

This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences

(<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00450618.2021.1964598>).

It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

GC-MS – Still standing for clinical and forensic analysis: validation of a multi-drug method to detect and quantify illicit drugs

Ana Beatriz Ferreira (a.beatriz.p.f@gmail.com)^{1,2}, André L. Castro^{1,3*}, Sónia Tarelho¹ (sonia.h.tarelho@inmlcf.mj.pt), Pedro Domingues² (p.domingues@ua.pt), João Miguel Franco¹ (j.miguel.franco@inmlcf.mj.pt)

¹National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences, Portugal

²LAQV-REQUIMTE, Department of Chemistry, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal

³ ICBAS - School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, University of Porto, Portugal

*Corresponding author:

Address: National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences, Laboratory of Forensic Chemistry and Toxicology, North Branch, Jardim Carrilho Videira, s/n, 4050-067 Porto, Portugal

Phone: +351 220 921 385

Fax: +351 222 018 069

E-mail address: andre.l.castro@inmlcf.mj.pt

ABSTRACT

An SPE-GC-MS analytical method using whole blood samples has been developed and validated to detect and quantify nineteen compounds belonging to the Drugs of Abuse (DA) groups of cocaine and metabolites, opiates and new psychoactive substances (NPS). The method detailed here is necessary because the recreational consumption of these DA has increased considerably in recent years and poly-drug-consumption is now very common.

The method developed was both specific and selective. Three different working ranges have been defined due to the differences between therapeutic, toxic and lethal concentrations of DA. Linearity was confirmed for the defined working ranges of all DA, except pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, norephedrine, and TFMPP. Since the remaining nineteen substances showed heteroscedasticity, six ponderation factors were studied to find the best fit for each compound.

Limits of Detection and Lower Limits of Quantification have been studied and defined. No carryover was noted, with acceptable extraction recoveries.

The achievement of all validation criteria according to international guidelines allows the application of the proposed method in routine forensic analysis. Using this method can also significantly reduce response times and GC-MS analysis costs.

Key-words: Forensic toxicology, multi-drug method, cocaine, opiates, new psychoactive substances, GC-MS, solid-phase extraction

1 - Introduction

The need for analytical methods allowing the interpretation of toxicity-related death situations and the assessment of an influenced state has fostered the development of sophisticated techniques for the detection and quantification of drugs of abuse (DA) in biological samples. In addition, in recent years the development of new multi-drug analysis methods has increased in forensic toxicology, with laboratories continually seeking to increase their methodological and analytical capacities. The application of multi-substance methods has several objectives, namely to reduce the response time of the laboratory, since the detection of several substances from different groups is carried out in a single analysis, the use of smaller amounts of sample and reduction of costs in terms of material, without compromising the sensitivity and fit-for-purpose of the method.

There are several reviews available that elucidate the most appropriate detection and quantification techniques and methods for several groups of drugs, such as cocaine and its metabolites^{1,2}, opiates/opioids³ and new psychoactive substances (NPS)⁴. Gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (GC-MS) remains the most widely used technique in clinical and forensic toxicology laboratories⁵ because GC systems are less expensive and require less maintenance than alternative systems (such as liquid chromatography)⁶. Because GC-MS exhibits good sensitivity and robustness, the development of methods that include this technique continues to be pursued, although in smaller numbers than the other techniques.

Despite the increasing development of multi-drug methodologies using less conventional matrices, such as hair, sweat or vitreous humour⁷⁻⁹, blood and blood products remain the most commonly used matrices to detect, quantify and interpret drug

concentrations and metabolites. This is especially true for analytes belonging to the three DA groups mentioned, as this preference is evident in recently published multi-drug GC-MS methods which use whole blood, serum or plasma as samples^{5,10–14}. Although serum or plasma are cleaner matrices, it is not always possible to obtain them in forensic toxicology samples^{15,16}. Besides its homogeneity and the possibility of detecting and quantifying not only the drug metabolites but also the original drug, one of the main advantages of using a whole blood matrix is the possibility of obtaining samples *in vivo* or *post-mortem*, which is extremely relevant in forensic toxicology¹⁷.

The main objective of the present work was to develop and validate an SPE-GC-MS analytical method to detect and quantify 23 compounds belonging to the DA groups of cocaine and metabolites, opiates/opioids and NPS, both *in vivo* and *post mortem* whole blood samples.

The DA groups and the selection of analytes were based both on the casuistry of the Chemistry and Forensic Toxicology Service of the National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences North Branch (SQTF-N), as well as on information from the competent authorities monitoring consumption¹⁸. In Europe, cocaine is, along with ecstasy and amphetamines, the most widely used stimulant drug¹⁸. As for opiates/opioids, the misuse of prescription opioids, the increase in heroin use, the rise of fentanyl derivatives on the market and the presence of opioids in 85% of fatal overdoses in 2018 reinforce the need to unequivocally detect and identify these substances in biological samples^{18,19}. The increase in internet sales has encouraged the consumption of NPS¹⁸. Known as “legal highs”, the variety of existing NPSs seriously affects the development of methodologies robust enough to be used in routine analysis situations^{18,20} and the European Union has created an Early-Warning System, to share NPS’ information among authorities in member countries. At the end of 2017, more than 700 compounds were

monitored by the EMCDDA (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction) and this number continues to increase, albeit at a slower pace, compared to previous years¹⁸. In addition, the simultaneous consumption of several psychotropic substances is also increasing¹⁸, making it imperative to develop methodologies to determine the analytes of several classes of DA.

2 - Material and Methods

2.1. Materials, standards, and chemicals

Pure standards of the target compounds and deuterated internal standards (IS) were provided by Cerilliant Corporation (Texas, USA) and Lipomed (Arlesheim, Switzerland). Stock standard solutions (1 mg/mL) and working solutions were prepared in methanol. A mixture of all IS with a final concentration of 5000 ng/mL was prepared, as well as three mixtures of analytes (Table 1): Set 1 with tramadol and ketamine at 10000 ng/mL, Set 2 with cocaethylene, 6-mono-acethyl-morphine (6-MAM), fentanyl, phencyclidine (PCP) and buprenorphine at 500 ng/mL and Set 3 with ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, norephedrine, ecgonine methylester (EME), 3-Trifluoromethylphenylpiperazine (TFMPP), d-propoxyphene, pethidine, N-desmethyltramadol (N-DT), O-desmethyltramadol (O-DT), 2-ethylidene-1,5-dimethyl-3,3-diphenylpyrrolidine (EDDP), 3-Methoxyphencyclidine (3-MeO-PCP), methadone, cocaine, benzoylecgonine, codeine and morphine at 5000 ng/mL. All standard solutions were stored at -20°C.

Methanol, n-hexane, dichloromethane, propan-2-ol, ammonia and ethyl acetate were purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). Stock sodium carbonate buffer from Thermo Fisher Scientific (Waltham, USA) was used to prepare sodium carbonate 0.15 M pH 9.5 buffer. Similarly, phosphate buffer saline (PBS) solution was prepared with a

dilution of 50 mL of Phosphate Buffered Saline PBS 20X pH 7.5, from AMRESCO (Solon, USA) in 950 mL of deionized water. Solid-phase extraction was performed using OASIS MCX[®] columns from WATERS[™] (Massachusetts, USA). The derivatization reagent [BSTFA (N,O-bis(trimethylsilyl) trifluoroacetamide) + 1% TMCS (trimethylchlorosilane)] was obtained from Supelco (Madrid, Spain).

2.2. Biological samples collection

Analytical validation was developed from whole blood samples (previously tested for positivity) and obtained from the Portuguese blood bank.

Selectivity was tested using 10 pooled samples, consisting of 4 different subsamples (*in vivo* and post-mortem). The samples were collected *in vivo* (at General Hospitals' Emergency Rooms), according to the procedures described in Portuguese legislation concerning driving under the influence of drugs, and also collected post-mortem according to the routine procedures in force in the Forensic Pathology Department of the Portuguese National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences, North Branch.

2.3. Sample preparation, Solid Phase Extraction and derivatization procedure

Four millilitres of PBS buffer were spiked with IS solution and working solutions (Set 1, 2 and 3). A 500 µL aliquot of whole blood, previously shaken in a roller mixer for 15 minutes, was added to this mixture. Then the mixture was vortexed and centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 30 minutes. The supernatant solution was used for SPE, which was performed using OASIS MCX[®] columns. Cartridge condition and equilibration were achieved by adding 2 mL of methanol and 2 mL of deionised water to the cartridge. The sample was loaded onto the conditioned cartridge and allowed to drain by gravity. For

the washing step, 2 mL of sodium carbonate 0.15 M pH 9.5 buffer, followed by 2 mL of deionised water and 3 mL of hexane were added to the column. After that, vacuum drying was carried out for half an hour. The samples were then eluted with 2 mL of dichloromethane/propan-2-ol/ammonia (78:20:2, v/v/v) mixture and evaporated to dryness at 45°C, for 60 minutes, in a rotary evaporator. Finally, the dry eluates were silylated with 60 µL of BSTFA:TMCS (99:1) by heating at 65°C, for 30 minutes, followed by instrumental analysis using GC-MS.

2.4. GC-MS analysis

GC-MS analysis was performed using an Agilent 6890N gas chromatograph (Agilent, Santa Clara, USA), with a J&W HP-5MS Capillary Column (30 m - 0.25 mm i.d. - 0.25 µm film thickness) (Agilent, Santa Clara, USA), coupled to an Agilent 5973N simple quadrupole (Agilent, Santa Clara, USA). The temperature of the GC oven was initially set to run at 100°C for 4 minutes, increased to 290°C at 15°C/min, and held at this temperature for six minutes, with a total run time of 27 minutes. The temperatures of the injector, transfer line and source were set at 300°C, 280°C and 230°C, respectively. Helium (GASIN, Barcelona, Spain) was used as carrier gas with a flow rate of 1 mL/min for 18.5 min and 1.3 mL/min until the end of the run. The splitless mode was used to inject 2 µL of sample and the MS detector was operated in SIM mode. The retention time (in minutes) and monitored ions (m/z) for all the analytes are described in Table 2. GC-MS control, data acquisition and processing were achieved with Enhanced ChemStation Software (Agilent, Santa Clara, USA).

