results of the experiment are presented in **Figure 5**. The highest Chit-Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensitivity was produced in solution A (**Table 3**), which probably due to more glutaraldehyde was added, so that the level chitosan swelling is greater, thus attracts more water. This was then accelerating the equilibrium of  $Pb^{2+}$  ions in solution with  $Pbl_2$  on the sensor. A higher concentration of  $HNO_3$  in the solution will accelerate the equilibrium, but on the other hand, a large amount of  $NO_3^-$  can interfere the sensor. Based on the results of the four  $Pb^{2+}$  sensors, to determine the level of  $Pb^{2+}$  dissolved in water, Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor was the best option. However, when applied to solid samples, it requires preparation, which commonly uses  $HNO_3$  as a solvent.

## Application of Pb<sup>2+</sup> sensor in herbal medicine samples

The herbal sample consisted of two solid samples and one liquid sample. All samples were dissolved in 0.001 M nitric acid (pH = 3). Therefore, the standard curve was made with a solution of Pb<sup>2+</sup> in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3 in the range of 5 - 25 ppm. The sensors used to determine Pb<sup>2+</sup> in herbal sample are Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 and Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2. The linear regression equation for the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor is E<sub>cell</sub> = 275.84 + 20.281 log [Pb<sup>2+</sup>], whereas for the Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor is E<sub>cell</sub> = 174.52 + 16.51 log [Pb<sup>2+</sup>]. Recovery was determined by adding 20 ppm of standard Pb<sup>2+</sup> solution to the sample solution.

Based on the linear regression equation, with the concentration range of 5 - 25 ppm Pb<sup>2+</sup> in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3, the sensitivity of the Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor is 16.51 mV / decade, whereas the sensitivity of Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 is 20.67 mV / decade. The average recovery of 20 ppm Pb<sup>2+</sup> added to the herbal sample is 85.62% for the Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor and 94.10% for Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2. As observed in Table 3, the recovery and accuracy of Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor is higher than that of Chit\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 sensor. In addition, sample measurements were also carried out using differential pulse voltammetry (DPV) method (**Table 5**). The Pb<sup>2+</sup> levels were considerably identical to the results of the potentiometric determination, except for the JD sample.

Table 4. R addition st	ecovery of Pb <sup>2+</sup> determina andard of 20 ppm Pb <sup>2+</sup> sol	tion by the Clay_Pbl2_2 ( <b>II</b> ) ution.	and Chit_Pbl2_2 ( <b>IV</b> ) sensors, with	th
Sample	Concentration of $Pb^{2+}$ in	Concentration of Pb <sup>2+</sup> in sample + standard	Recovery (%)	

Sample code	Concentration of Pb <sup>2+</sup> in sample (ppm)		sample + standard (ppm)		Recovery (%)	
	II	IV	II	IV	II	IV
JD	5.4	4.5	24.2	21.6	94.05 ± 1.75	85.53 ± 6.07
MKD	14.7	14.5	33.3	31.5	92.94 ± 1.21	84.98 ± 2.79
PM	15.4	15.2	34.4	32.4	95.30 ± 0.27	86.34 ± 1.27

**Table 5.** Levels of  $Pb^{2+}$  (mg / pack) in the herbal sample determined by the Clay\_Pbl<sub>2</sub>\_2 (sensor II) and the Chit Pbl<sub>2</sub> 2 (sensor IV), compared with the results of the DPV determination.

Samala codo	Volumo packina -	Concentration of Pb <sup>2+</sup> (mg/pack)			
Sumple code	volume packing	Sensor II	Sensor IV	DPV	
JD	600 mL	8.1	6.8	7.9	
MKD	7 g	1.0	1.0	1.0	
PM	9 g	1.4	1.4	1.4	

# CONCLUSIONS

The electrolyte condition of the sample solution affects the performance of both  $Pb^{2+}$  sensor from  $Clay_Pbl_2$  and  $Chit_Pbl_2$  sensors. The highest performance was resulted by the  $Chit_Pbl_2_2$  sensor for  $Pb^{2+}$  solution in demineralized water, which is 32.49 mV / decade. Application of the  $Chit_Pbl_2_2$  sensor to herbal medicinal samples dissolved in HNO<sub>3</sub> pH 3 had a sensitivity of 16.51 mV / decade in the concentration range of 5-25 ppm, with an average recovery of 85.62%. Meanwhile, the application of the  $Clay_Pbl_2_2$  sensor produces a sensitivity of 20.67 mV/decade with an average recovery of 94.10%.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors would like to thank to the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Brawijaya University for funding this research through the Associate Professor Research Grant Scheme 2020.

## REFERENCES

- Akakuru, O.U. & Isiuku, B.O., (2017) Chitosan hydrogels and their glutaraldehyde-crosslinked counterparts as potential drug release and tissue engineering systems - synthesis, characterization, swelling kinetics and mechanism, Journal of Physical Chemistry & Biophysics, 7, 1-7
- Akanji, S.P., Arotiba, O.A., & Duduzile Nkosi, D., (2019), Voltammetric determination of Pb(II) ions at a modified kaolinite-carbon paste Electrode, *Electrocatalysis*, 10, 643–652.
- Badan Pengawas Obat dan Makanan RI, (2019), Peraturan Nomor 32 Tahun 2019 tentang Persyaratan Keamanan dan Mutu Obat Tradisional, Jakarta.