2.5. Validation studies

To assess and choose the three diagnostic ions to monitor each standard and IS compound (at a concentration of 10 mg/L) was derivatized and injected in SCAN mode. After that, standards were injected in SIM mode to optimize GC-MS conditions.

The developed method was validated according to the guidelines suggested by Peters *et al*^{6,21}. The acceptance analytical criteria, internally established and based on WADA guidelines²² were applied.

To assess specificity and selectivity, 10 sample pools of 4 different whole blood samples were used. The analytes and IS were added at a concentration of 300 ng/mL for the substances of Set 1, 10 ng/mL for the compounds belonging to Set 2 and 100 ng/mL for the analytes of Set 3 and IS Set. At the same time, pools of the equivalent non-fortified sample were also tested.

In this work, three working ranges were proposed (Table 1), according to the relevant forensic concentrations for each drug considered. The calibration linearity was studied using a calibration curve, of ten standard concentrations, with the concentration ranges between the different standards being as equal as possible (Figure 1 shows an example for 6-MAM). After evaluation of the coefficient of correlation (r^2) and origin interception, aliquots of the lower and higher limits of each calibration curve were injected five times. To assess the homoscedasticity, the variance (s^2) of each concentration level (Set 1: 50 and 4000 ng/mL; Set 2: 5 and 100 ng/mL; Set 3: 25 and 1000 ng/mL) was calculated and an F-test was applied. The tested value (F_{calc}) was compared to the reference value (F_{crit}) of the F-test table (4 degrees of freedom).

To determine the limits of detection (LOD) and quantification (LOQ), calibration curves close to the estimated LOD for each set (Set 1 with LOD = 25 ng/mL, Set 2 with LOD = 2 ng/mL and Set 3 with LOD = 10 ng/mL) were prepared. The parameters of the generated calibration curves, namely the standard deviation of the response ($S_{y/x}$) and the

slope of the linear regression (b), were used to estimate the limits of detection and quantitation using the following equations: $LOD = (3.3S_{y/x})/b$ and $LOQ = (10S_{y/x})/b$. After calculation, the LOD and LOQ were tested, as well as the maximum concentration level of each working range, using five replicates for the chosen concentrations. LOQ was also studied for accuracy and precision.

Carryover studies were performed by injecting extracted blank samples between samples spiked at high concentrations (6000 ng/mL for psychotropic drugs included in Set 1, 200 ng/mL for compounds in Set 2 and 2000 ng/mL for DA in Set 3) and the presence of the target substances in the blank samples was verified. For each DA, five whole blood samples were used.

Although not considered a mandatory parameter of the validation process²¹, extraction recovery was also tested, as some authors understand that recoveries need to be optimized²³. For this, IS and analyte sets were added to the blank samples, at two distinct concentrations, representative of the low (50 ng/mL for Set 1, 10 ng/mL for Set 2 and 100 ng/mL for Set 3) and high ranges (3500 ng/mL for Set 1, 75 ng/mL for Set 2 and 700 ng/mL for Set 3), before and after the extraction procedure. The IS Set was added to all the samples at 100 ng/mL before the SPE step. Each concentration level was tested in triplicate ($n=12$). Recovery percentage was determined by calculating the ratio between the area ratios before and after extraction.

The precision was assessed by calculating the intermediate precision, repeatability, and limit of repeatability, using an ANOVA test, at three different concentration levels for each set (Set 1: 500, 1500 and 3000 ng/mL; Set 2: 5, 10 and 70 ng/mL; Set 3: 100, 400 and 700 ng/mL). Along with these quality controls (QC), calibration curves for all analytes were prepared and the respective *weighting factor*, selected for each DA, was applied. This procedure was repeated eight times, with

intermediate precision conditions. The coefficient variation (CV) obtained for each concentration level was also determined.

The data obtained in the precision study were used for the estimation of uncertainty in this work. For the uncertainty associated with accuracy ($u(\bar{R}_m)$) evaluation, a t-student test was applied and the values of t_{exp} obtained for each substance at each CQ level were compared to $t_{crit} = 2.131$, considering 15 degrees of freedom for a confidence interval of 95%. If the condition $t_{exp} < t_{crit}$ was verified, no correction of the results in terms of accuracy was needed. Otherwise, calculation of the relative standard uncertainty ($u'(\bar{R}_m)$) was required. Concerning the uncertainty associated with the precision ($u'_{precision}$), its value was considered to be equal to the Relative Standard Deviation (in %) obtained for the intermediate precision. The uncertainties associated with accuracy and precision were used to determine the combined uncertainty ($u(y)$) and the expanded combined uncertainty ($U(y)$).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Selectivity/Specificity

The target compounds were unequivocally identified, using the three diagnostic ions established for each DA (supplementary data S1), as well as their retention time and the relative retention time of the internal standard. The results obtained from the selectivity/specificity evaluation generally showed an absence of possible interferences. Thus, the method was considered to be selective and specific for the 23 compounds.

3.2. Working range, linearity and calibration model

Calibration curves within working ranges for all considered DA were prepared and linearity was studied. By applying the least-squares model, r^2 and origin interception

were determined (Table 3). Since pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, norephedrine and TFMPP did not comply with the defined criteria for linearity ($r^2 > 0.98$), working range studies ended at this point for these four substances.

The evaluation of the homoscedasticity variances was carried out using an F-test, considering a critical F (F_{crit}) value equal to 6.388. All 23 substances showed $F_{calculated} > F_{crit}$ (Supplemental data S2), and so were considered heteroscedastic. These results were expected, due to the wide working ranges proposed in this method, which exceed an order of magnitude^{6,21}. In forensic toxicology, the need to use wide working ranges makes it difficult to adjust them until homoscedasticity is verified. As such, Peters *et al*²¹ proposed a mathematical transformation of the data or the application of a weighted least squares model.

For this work, six weight factors (w) were evaluated for each drug ($1/x^{1/2}$, $1/x$, $1/x^2$, $1/y^{1/2}$, $1/y$, $1/y^2$). The sum of the relative errors ($\Sigma \%RE$) is mentioned as a sensitive indicator to assess the adjustment of a *weighting factor* to a calibration curve²⁴. However, some authors suggest independent studies of quality control and accuracy²⁵. As such, we determined the limits of repeatability and expanded uncertainties for each level of CQ (Supplemental Data S3). In addition, r^2 and $\Sigma \%RE$ were calculated for each of the eight calibration curves, generated in intermediate precision conditions, for the target analytes with confirmed linearity (Table 4). The w which revealed a mean $r^2 < 0.98$ weren't evaluated for the remaining parameters ($\Sigma \%RE$, the limit of repeatability and expanded uncertainty).

A rank classification was assigned to the three parameters evaluated for each w , shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6. The weight factors providing the lowest percentage result for each parameter and therefore those which best fitted to each substance data were assigned with the lowest score. Therefore, the w with the lowest sum of ranks, or the final rank,

was chosen for each of the 19 quantifiable psychotropic drugs (Table 7). The data confirm that ketamine, fentanyl, cocaethylene, d-propoxyphene, pethidine, N-DT and codeine have at least one w with a mean $r^2 < 0.99$. As this is an essential criterion for the acceptance of the calibration curves, those w were no longer studied for the indicated DA and no classification was given. It's also worth mentioning that, for methadone, 2 w obtained the same rank score, meaning both w 's had an equal adjustment to the defined working range. Thus, the choice of w for methadone was based only on the w fitting to most of the compounds in Set 3. The weighted least squares models chosen for the analytes in this method are summarized in Table 8.

3.3. LOD/LLOQ

As mentioned previously, the calibration curves close to the pre-defined LOD were used to determine the LOD and LLOQ for the DA present in each Set. For pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, norephedrine and TFMPP, due to poor signal-to-noise ratio at low concentrations or imprecise or non-linear calibration curves ($r^2 < 0.98$), the positivity criteria were verified at 25 ng/mL for pseudoephedrine and ephedrine and at 50 ng/mL for norephedrine and TFMPP. From this moment, the presented method was considered as qualitative for these four DA.

The LOD values, determined for the remaining DA, were as follows: for the compounds of Set 1, the calculated LOD was less than 3 ng/mL, for the analytes of Set 2, the obtained LOD was between 1.0 and 1.6 ng/mL and the DA present in Set 3 showed LOD values between 1.6 and 3.4 ng/mL, except for N-DT, which LOD was 7.8 ng/mL. As for the LLOQ, the substances of set 1 showed an LLOQ ≥ 9 ng/mL. The DA in Set 2 and Set 3 had an LLOQ between 3.1 and 4.7 ng/mL and 4.7 and 24 ng/mL, respectively.

Despite the LOD and LLOQ presented, and according to the literature²¹, it is acceptable to establish a higher LLOQ as long as it remains appropriate for the toxicological interpretation. As such, these LLOQ were established for the presented method: 50 ng/mL for Set 1, 2.5 ng/mL for Set 2 and 25 ng/mL for Set 3. These defined LLOQs and the upper points of each working range were tested for their variation coefficients (CV%). The results obtained confirmed a CV% less than or equal to 20% satisfying the laboratory acceptance criteria.

3.4. Carryover and Extraction Recovery

Carryover evaluation did not reveal any false positives, proving the absence of carryover phenomena for the 23 analytes.

Extraction recovery data demonstrates a good per cent recovery for the majority of DA, with values ranging from 62.07% to 97.14% (Table 9). However, there were two substances with lower recovery percentages – EDDP and buprenorphine. Despite these results, it was still possible to perform the identification and quantification in the working range. On the other hand, the detection of metabolites, such as EDDP, is much more valuable than the quantitation value itself, being that aim properly verified in LOD validation procedure, with proper identification of the compound, even with a low recovery value as this.

The compounds d-propoxyphene, 3-MeO-PCP and N-DT are distinguished by recoveries greater than 100%. The recovery percentages of d-propoxyphene and 3-MeO-PCP remain within the laboratory acceptance criteria ($100 \pm 20\%$). As for N-DT, several reasons may help to justify the recovery value obtained, since the instability of compounds with N-amines has already been reported^{26,27}. One possible explanation is the presence of enzymes in blood samples, due to the putrefaction process, which can increase

the pH value, allowing the formation of N-DT. In addition, the physicochemical properties of N-DT and the pH variations resulting from the SPE extraction process can be based on the high recovery rates obtained²⁶.

Even if the recovery percentages make it possible to detect and quantify all DA in the working ranges tested, they can be considered suitable for the methods presented.

3.5. Precision

The precision results are shown in Table 10. The CV % determined for the high-level concentration QCs of the quantifiable analytes were less than 10%, except for ketamine, pethidine and N-DT, and less than 20% for the low concentration level QCs of the 19 substances considered. The CV percentages obtained for an intermediate level concentration were also evaluated and considered in compliance, since they were equal to or less than the maximum value established for high concentration levels, 10%, except for EME and pethidine, which were below the percentage defined for low concentration levels.

3.6. Accuracy/Uncertainty

As occurred for precision, accuracy was assessed only for the 19 quantifiable compounds (Supplemental Data S3), taking into account the selected weight factors. For validation and routine application purposes, this method is assumed to be exact, with the highest percentage of U(y) for each DA being considered as the uncertainty associated with the method. The method uncertainty values range from 24.76% to 76.66%. However, these results are compatible with the use of the method in a routine forensic laboratory setting, giving the complexity of the samples used.

3.7. Application to Real samples

Actual clinical samples were obtained from DUID (Driving Under the Influence of Drugs) police actions. Postmortem samples were obtained through routine sampling procedures applied at the Portuguese National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences. All samples were selected after previous analysis according to routine laboratory procedures. A summary of the results obtained is shown in Table 11. The results were all consistent with previous results reported in the routine procedure.

4. Conclusions

In this work, we have developed a method that detects and quantifies nineteen compounds belonging to the Drugs of Abuse (DA) groups of cocaine and metabolites, opiates and new psychoactive substances (NPS). All results presented complied with the acceptance criteria for quantitative laboratory analysis, being possible to consider the presented GC-MS method is suitable for identification and quantitation of 19 analytes. In addition, this method can be used as a qualitative technique to detect ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, norephedrine and TFMPP. The working ranges and limits of detection and quantification are suitable for the toxic and lethal concentrations of the target analytes. Furthermore, the presented methodology is found to be precise and accurate for the main objective, without carryover and excellent recoveries for 17 out of 19 compounds, considering the small amount of sample, the SPE extraction procedure and the derivatization method.

Combining the detection and quantification of multiple target compounds in a single multi-drug method is very useful in laboratory routine as it reduces the laboratory response times, as well as solvent and sample consumption.

Although different techniques can be used to detect DA and metabolites in biological samples, GC-MS remains a robust and reliable technique, easy to use and maintain, with contained costs and meets all the major requirements for DA forensic analysis. Thus, the proposed method could present itself as a reliable method, applicable to a routine procedure, coupled with other fast screening procedures, such as immunoassays. It could also allow the availability of other more expensive and more complex equipment for other purposes, in addition to promoting greater cost-effectiveness of all the equipment available in the laboratory.

References

1. Barroso M, Gallardo E, Queiroz JA. Bioanalytical methods for the determination of cocaine and metabolites in human biological samples. *Bioanalysis*. 2009;1:977–1000.
2. De Giovanni N, Marchetti D. Cocaine and its metabolites in the placenta: a systematic review of the literature. *Reprod. Toxicol.* 2012;33:1–14.
3. Barroso M, Gallardo E., Vieira DN, Queiroz JA, López-Rivadulla M. Bioanalytical procedures and recent developments in the determination of opiates/opioids in human biological samples. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 2011;400:1665–1690.
4. Smith JP, Sutcliffe OB, Banks CE. An overview of recent developments in the analytical detection of new psychoactive substances (NPSs). *The Analyst* 2015;140:4932–4948.

5. Mercieca G, Odoardi S, Cassar M, Strano-Rossi S. Rapid and simple procedure for the determination of cathinones, amphetamine-like stimulants and other new psychoactive substances in blood and urine by GC-MS. *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.* 2018;149:494–501.
6. Peters FT, Wissenbach DK, Busardò FP, Marchei E, Pichini S. Method development in Forensic Toxicology. *Curr. Pharm. Des.* 2017;23(36):5455-5467.
7. Orfanidis A, Mastrogianni O, Koukou A, Psarros G, Gika H, Theodoridis G, Raikos N. A GC-MS method for the detection and quantitation of ten major drugs of abuse in human hair samples. *J. Chromatogr. B Analyt. Technol. Biomed. Life. Sci.* 2017;1047:141–150.
8. Gentili S, Mortali C, Mastrobattista L, Berretta P, Zaami S. Determination of different recreational drugs in sweat by headspace solid-phase microextraction gas chromatography mass spectrometry (HS-SPME GC/MS): Application to drugged drivers. *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.* 2016;129:282–287.
9. Mozaner-Bordin DC, Alves MNR, Cabrices OG, de Campos EG, De Martinis BS. A rapid assay for the simultaneous determination of nicotine, cocaine and metabolites in meconium using disposable pipette extraction and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS). *J. Anal. Toxicol.* 2014;38:31–38.
10. Fernández N, Olivera NM, Keller GA, Diez RA, Di Girolamo G, Quiroga PN. Simultaneous quantitation of meperidine, normeperidine, tramadol, propoxyphene and norpropoxyphene in human plasma using solid-phase extraction and gas chromatography/mass spectrometry: Method validation and application to cardiovascular safety of therapeutic doses. *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 2017;RCM 31:1519–1533.
11. Alves EA, Agonia AS, Cravo SM, Afonso CM, Netto ADP, de LB, Carvalho F, Dinis-Oliveira RJ. GC-MS method for the analysis of thirteen opioids, cocaine and

- cocaethylene in whole blood based on a modified quechers extraction. *Curr. Pharm. Anal.* 2017;13:215–223.
12. Margalho C, Castanheira A, Real FC, Gallardo E, López-Rivadulla M. Determination of ‘new psychoactive substances’ in postmortem matrices using microwave derivatization and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. B Analyt. Technol. Biomed. Life. Sci.* 2016;1020:14–23.
 13. Pelição FS, Peres MD, Pissinate JF, De Martinis BS. A one-step extraction procedure for the screening of cocaine, amphetamines and cannabinoids in postmortem blood samples. *J. Anal. Toxicol.* 2014;38:341–348.
 14. Lerch O, Temme O, Daldrup T. Comprehensive automation of the solid phase extraction gas chromatographic mass spectrometric analysis (SPE-GC/MS) of opioids, cocaine, and metabolites from serum and other matrices. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 2014;406:4443–4451.
 15. Skopp G. Postmortem toxicology. *Forensic Sci. Med. Pathol.* 2010;6:314–325.
 16. Teng X, Liang C, Wang R, Sun T, Rao Y, Ni C, Zeng L, Xiong L, Li Y, Zhang Y. Screening of drugs of abuse and toxic compounds in human whole blood using online solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography with time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *J. Sep. Sci.* 2015;38:50–59.
 17. Moeller MR, Steinmeyer S, Kraemer T. Determination of drugs of abuse in blood. *J. Chromatogr. B. Biomed. Sci. App.* 1998;713:91–109.
 18. European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). European Drug Report 2020: Trends and Developments. 2020.
 19. Eckart K, Röhrich J, Breitmeier D, Ferner M, Laufenberg-Feldmann R, Urban R. Development of a new multi-analyte assay for the simultaneous detection of opioids

- in serum and other body fluids using liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. B Analyt. Technol. Biomed. Life. Sci.* 2015;1001:1–8.
20. Favretto D, Pascali JP, Tagliaro F. New challenges and innovation in forensic toxicology: focus on the ‘New Psychoactive Substances’. *J. Chromatogr. A* 2013;1287:84–95.
21. Peters FT, Drummer OH, Musshoff F. Validation of new methods. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 2007;165:216–224.
22. WADA Laboratory Expert Group. WADA Technical Document - TD 2017 DL - Decision limits for the confirmatory quantification of threshold substances. 2017.
23. Peters FT, Maurer HH. Bioanalytical method validation and its implications for forensic and clinical toxicology – A review. *Accred Qual Assur* 2002;441–449.
24. Almeida AM, Castel-Branco MM, Falcão AC. Linear regression for calibration lines revisited: weighting schemes for bioanalytical methods. *J. Chromatogr. B Analyt. Technol. Biomed. Life. Sci.* 2002;774:215–222.
25. Singtoroj T, Tarning J, Annerberg A, Ashton M, Bergqvist Y, White NJ, Lindegardh N, Day NPJ. A new approach to evaluate regression models during validation of bioanalytical assays. *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.* 2006;41:219–227.
26. Skopp G. Preanalytic aspects in postmortem toxicology. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 2004;142:75–100.
27. Hackett J, Elian AA. Extraction and analysis of flunitrazepam/7-aminoflunitrazepam in blood and urine by LC–PDA and GC–MS using butyl SPE columns. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 2006;157:156–162.

Table 1

Sets' composition and corresponding work range. Working solution concentrations is presented, as well as the IS used for each analyte.

	Work Range	Substance	IS Set (5000 ng/mL)
Set 1 (10000 ng/mL)	50 - 4000 ng/mL	Tramadol	Tramadol-C ₁₃ .D ₃
		Ketamine	Benzoylecgonine-D ₃
		Cocaethylene	
Set 2 (500 ng/mL)	5 - 100 ng/mL	6-MAM	6-MAM-D ₃
		Fentanyl	
		PCP	PCP-D ₅
		Buprenorphine	Buprenorphine-D ₄
		Pseudoephedrine	
Set 3 (5000 ng/mL)	25 - 1000 ng/mL	Ephedrine	EME-D ₃
		Norephedrine	
		EME	
		TFMPP	
		d-Propoxyphene	PCP-D ₅
		Pethidine	
		N- Desmethyltramadol	Tramadol-C ₁₃ .D ₃
		O- Desmethyltramadol	
		EDDP	EDDP-D ₃
		3-MeO-PCP	PCP-D ₅
		Methadone	Methadone-D ₃
		Cocaine	Cocaine-D ₃
		Benzoylecgonine	Benzoylecgonine-D ₃
		Codeine	Codeine-D ₃
		Morphine	Morphine-D ₃

Table 2

Retention times, in minutes, and m/z ratios of the three diagnostic ions chosen for each psychotropic drug or metabolite, with the quantification ion highlighted in bolt.