- Bhat, V.S., Ijeri, V.S., & Srivastava, A.K., (2018), Coated wire lead(II) selective potentiometric sensor based on 4-tert-butylcalix[6]arene, Sensors and Actuators B, 99, 98–105.
- Canfield, R.L, Henderson, C.R. Jr, Cory-Slechta, D.A., Cox. C., Jusko, T.A, & Lanphear, B.P., (2003), Intellectual impairment in children with blood lead concentrations below 10 µg per deciliter, New England Journal of Medicine, 348, 1517– 1526
- Chen, Y-T., Sarangadharan, I., Sukesan, R., Hseih, Ch-Y., Lee, G-Y., Chyi, J-I., & Wang, T-L., (2018), High-feld modulated ion-selective feldefect-transistor (FET) sensors with sensitivity higher than the ideal Nernst sensitivity, *Scientific Reports*, 8, 8300.
- Fatnassi, M., Solterbeck, C.H., & Es-Souni, M., (2014), Clay nanomaterial thin film electrodes for electrochemical energy storage applications, *Royal Society of Chemistry Advances*, 4, 46976–46979
- Garcia-Valles, M., Alfonso, P., Martínez, S., & Roca, N., (2020), Mineralogical and Thermal characterization of kaolinitic clays from Terra Alta (Catalonia, Spain), *Minerals*, , 10, 142
- Golcs, A., Horváth, V., Huszthy, P., & Tóth, T., (2018), Fast potentiometric analysis of lead in aqueous medium under competitive conditions using an acridono-crown ether neutral ionophore, Sensors, 18, 1407
- Gómez, Y., Fernández, L., Borrás, C., Mostany, J., & Scharifker, B., (2011), Characterization of a carbon paste electrode modified with tripolyphosphate-modified kaolinite clay for the detection of lead, *Talanta*, 85, 1357–1363

- Jiménez-Gómez, C.P., & Cecilia, J.A., (2020), Chitosan: A natural biopolymer with a wide and varied range of applications, *Molecules*, 25, 3981.
- Kaur, K. & Aulakh, J.S., (2016), Fabrication of Pb(II) Selective polymeric membrane electrode based on 2,2'[propane-1,3-diylbis(oxy)] dibenzaldehyde as an lonophore, Journal of Analytical & Bioanalytical Techniues, 9 (2), 1000399.
- Mousavi, M.P.S., Ainla, A., Tan, E.K.W., El-Rahman, M.K.A., Yoshida, Y., Yuan, L, Sigurslid, H.H., Arkan, N., Yip,M.C., Abrahamsson,Ch.K., Homer-Vanniasinkam, S., & Whitesides, G.M., (2018), Ion sensing with thread-based potentiometric electrodes, *Lab on a Chip*, 18, 2279–2290.
- Mulyasuryani, A. (2011). Pembuatan ESI iodat menggunakan membran kitosan sebagai pendukung bahan aktif pada permukaan batang grafit. Sains dan Terapan Kimia. 5(2), 112-121.
- Mulyasuryani, A., Haryanto, E., Sulistyarti, H., & Rumhayati, B., (2018), Molecularly imprinted polymers chitosan-glutaraldehyde for monosodium glutamate, *IOP* Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 299, 012010

- Novitasari, E., Anggraeni, A.R., Muhiroh, Dahlan, M.W., & Mulyasuryani, A., (2016), Sensor Timbal Berbasis Potensiometri Untuk Mendeteksi Kadar Timbal Dalam Darah, Jurnal Penelitian Saintek, 21(1), 47-54.
- Nair, M., Best, S.M., & Cameron, R.E., (2020), Crosslinking collagen constructs: achieving cellular selectivity through modifications of physical and chemical properties, *Applied Sciences*, 10, 6911
- Rocha, A., & Trujillo, K., (2019), Neurotoxicity of lowlevel lead exposure: History, mechanisms of action, and behavioral effects in humans and preclinical models, *Neurotoxicology*, 73, 58– 80.
- Yahaya, S., Jikan, S.S., Badarulzaman, & N.A., Adamu, A.D., (2017), Chemical composition and particle size analysis of kaolin, *Traektoriâ Nauki* -Path of Science, 3, 1001-1004.
- Vorvolakos, T, Arseniou, S, & Samakouri, M., (2016)., There is no safe threshold for lead exposure: alpha literature review, *Psychiatrike*, 27, 204–214
- Wai, K.M., Mar, O., Kosaka, S., Umemura, M., & Watanabe, Ch., (2017), Prenatal heavy metal exposure and adverse birth outcomes in Myanmar: A birth-cohort study, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.14, 1339.