Substance	Retention Time (min)	Diagnostic Ions (m/z)
Pseudoephedrine di-TMS	8.748	149 , 163, 179
Ephedrine di-TMS	8.805	149 , 163, 179
Norephedrine di-TMS	9.709	116 , 149, 280
EME-D ₃	10.584	99
EME	10.601	96 , 82, 83
TFMPP mono-TMS	11.534	302 , 287, 172
d-Propoxyphene	11.738	208 , 193, 178
Pethidine	12.089	247 , 246, 218
Ketamine	13.010	182 , 209, 152
PCP-D ₅	13.165	205
PCP	13.194	200 , 242, 243
Tramadol-C ₁₃ .D ₃ mono-TMS	13.611	339
Tramadol mono-TMS	13.628	335 , 245, 320
N-Desmethyltramadol di-TMS	13.829	189 , 202, 261
O-Desmethyltramadol di-TMS	14.040	58 , 303, 393
EDDP-D ₃	14.143	280
EDDP	14.160	277 , 276, 262
3-MeO-PCP	14.601	230 , 272, 273
Methadone-D ₃	14.847	297
Methadone	14.859	294 , 223, 309
Cocaine-D ₃	15.271	185
Cocaine	15.282	182 , 82, 303
Cocaethylene	15.595	196 , 94, 317
Benzoylecgonine-D ₃ mono-TMS	15.631	243
Benzoylecgonine mono-TMS	15.642	240 , 94, 361
Codeine-D ₃ mono-TMS	16.632	237
Codeine mono-TMS	16.638	234 , 178, 196
Morphine-D ₃ di-TMS	16.861	432
Morphine di-TMS	16.873	429 , 236, 414
6-MAM-D ₃ mono-TMS	17.233	402
6-MAM mono-TMS	17.251	399 , 287, 340
Fentanyl	17.970	245 , 146, 189
Buprenorphine-D ₄ mono-TMS	26.344	454
Buprenorphine mono-TMS	26.420	450 , 482, 506

Table 3

Obtained data in linearity and variances homocedasticity studies. Variances of the low concentration level (S^2_{lower}) and high concentration level (S^2_{upper}) were calculated for the analytes which coefficient of correlation $r^2 > 0.98$. The value of $F_{\text{calculated}}$ was obtained through S^2_{inferior} and S^2_{superior} values.

Set / Work Range	Analyte	r^2	S^2_{lower}	S^2_{upper}	$F_{\text{calculated}}$
Set 1 50 - 4000 ng/mL	Tramadol	0.999	8.24	25528.8	3097.973
	Ketamine	0.990	32.43	63578.4	1960.534
Set 2 5 - 100 ng/mL	Buprenorphine	0.994	0.23	13.19	56.870
	Fentanyl	0.992	4.60	53.06	11.532
	6-MAM	0.999	0.24	4.77	20.038
	Cocaethylene	0.991	0.46	40.20	87.048
	PCP	0.997	0.22	3.98	17.726
Set 3 25 - 1000 ng/mL	Pseudoephedrine	0.832	-	-	-
	Ephedrine	0.878	-	-	-
	Norephedrine	0.853	-	-	-
	EME	0.997	50.16	9294.65	185.311
	TFMPP	0.875	-	-	-
	d-Propoxyphene	0.993	23.17	575.19	24.827
	Pethidine	0.995	36.67	1996.21	54.441
	N- Desmethyltramadol	0.998	10.12	54063.6	5344.046
	O- Desmethyltramadol	0.991	40.49	2230.23	55.076
	EDDP	0.999	45.80	1959.02	42.771
	3-MeO-PCP	0.998	93.50	947.25	10.131
	Methadone	0.996	46.48	38756.4	833.914
	Cocaine	0.997	46.12	1214.42	26.332
	Benzoylcegonine	0.998	41.90	847.48	20.226
	Codeine	0.996	17.99	9487.28	527.217
	Morphine	0.995	10.88	16892.2	1552.65

Table 4

Weight factors (w) study results, based on eight calibration curves prepared for each of the 19 quantifiable compounds. The sum of relative errors ($\Sigma\%RE$) is shown and a classification was assigned to each w, between 1 and 6, in ascending order of $\Sigma\%RE$. Weight factors with r^2 (mean) lower than 0.99 had no classification.

Weight factors (w)	Tramadol			Ketamine			Buprenorphine			Fentanyl		
	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank
1/x ^{1/2}	0.993	835.2%	6	0.994	675.8%	5	0.996	702.8%	4	0.995	664.2%	4
1/x	0.993	483.6%	3	0.992	481.8%	3	0.996	589.3%	3	0.994	562.1%	3
1/x ²	0.993	309.6%	2	0.992	302.7%	1	0.992	268.5%	1	0.991	246.5%	1
1/y ^{1/2}	0.993	817.2%	5	0.995	622.9%	4	0.996	821.4%	6	0.995	765.6%	5
1/y	0.993	492.7%	4	0.989	553.8%	-	0.996	774.7%	5	0.995	498.7%	2
1/y ²	0.994	294.5%	1	0.991	317.8%	2	0.994	350.9%	2	0.989	285.7%	-
Weight factors (w)	Cocaethylene			PCP			EME			d-Propoxyphene		
	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank
1/x ^{1/2}	0.994	819.9%	4	0.996	874.9%	5	0.995	436.0%	5	0.994	538.4%	5
1/x	0.995	415.1%	2	0.994	666.3%	3	0.994	374.8%	3	0.993	415.9%	3
1/x ²	0.994	218.4%	1	0.993	259.1%	1	0.991	246.7%	1	0.993	228.6%	1
1/y ^{1/2}	0.994	851.7%	5	0.995	1114.8%	6	0.995	501.1%	6	0.986	471.4%	-
1/y	0.995	434.1%	3	0.994	750.4%	4	0.994	385.5%	4	0.993	427.7%	4
1/y ²	0.980	343.5%	-	0.992	284.8%	2	0.992	291.5%	2	0.992	265.6%	2
Pethidine			N-DT			O-DT			EDDP			

Weight factors (w)	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank
1/x ^{1/2}	0.991	586.5%	4	0.994	527.2%	2	0.996	426.3%	5	0.996	325.3%	5
1/x	0.990	446.0%	2	0.991	426.0%	1	0.995	342.8%	4	0.996	299.1%	3
1/x ²	0.988	277.3%	-	0.986	298.1%	-	0.994	249.2%	1	0.994	228.9%	1
1/y ^{1/2}	0.993	525.7%	3	0.992	545.3%	3	0.995	440.7%	6	0.996	409.8%	6
1/y	0.992	422.5%	1	0.989	393.3%	-	0.996	320.8%	3	0.995	304.5%	4
1/y ²	0.989	282.6%	-	0.984	318.8%	-	0.995	253.8%	2	0.993	248.3%	2
Weight factors (w)	Methadone			3-MeO-PCP			Cocaine			Benzoylecgonine		
	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank
1/x ^{1/2}	0.997	320.4%	5	0.995	552.1%	6	0.998	336.2%	5	0.996	369.8%	5
1/x	0.997	265.7%	4	0.995	311.8%	4	0.997	267.8%	3	0.995	300.9%	2
1/x ²	0.995	232.0%	1	0.994	234.2%	1	0.996	218.5%	1	0.994	261.1%	1
1/y ^{1/2}	0.997	330.5%	6	0.994	551.4%	5	0.998	346.9%	6	0.994	409.7%	6
1/y	0.997	251.4%	3	0.995	302.7%	3	0.996	324.5%	4	0.994	350.7%	4
1/y ²	0.995	241.3%	2	0.994	252.2%	2	0.996	221.3%	2	0.990	307.6%	3
Weight factors (w)	Codeine			Morphine								
	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank	r ² (mean)	Σ%RE	Rank						
1/x ^{1/2}	0.993	836.0%	3	0.993	815.0%	6						
1/x	0.991	524.7%	1	0.994	515.8%	3						
1/x ²	0.989	284.8%	-	0.990	332.6%	1						
1/y ^{1/2}	0.993	901.5%	4	0.994	713.3%	5						
1/y	0.991	697.3%	2	0.994	579.9%	4						
1/y ²	0.989	319.4%	-	0.992	346.6%	2						

Table 5

Results of the repeatability limit study, for each of the three quality control levels (QC) using different weight factors. The lowest percentage is classified with the lower rank number, and equal values are classified with the same rank number.

Repeatability limit (%)																		
Weight factors (w)	Tramadol						Ketamine						Buprenorphine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	13.8	2	20.3	2	10.8	2	13.8	2	19.9	2	32.0	2	39.9	2	14.6	4	8.3	2
$1/x$	14.6	3	20.5	4	10.9	3	14.3	3	20.3	4	32.5	3	43.0	3	14.8	5	8.3	2
$1/x^2$	15.1	5	20.7	5	11.0	4	15.2	4	21.0	5	33.5	4	46.1	5	15.4	6	8.3	3
$1/y^{1/2}$	13.7	1	20.2	1	10.8	1	13.8	1	19.9	1	32.0	1	39.5	1	14.5	1	8.3	2
$1/y$	14.6	4	20.5	3	10.9	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	44.5	4	14.6	3	8.3	1
$1/y^2$	15.1	6	20.7	5	11.0	4	15.2	5	21.0	3	33.5	5	46.7	6	14.5	2	8.3	1
Weight factors (w)	Fentanyl						Cocaethylene						PCP					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	35.1	2	19.1	3	11.6	4	20.5	2	10.9	3	17.6	2	24.5	2	13.7	1	14.7	2
$1/x$	36.9	4	19.5	5	11.5	3	23.5	4	11.8	4	17.8	4	25.0	3	13.8	2	14.7	3
$1/x^2$	36.6	3	19.1	2	11.6	5	24.6	5	11.9	5	17.8	5	27.9	5	14.0	5	14.7	5
$1/y^{1/2}$	34.8	1	18.4	1	11.3	1	20.0	1	10.6	2	17.6	1	24.2	1	13.8	3	14.6	1
$1/y$	37.3	5	19.2	4	11.5	2	21.9	3	10.3	1	17.7	3	25.2	4	13.8	4	14.7	5
$1/y^2$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.3	6	14.2	6	14.7	4
Weight factors (w)	EME						d-Propoxyphene						Pethidine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	19.7	5	28.3	2	22.3	5	27.6	4	18.6	4	22.8	5	30.2	4	29.6	4	31.5	4
$1/x$	19.5	3	28.4	3	22.3	4	25.8	5	18.3	3	22.6	4	27.5	3	29.2	2	31.2	1
$1/x^2$	18.3	1	28.5	4	22.2	1	24.4	2	18.1	1	22.5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
$1/y^{1/2}$	19.6	4	28.0	1	22.3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	26.4	2	29.5	3	31.4	3
$1/y$	19.7	2	28.6	5	22.3	6	25.6	3	18.3	2	22.6	3	25.7	1	29.2	1	31.2	2
$1/y^2$	19.1	6	28.6	6	22.2	2	24.4	1	18.1	1	22.5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-

Weight factors (w)	N-DT						O-DT						EDDP					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	27.4	1	23.3	1	58.2	3	13.8	2	18.9	2	11.1	3	25.4	2	23.0	3	14.1	3
$1/x$	28.7	3	23.6	3	58.1	2	14.0	3	18.9	3	11.0	2	25.8	4	22.9	2	14.0	2
$1/x^2$	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.4	4	19.1	4	11.0	1	26.4	6	23.2	6	14.1	6
$1/y^{1/2}$	27.5	2	23.4	2	58.0	1	13.7	1	18.9	1	11.1	3	25.1	1	22.4	1	13.8	1
$1/y$	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.8	6	19.3	6	11.0	2	25.8	3	23.0	4	14.0	4
$1/y^2$	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.8	5	19.2	5	11.0	1	26.3	5	23.2	5	14.1	5
Weight factors (w)	Methadone						3-MeO-PCP						Cocaine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	22.0	2	18.1	2	12.3	4	26.5	6	18.4	6	18.7	4	15.6	2	16.6	2	10.1	5
$1/x$	22.0	1	18.1	3	12.3	3	24.7	4	18.2	3	18.6	3	16.9	6	18.5	6	10.0	3
$1/x^2$	22.6	4	18.4	4	12.3	1	24.1	1	18.2	1	18.5	1	16.2	4	16.9	4	10.0	1
$1/y^{1/2}$	22.1	3	18.0	1	12.4	5	25.5	5	18.3	5	18.7	5	15.6	1	16.6	1	10.0	5
$1/y$	23.3	6	18.5	6	12.4	5	24.4	3	18.2	3	18.6	3	15.7	3	16.7	3	10.0	4
$1/y^2$	22.7	5	18.4	5	12.3	2	24.2	2	18.2	2	18.6	2	16.2	5	17.0	5	10.0	2
Weight factors (w)	Benzoylcegonine						Codeine						Morphine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	16.1	3	16.8	4	10.0	4	20.0	3	14.1	3	6.95	3	29.6	4	18.1	5	12.1	5
$1/x$	15.7	2	16.7	3	9.9	2	17.9	1	13.8	1	6.85	1	26.6	3	17.8	3	11.9	3
$1/x^2$	15.5	1	16.6	2	9.9	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	24.6	1	17.5	1	11.8	1
$1/y^{1/2}$	18.3	6	15.7	1	11.5	6	20.7	4	14.2	4	6.97	4	30.4	5	18.1	6	12.1	6
$1/y$	17.2	5	17.6	6	10.0	5	18.8	2	13.9	2	6.89	2	64.9	6	17.8	4	11.9	4
$1/y^2$	16.6	4	17.3	5	9.9	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.5	2	17.6	2	11.8	2

Table 6

Results of the expanded uncertainty study, for each of the three quality control levels (QC) using different weight factors. The lowest percentage is classified with the lower rank number, and equal values are classified with the same rank number.

Expanded uncertainty (%)																		
Weight factors (w)	Tramadol						Ketamine						Buprenorphine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	23.52	1	7.84	1	18.05	1	29.08	5	29.08	1	30.21	2	36.46	2	40.37	2	32.89	1
$1/x$	27.75	4	9.26	4	18.99	4	26.82	3	29.89	3	30.44	3	36.40	1	43.02	6	33.16	3
$1/x^2$	27.78	5	9.28	5	19.45	6	24.40	1	32.64	4	32.64	4	38.44	3	40.26	1	53.97	6
$1/y^{1/2}$	24.66	2	8.21	2	18.07	2	27.86	4	29.45	2	30.20	1	41.53	5	41.10	4	32.95	2
$1/y$	27.84	6	9.28	6	19.06	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	41.44	4	42.14	5	33.25	4
$1/y^2$	27.30	3	9.12	3	18.34	3	25.38	2	33.19	5	33.08	5	44.29	6	40.99	3	48.77	5
Weight factors (w)	Fentanyl						Cocaethylene						PCP					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	84.05	2	30.78	2	28.28	3	28.68	2	32.92	1	25.51	2	35.15	2	20.58	2	22.77	1
$1/x$	84.85	3	32.08	3	23.13	2	28.10	1	35.25	3	25.85	3	41.24	4	19.71	1	23.37	3
$1/x^2$	91.05	5	35.68	5	48.00	5	35.12	4	41.51	5	34.23	5	52.26	5	32.23	6	39.70	6
$1/y^{1/2}$	78.39	1	32.75	4	20.68	1	29.29	3	33.37	2	25.50	1	27.80	1	23.30	3	22.98	2
$1/y$	86.22	4	30.52	1	38.12	4	45.75	5	38.95	4	30.26	4	35.61	3	29.85	4	37.52	4
$1/y^2$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51.78	6	31.37	5	38.58	5
Weight factors (w)	EME						d-Propoxyphene						Pethidine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
$1/x^{1/2}$	36.37	4	32.09	4	40.93	6	35.15	1	24.47	2	27.11	2	59.82	1	39.64	3	33.38	4
$1/x$	39.12	5	31.67	2	40.39	4	35.64	2	24.26	1	27.20	3	63.35	3	37.47	1	30.73	1
$1/x^2$	40.74	6	31.39	1	36.86	3	38.54	5	25.96	4	27.33	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
$1/y^{1/2}$	33.81	1	32.01	3	40.49	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	61.94	2	40.66	4	33.37	3

1/y	35.45	3	53.23	5	29.91	2	37.95	4	24.72	3	26.90	1	64.79	4	39.46	2	33.23	2
1/y²	34.37	2	56.56	6	28.23	1	36.91	3	26.05	5	28.96	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weight factors (w)	N-DT						O-DT						EDDP					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
1/x^{1/2}	66.39	3	57.61	2	56.65	2	24.72	2	25.66	3	24.56	5	23.38	4	23.19	3	18.75	1
1/x	65.73	1	56.49	1	56.35	1	28.27	6	25.51	1	24.01	4	27.30	6	21.54	2	24.88	4
1/x²	-	-	-	-	-	-	27.90	5	27.13	4	18.93	2	25.07	5	27.05	5	19.62	3
1/y^{1/2}	66.23	2	57.63	3	58.64	3	23.76	1	25.60	2	24.58	6	22.17	1	20.73	1	25.02	6
1/y	-	-	-	-	-	-	26.58	3	41.56	6	23.45	1	22.81	3	23.69	4	18.94	2
1/y²	-	-	-	-	-	-	27.51	4	38.96	5	20.94	3	22.16	2	33.61	6	24.89	5
Weight factors (w)	Methadone						3-MeO-PCP						Cocaine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
1/x^{1/2}	29.12	1	20.88	3	25.23	5	30.58	1	26.54	3	28.77	6	26.09	4	21.31	4	24.94	6
1/x	29.40	3	20.65	1	24.54	4	38.09	3	26.70	6	28.40	3	28.23	6	21.05	1	24.01	3
1/x²	30.12	4	27.05	4	14.39	1	36.89	2	25.50	1	28.51	4	25.22	1	27.20	5	12.55	1
1/y^{1/2}	29.13	2	20.86	2	25.27	6	39.45	5	26.55	5	28.52	5	25.70	2	21.27	3	24.93	5
1/y	32.19	6	30.29	6	16.73	3	40.05	6	26.54	4	28.34	2	28.20	5	21.17	2	24.01	4
1/y²	30.93	5	28.17	5	15.12	2	39.31	4	25.85	2	27.18	1	25.80	3	28.33	6	13.07	2
Weight factors (w)	Benzoylecgonine						Codeine						Morphine					
	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank	QC 1	Rank	QC 2	Rank	QC 3	Rank
1/x^{1/2}	39.29	2	22.28	3	21.22	6	39.57	4	21.91	3	12.30	3	40.10	1	32.79	2	18.15	2
1/x	45.00	5	21.72	2	20.44	4	36.19	1	20.32	1	10.68	1	41.33	3	34.12	4	18.46	3
1/x²	46.34	6	17.44	1	20.69	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	45.05	5	25.86	1	15.73	1
1/y^{1/2}	38.88	1	23.35	4	17.80	3	39.54	3	21.87	2	11.74	2	40.12	2	33.86	3	20.37	6
1/y	41.10	3	35.02	6	15.67	2	38.34	2	24.16	4	13.08	4	55.52	6	34.13	5	18.52	4
1/y²	44.53	4	31.13	5	15.12	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	43.88	4	34.49	6	19.05	5

Table 7

Final rank classification for different w , based on the partial sums of each evaluated parameter: relative error (%RE), repeatability limit (r) and expanded uncertainty ($U(y)$). Highlighted in bold are the lowest classifications of the final rank, which correspond to the w best fitting the respective DA's work range.

Weight factors (w)	Tramadol				Ketamine				Buprenorphine			
	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>
	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$		$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$		$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	
$1/x^{1/2}$	6	6	3	15	5	6	8	19	4	8	5	17
$1/x$	3	10	12	25	3	10	9	22	3	10	10	23
$1/x^2$	2	14	16	32	1	13	9	23	1	14	10	25
$1/y^{1/2}$	5	3	6	14	4	3	7	14	6	4	11	21
$1/y$	4	10	17	31	-	-	-	-	5	8	13	26
$1/y^2$	1	15	9	25	2	13	12	27	2	9	14	25
Weight factors (w)	Fentanyl				Cocaethylene				PCP			
	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>
	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$		$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$		$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	
$1/x^{1/2}$	4	9	7	20	4	7	5	16	5	5	5	15
$1/x$	3	12	8	23	2	12	7	21	3	8	8	19
$1/x^2$	1	10	15	26	1	15	14	30	1	15	17	33
$1/y^{1/2}$	5	3	6	14	5	4	6	15	6	5	6	17
$1/y$	2	11	9	22	3	7	13	23	4	13	11	28
$1/y^2$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	16	16	34
Weight factors (w)	EME				d-Propoxyphene				Pethidine			
	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>	%RE	r	$U(y)$	<i>Final Rank</i>
	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$		$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$		$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	$\Sigma Rank$	
$1/x^{1/2}$	5	12	14	31	5	13	5	23	4	12	8	24

$1/x$	3	10	11	24	3	12	6	21	2	5	5	12
$1/x^2$	1	6	10	17	1	4	13	18	-	-	-	-
$1/y^{1/2}$	6	8	9	23	-	-	-	-	3	7	9	19
$1/y$	4	13	10	27	4	8	8	20	1	6	8	15
$1/y^2$	2	14	9	25	2	4	13	19	-	-	-	-

Weight factors (w)	N-DT				O-DT				EDDP			
	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank
	Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank		Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank		Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank	
$1/x^{1/2}$	2	5	7	14	5	7	10	22	5	8	8	21
$1/x$	1	8	3	12	4	8	11	23	3	8	12	23
$1/x^2$	-	-	-	-	1	9	11	21	1	18	13	32
$1/y^{1/2}$	3	5	8	16	6	5	9	20	6	3	8	17
$1/y$	-	-	-	-	3	14	10	27	4	11	9	24
$1/y^2$	-	-	-	-	2	11	12	25	2	15	13	30

Weight factors (w)	Methadone				3-MeO-PCP				Cocaine			
	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank
	Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank		Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank		Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank	
$1/x^{1/2}$	5	8	9	22	6	16	10	32	5	9	14	28
$1/x$	4	7	8	19	4	10	12	26	3	15	10	28
$1/x^2$	1	9	9	19	1	3	7	11	1	9	7	17
$1/y^{1/2}$	6	9	10	25	5	15	15	35	6	7	10	23
$1/y$	3	17	15	35	3	9	12	24	4	10	11	25
$1/y^2$	2	12	12	26	2	6	7	15	2	12	11	25

Weight factors (w)	Benzoylecgonine				Codeine				Morphine			
	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank	%RE	r	$U(y)$	Final Rank
	Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank		Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank		Σ Rank	Σ Rank	Σ Rank	
$1/x^{1/2}$	5	11	11	27	3	9	10	22	6	14	5	25
$1/x$	2	7	11	20	1	3	3	7	3	9	10	22
$1/x^2$	1	4	12	17	-	-	-	-	1	3	7	11

$1/y^{1/2}$	6	13	8	27	4	12	7	23	5	17	11	33
$1/y$	4	16	11	31	2	6	10	18	4	14	15	33
$1/y^2$	3	12	10	25	-	-	-	-	2	6	15	23

Table 8

Selected weight factors for 19 quantifiable analytes, according to the final rank classification.

Set / Work range	Analyte	Weight factor (w)
Set 1 50-4000 ng/mL	Tramadol	$1/y^{1/2}$
	Ketamine	$1/y^{1/2}$
Set 2 5-100 ng/mL	Buprenorphine	$1/x^{1/2}$
	Fentanyl	$1/y^{1/2}$
	6-MAM	$1/y^{1/2}$
	Cocaethylene	$1/y^{1/2}$
	PCP	$1/x^{1/2}$
Set 3 25-1000 ng/mL	EME	$1/x^2$
	d-Propoxyphene	$1/x^2$
	Pethidine	$1/x$
	N-Desmetiltramadol	$1/x$
	O-Desmetiltramadol	$1/y^{1/2}$
	EDDP	$1/y^{1/2}$
	Methadone	$1/x^2$
	3-MeO-PCP	$1/x^2$
	Cocaine	$1/x^2$
	Benzoylcegonine	$1/x^2$
	Codeine	$1/x$
	Morphine	$1/x^2$

Table 9

Data from extraction recovery assessment for analytes considered to quantification. Percentages (mean, n=3) obtained at low and high concentration levels are shown. Also, mean extraction recovery values are presented.

Analyte	Low level mean recovery (%)	High level mean recovery (%)	Mean Extraction Recovery (%)
Tramadol	81	85	83
Ketamine	77	86	82
Buprenorphine	44	48	46
Fentanyl	94	96	95
6-MAM	76	78	77
Cocaethylene	86	94	90
PCP	82	88	85
EME	102	92	97
d-Propoxyphene	112	91	101
Pethidine	95	99	97
N-DT	135	179	157
O-DT	93	93	93
EDDP	31	20	25
Methadone	86	86	86
3-MeO-PCP	100	100	100
Cocaine	97	91	94
Benzoylcegonine	78	74	76
Codeine	93	93	93
Morphine	61	63	62

Table 10

Coefficients of variation (CV) and repeatability limits (r) percentages for each of the three QC concentration levels studied for each drug of abuse. Highlighted in bold are the highest r values, chosen as repeatability limits of the method, for the corresponding substances.

Analyte	CV (%)	r (%)	CV (%)	r (%)	CV (%)	r (%)
Set 1 50-4000 ng/mL	QC 1 (500 ng/mL)		QC 2 (1500 ng/mL)		QC 3 (3000 ng/mL)	
Tramadol	4.9	13.7	7.2	20.2	3.9	10.8
Ketamine	4.9	13.8	7.1	19.9	11.4	32.0
Set 2 5-100 ng/mL	QC 1 (5 ng/mL)		QC 2 (10 ng/mL)		QC 3 (70 ng/mL)	
Buprenorphine	14.3	39.9	5.2	14.6	3.0	8.3
Fentanyl	12.4	34.8	6.6	18.4	4.1	11.3
6-MAM	7.7	21.4	4.8	13.3	4.5	12.5
Cocaethylene	7.2	20.0	3.8	10.6	6.3	17.6
PCP	8.8	24.6	4.9	13.7	5.2	14.7
Set 3 25-1000 ng/mL	QC 1 (100 ng/mL)		QC 2 (400 ng/mL)		QC 3 (700 ng/mL)	
EME	6.7	18.8	10.2	28.5	7.9	22.2
d-Propoxyphene	8.7	24.4	6.5	18.1	8.0	22.5
Pethidine	19.2	53.9	10.4	29.2	11.1	31.2
N-DT	10.3	28.7	8.4	23.6	20.8	58.1
O-DT	4.9	13.7	6.7	18.9	3.9	11.1
EDDP	9.0	25.1	8.0	22.4	4.9	13.8
Methadone	8.1	22.6	6.6	18.4	4.4	12.3
3-MeO-PCP	8.6	24.1	6.5	18.2	6.6	18.5
Cocaine	5.8	16.2	6.1	16.9	3.6	10.0
Benzoylcegonine	5.5	15.5	5.9	16.6	3.5	9.9
Codeine	6.4	17.9	4.9	13.8	2.4	6.9
Morphine	8.8	24.6	6.3	17.5	4.2	11.8

Table 11

Results obtained in real samples.

Case	Age	Sex	Medico-Legal ethiology	Results (ng/mL)
1	62	M	Accident	ODT (123) ; Tramadol (211)
2	57	M	Overdose	Methadone (904) ; EDDP (446) ; Cocaine (119) EME (535) ; Benzoylecgonine (2868)
3	38	M	Car accident	Cocaine (<25) ; EME (81) Benzoylecgonine (402)
4	62	F	Natural causes	NDT (227) ; ODT (59) ; Tramadol (1998)
5	46	F	Sepsis	ODT (40) ; Tramadol (76)
6	28	M	Motorbike accident	EME (29) ; Benzoylecgonine (534)
7	73	M	Natural causes	Morphine (67) Tramadol (940)
8	60	F	Suicide	NDT (218) ; ODT (138) ; Tramadol (532)
9	60	M	DUID	Morphine (36)
10	21	M	DUID	Morphine (73)
11	U	M	overdose	Codeine (78) ; Morphine (807) ; 6-AM (56) ; Methadone (733) ; NDT (32) ; ODT (80) ; Tramadol (181) ; EME (56) Benzoilecgonine (50)

U- unknown; NDT – N-Desmethyltramadol ; ODT – O-Desmethyltramadol ; EDDP (Methadone metabolite) ; DUID – Traffic control (Driving under the influence of drugs)

Supplementary data 1 – Results obtained in the Specificity/selectivity tests, per compound and per pool.

Ecgonine Methylester

		POOL					Control					Criteria		
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	ΔRel RT
1	m/z 82	54324	100,0%				23268	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	38855	71,5%			2	18003	77,4%				67,4/87.4	>3	<1
	m/z 96	34850	64,2%				16324	70,2%				60.2/80.2	>3	<1
2	m/z 82	23268	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	18003	77,4%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	16324	70,2%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
3	m/z 82	46760	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	36249	77,5%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	34061	72,8%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 82	52716	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	34619	65,7%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	31681	60,1%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
5	m/z 82	27362	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	20602	75,3%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	18768	68,6%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 82	23358	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	18451	79,0%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	17260	73,9%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 82	25627	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	19369	75,6%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	18885	73,7%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
8	m/z 82	5384	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	4000	74,3%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	3669	68,1%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
9	m/z 82	34376	100,0%				54324	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	25681	74,7%			1	38855	71,5%				61.5/81.5	>3	<1
	m/z 96	25040	72,8%				34850	64,2%				54.2/74.2	>3	<1
10	m/z 82	11615	100,0%				34376	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 83	8874	76,4%			10	25681	74,7%				64.7/84.7	>3	<1
	m/z 96	8557	74,0%				25040	72,8%				62.8/82.8	>3	<1

Pseudoephedrine

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 149	3855	100,0%				3444	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	817	21,2%			2	592	17,2%				12.2/22.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	539	14,0%				376	10,9%				5.9/15.9	>3	<1
2	m/z 149	3444	100,0%				4594	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	592	17,2%			3	611	13,3%				8.3/18.3	>3	<1
	m/z 179	376	10,9%				307	6,7%				1.7/11.7	>3	<1
3	m/z 149	4594	100,0%									-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	611	13,3%			2							>3	<1
	m/z 179	307	6,7%										>3	<1
4	m/z 149	5095	100,0%				3444	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	701	13,8%			2	592	17,2%				12.2/22.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	463	9,1%				376	10,9%				5.9/15.9	>3	<1
5	m/z 149	3938	100,0%				3855	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	853	21,7%			1	817	21,2%				16.2/26.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	512	13,0%				539	14,0%				9.0/19.0	>3	<1
6	m/z 149	3307	100,0%				3444	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	428	12,9%			2	592	17,2%				12.2/22.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	267	8,1%				376	10,9%				5.9/15.9	>3	<1
7	m/z 149	3922	100,0%				3855	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	655	17,0%			1	817	21,2%				16.2/26.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	389	10,0%				539	14,0%				9.0/19.0	>3	<1
8	m/z 149	5641	100,0%				4594	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	565	10,0%			3	611	13,3%				8.3/18.3	>3	<1
	m/z 179	266	4,7%				307	6,7%				1.7/11.7	>3	<1
9	m/z 149	5155	100,0%				3855	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	1074	20,8%			1	817	21,2%				16.2/26.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	613	11,9%				539	14,0%				9.0/19.0	>3	<1
10	m/z 149	2150	100,0%				3444	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	464	21,6%			2	592	17,2%				12.2/22.2	>3	<1
	m/z 179	306	14,2%				376	10,9%				5.9/15.9	>3	<1

Ephedrine

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▢Rel RT
1	m/z 149	7600	100,0%				5030	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	4923	64,8%			6	2844	56,5%				46.5/66.5	>3	<1
	m/z 179	3327	43,8%				1999	39,7%				31.8/47.7	>3	<1
2	m/z 149	5458	100,0%				5210	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	2320	42,5%			4	2227	42,7%				34.2/51.3	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1789	32,8%				1552	29,8%				23.8/35.7	>3	<1
3	m/z 149	3345	100,0%				5458	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	1322	39,5%			2	2320	42,5%				34.0/51.0	>3	<1
	m/z 179	996	29,8%				1789	32,8%				26.2/39.3	>3	<1
4	m/z 149	5210	100,0%				5458	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	2227	42,7%			2	2320	42,5%				34.0/51.0	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1552	29,8%				1789	32,8%				26.2/39.3	>3	<1
5	m/z 149	5030	100,0%				7600	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	2844	56,5%			1	4923	64,8%				54.8/74.8	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1999	39,7%				3327	43,8%				35.0/52.5	>3	<1
6	m/z 149	4038	100,0%				5458	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	1619	40,1%			2	2320	42,5%				34.0/51.0	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1195	29,6%				1789	32,8%				26.2/39.3	>3	<1
7	m/z 149	3638	100,0%				3345	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	942	25,9%			3	1322	39,5%				31.6/47.4	>3	<1
	m/z 179	714	19,6%				996	29,8%				23.8/35.7	>3	<1
8	m/z 149	5220	100,0%				5458	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	1992	38,2%			2	2320	42,5%				34.0/51.0	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1409	27,0%				1789	32,8%				26.2/39.3	>3	<1
9	m/z 149	5086	100,0%				7600	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	2893	56,9%			1	4923	64,8%				54.8/74.8	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1987	39,1%				3327	43,8%				35.0/52.5	>3	<1
10	m/z 149	3789	100,0%				7600	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 163	2275	60,0%			1	4923	64,8%				54.8/74.8	>3	<1
	m/z 179	1540	40,6%				3327	43,8%				35.0/52.5	>3	<1

Norephedrine

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▫Rel RT
1	m/z 116	469100	100,0%				126286	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	7850	1,7%			2	1632	1,3%				0.6/1.9	>3	<1
	m/z 280	10156	2,2%				2598	2,1%				1.0/3.1	>3	<1
2	m/z 116	126286	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	1632	1,3%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	2598	2,1%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
3	m/z 116	141865	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	3260	2,3%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	3050	2,1%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 116	297483	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	4556	1,5%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	6503	2,2%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
5	m/z 116	307015	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	5282	1,7%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	7300	2,4%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 116	239723	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	3788	1,6%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	5644	2,4%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 116	132058	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	2618	2,0%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	3085	2,3%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
8	m/z 116	70615	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	1258	1,8%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	1717	2,4%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
9	m/z 116	374532	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	4935	1,3%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	8728	2,3%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
10	m/z 116	200829	100,0%				469100	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 149	3414	1,7%			1	7850	1,7%				0.8/2.5	>3	<1
	m/z 280	5188	2,6%				10156	2,2%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1

TFMPP

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 302	21514	100,0%				7785	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	6324	29,4%			2	2202	28,3%				22.6/33.9	>3	<1
	m/z 172	3614	16,8%				1020	13,1%				8.1/18.1	>3	<1
2	m/z 302	7785	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	2202	28,3%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	1020	13,1%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
3	m/z 302	14018	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	4139	29,5%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	2231	15,9%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
4	m/z 302	15675	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	4496	28,7%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	2679	17,1%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
5	m/z 302	16307	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	4818	29,5%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	2427	14,9%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
6	m/z 302	14449	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	3883	26,9%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	2008	13,9%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
7	m/z 302	12014	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	3547	29,5%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	1970	16,4%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
8	m/z 302	8857	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	2288	25,8%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	1254	14,2%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
9	m/z 302	17314	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	5247	30,3%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	2679	15,5%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1
10	m/z 302	8673	100,0%				21514	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 287	2631	30,3%			1	6324	29,4%				23.5/35.3	>3	<1
	m/z 172	1271	14,7%				3614	16,8%				11.8/21.8	>3	<1

Propoxyphene

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 208	20307	100,0%				8737	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	13524	66,6%			2	6009	68,8%				58.8/78.8	>3	<1
	m/z 178	5834	28,7%				2279	26,1%				20.9/31.3	>3	<1
2	m/z 208	8737	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	6009	68,8%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2279	26,1%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
3	m/z 208	9952	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	6523	65,5%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2582	25,9%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
4	m/z 208	8932	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	5816	65,1%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2239	25,1%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
5	m/z 208	8876	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	5606	63,2%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2289	25,8%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
6	m/z 208	8602	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	6236	72,5%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2625	30,5%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
7	m/z 208	10051	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	6577	65,4%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2852	28,4%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
8	m/z 208	3952	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	2504	63,4%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	972	24,6%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
9	m/z 208	9657	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	6198	64,2%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	2586	26,8%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1
10	m/z 208	7694	100,0%				20307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 193	4760	61,9%			1	13524	66,6%				56.6/76.6	>3	<1
	m/z 178	1890	24,6%				5834	28,7%				23.0/34.5	>3	<1

Pethidine

		POOL					Control					Criteria		
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 247	39533	100,0%				18886	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	24570	62,2%			2	12386	65,6%				55.6/75.6	>3	<1
	m/z 218	34288	86,7%				16249	86,0%				76.0/96.0	>3	<1
2	m/z 247	18886	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	12386	65,6%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	16249	86,0%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
3	m/z 247	16496	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	10407	63,1%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	14016	85,0%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
4	m/z 247	25755	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	16690	64,8%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	19779	76,8%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
5	m/z 247	25333	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	16856	66,5%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	19917	78,6%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
6	m/z 247	22264	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	14136	63,5%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	18549	83,3%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
7	m/z 247	23564	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	15560	66,0%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	20595	87,4%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
8	m/z 247	6704	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	4328	64,6%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	6324	94,3%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
9	m/z 247	30497	78,6%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	19548	50,4%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	28445	93,3%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1
10	m/z 247	15831	100,0%				39533	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 246	10255	64,8%			1	24570	62,2%				52.2/72.2	>3	<1
	m/z 218	14609	92,3%				34288	86,7%				76.7/96.7	>3	<1

Ketamine

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 182	67106	100,0%				66736	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	51482	76,7%			2	50984	76,4%				66.4/86.4	>3	<1
	m/z 152	31441	46,9%				30562	45,8%				36.6/55.0	>3	<1
2	m/z 182	66736	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	50984	76,4%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	30562	45,8%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
3	m/z 182	77523	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	61547	79,4%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	36117	46,6%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 182	74594	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	51871	69,5%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	34203	45,9%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
5	m/z 182	71271	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	55576	78,0%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	31730	44,5%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 182	65806	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	51549	78,3%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	28827	43,8%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 182	79747	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	62939	78,9%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	34475	43,2%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
8	m/z 182	21882	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	17892	81,8%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	10006	45,7%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
9	m/z 182	70520	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	58046	82,3%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	30781	43,6%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
10	m/z 182	45990	100,0%				67106	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 209	38335	83,4%			1	51482	76,7%				66.7/86.7	>3	<1
	m/z 152	21517	46,8%				31441	46,9%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1

PCP

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▢Rel RT
1	m/z 200	7360	100,0%				6184	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	2073	28,2%			2	1826	29,5%				23.6/35.4	>3	<1
	m/z 243	1502	20,4%				1565	25,3%				20.2/30.4	>3	<1
2	m/z 200	6184	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	1826	29,5%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	1565	25,3%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
3	m/z 200	12220	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	3251	26,6%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	2979	24,4%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
4	m/z 200	7721	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	1999	25,9%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	1442	18,7%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
5	m/z 200	8824	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	2677	30,3%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	2233	25,3%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
6	m/z 200	7899	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	1989	25,2%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	1668	21,1%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
7	m/z 200	10427	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	2367	22,7%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	2544	24,4%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
8	m/z 200	2582	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	812	31,4%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	570	22,1%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
9	m/z 200	10054	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	3057	30,4%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	2300	22,9%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1
10	m/z 200	5560	100,0%				7360	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 242	1819	32,7%			1	2073	28,2%				22.5/33.8	>3	<1
	m/z 243	1106	19,9%				1502	20,4%				15.4/25.4	>3	<1

TRAMADOL

			POOL			Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	Rel RT
1	m/z 335	44686	100,0%				47721	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	44085	98,7%			2	44416	93,1%				83.1/103.1	>3	<1
	m/z 320	14904	33,4%				15799	33,1%				26.5/39.7	>3	<1
2	m/z 335	47721	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	44416	93,1%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	15799	33,1%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
3	m/z 335	51040	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	45599	89,3%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	16758	32,8%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
4	m/z 335	46812	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	45831	97,9%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	15822	33,8%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
5	m/z 335	58267	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	51679	88,7%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	18556	31,8%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
6	m/z 335	53326	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	47453	89,0%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	17104	32,1%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
7	m/z 335	56698	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	50309	88,7%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	18363	32,4%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
8	m/z 335	17816	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	15836	88,9%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	5874	33,0%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
9	m/z 335	59433	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	52851	88,9%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	18898	31,8%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1
10	m/z 335	39386	100,0%				44686	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 245	34965	88,8%			1	44085	98,7%				88.7/108.7	>3	<1
	m/z 320	12781	32,5%				14904	33,4%				26.7/40.0	>3	<1

N-DT

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	ΔRel RT
1	m/z 189	6049	100,0%				2036	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	2774	45,9%			2	790	38,8%				31.0/46.6	>3	<1
	m/z 261	1877	31,0%				584	28,7%				22.9/34.4	>3	<1
2	m/z 189	2036	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	790	38,8%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	584	28,7%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
3	m/z 189	1677	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	862	51,4%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	482	28,7%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 189	5303	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	1961	37,0%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	1639	30,9%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
5	m/z 189	4158	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	1961	47,2%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	1368	32,9%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 189	6973	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	2846	40,8%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	2288	32,8%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 189	784	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	352	44,9%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	240	30,6%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
8	m/z 189	1099	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	545	49,6%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	325	29,6%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
9	m/z 189	2149	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	966	45,0%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	626	29,1%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
10	m/z 189	1888	100,0%				6049	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 202	912	48,3%			1	2774	45,9%				36.7/55.0	>3	<1
	m/z 261	631	33,4%				1877	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1

O-DT

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 58	1080238	100,0%				411535	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	31080	2,9%			2	14477	3,5%				1.8/5.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	23043	2,1%				11440	2,8%				1.4/4.2	>3	<1
2	m/z 58	411535	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	14477	3,5%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	11440	2,8%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
3	m/z 58	671167	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	25265	3,8%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	20404	3,0%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 58	558942	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	15263	2,7%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	10731	1,9%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
5	m/z 58	649943	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	23770	3,7%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	18537	2,9%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 58	609879	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	22247	3,6%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	17327	2,8%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 58	645378	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	24508	3,8%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	19225	3,0%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
8	m/z 58	179359	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	7279	4,1%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	5716	3,2%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
9	m/z 58	620927	100,0%				1080238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	23260	3,7%			1	31080	2,9%				1.4/4.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	18978	3,1%				23043	2,1%				1.1/3.2	>3	<1
10	m/z 58	397382	100,0%				411535	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 303	16772	4,2%			2	14477	3,5%				1.8/5.3	>3	<1
	m/z 393	13598	3,4%				11440	2,8%				1.4/4.2	>3	<1

EDDP

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 277	19660	100,0%				5011	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	18428	93,7%			2	4793	95,6%				85.6/105.6	>3	<1
	m/z 262	10160	51,7%				2346	46,8%				37.5/56.2	>3	<1
2	m/z 277	5011	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	4793	95,6%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	2346	46,8%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
3	m/z 277	50108	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	45299	90,4%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	22308	44,5%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
4	m/z 277	6572	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	6259	95,2%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	3940	60,0%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
5	m/z 277	4918	99,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	4966	100,0%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	2963	59,7%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
6	m/z 277	4136	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	4020	97,2%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	2440	59,0%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
7	m/z 277	16325	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	13908	85,2%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	8029	49,2%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
8	m/z 277	4725	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	4316	91,3%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	2563	54,2%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
9	m/z 277	17410	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	16047	92,2%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	9784	56,2%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1
10	m/z 277	1650	100,0%				19660	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 276	1602	97,1%			1	18428	93,7%				83.7/103.7	>3	<1
	m/z 262	987	59,8%				10160	51,7%				41.7/61.7	>3	<1

3-MeO-PCP

		POOL					Control					Criteria		
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	ΔRel RT
1	m/z 230	165861	100,0%				81307	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	51433	31,0%			2	25662	31,6%				25.2/37.9	>3	<1
	m/z 273	49977	30,1%				25339	31,2%				24.9/37.4	>3	<1
2	m/z 230	81307	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	25662	31,6%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	25339	31,2%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
3	m/z 230	141286	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	43508	30,8%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	42708	30,2%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 230	96285	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	28747	29,9%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	27899	29,0%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
5	m/z 230	129557	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	40878	31,6%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	40402	31,2%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 230	114257	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	35990	31,5%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	35781	31,3%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 230	136197	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	43446	31,9%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	42668	31,3%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
8	m/z 230	40878	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	12979	31,8%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	13106	32,1%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
9	m/z 230	130419	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	40732	31,2%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	40138	30,8%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1
10	m/z 230	87293	100,0%				165861	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 272	27853	31,9%			1	51433	31,0%				24.8/37.2	>3	<1
	m/z 273	28112	32,2%				49977	30,1%				24.1/36.2	>3	<1

Methadone

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	Rel RT
1	m/z 294	17658	100,0%				12289	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	11210	63,5%			10	7428	60,4%				50.4/70.4	>3	<1
	m/z 309	1712	9,7%				963	7,8%				2.8/12.8	>3	<1
2	m/z 294	12238	100,0%				21255	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	4374	35,7%			3	6967	32,8%				26.2/39.3	>3	<1
	m/z 309	942	7,7%				2182	10,3%				5.3/15.3	>3	<1
3	m/z 294	21255	100,0%				12238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	6967	32,8%			2	4374	35,7%				28.6/42.9	>3	<1
	m/z 309	2182	10,3%				942	7,7%				2.7/12.7	>3	<1
4	m/z 294	14416	100,0%				12238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	4872	33,8%			2	4374	35,7%				28.6/42.9	>3	<1
	m/z 309	1415	9,8%				942	7,7%				2.7/12.7	>3	<1
5	m/z 294	17208	100,0%				12238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	7038	40,9%			2	4374	35,7%				28.6/42.9	>3	<1
	m/z 309	1741	10,1%				942	7,7%				2.7/12.7	>3	<1
6	m/z 294	16027	100,0%				12238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	6208	38,7%			2	4374	35,7%				28.6/42.9	>3	<1
	m/z 309	1827	11,4%				942	7,7%				2.7/12.7	>3	<1
7	m/z 294	15762	100,0%				12238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	4509	28,6%			2	4374	35,7%				28.6/42.9	>3	<1
	m/z 309	1360	8,6%				942	7,7%				2.7/12.7	>3	<1
8	m/z 294	7257	100,0%				12238	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	2100	28,9%			2	4374	35,7%				28.6/42.9	>3	<1
	m/z 309	760	10,5%				942	7,7%				2.7/12.7	>3	<1
9	m/z 294	12289	100,0%				17658	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	7428	60,4%			1	11210	63,5%				53.5/73.5	>3	<1
	m/z 309	963	7,8%				1712	9,7%				4.7/14.7	>3	<1
10	m/z 294	18286	100,0%				21255	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 223	4925	26,9%			3	6967	32,8%				26.2/39.3	>3	<1
	m/z 309	1858	10,2%				2182	10,3%				5.3/15.3	>3	<1

Cocaine

			POOL			Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	Rel RT
1	m/z 82	132950	100,0%				55524	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	131733	99,1%			2	55538	100,0%				90.0/110.0	>3	<1
	m/z 303	30739	23,1%				12669	22,8%				17.8/27.8	>3	<1
2	m/z 82	55524	100,0%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	55538	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	12669	22,8%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
3	m/z 82	92572	100,0%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	89508	96,7%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	18121	19,6%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
4	m/z 82	65128	100,0%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	62187	95,5%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	14420	22,1%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
5	m/z 82	66619	91,8%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	72566	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	17504	24,1%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
6	m/z 82	60926	90,8%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	67104	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	16221	24,2%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
7	m/z 82	78563	92,0%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	85427	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	21168	24,8%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
8	m/z 82	18393	98,4%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	18686	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	4658	24,9%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
9	m/z 82	79851	93,9%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	85074	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	19489	22,9%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1
10	m/z 82	48594	97,2%				132950	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 182	49971	100,0%			1	131733	99,1%				89.1/109.1	>3	<1
	m/z 303	13298	26,6%				30739	23,1%				18.1/28.1	>3	<1

Cocaethylene

		POOL				Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 196	8834	100,0%				10619	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	4061	46,0%			3	5743	54,1%				44.1/64.1	>3	<1
	m/z 317	2078	23,5%				2637	24,8%				19.8/29.8	>3	<1
2	m/z 196	11226	100,0%				9310	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	7103	63,3%			8	5130	55,1%				45.1/65.1	>3	<1
	m/z 317	2441	21,7%				2237	24,0%				19.0/29.0	>3	<1
3	m/z 196	10619	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	5743	54,1%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	2637	24,8%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
4	m/z 196	7643	100,0%				7439	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	4587	60,0%			10	3951	53,1%				43.1/63.1	>3	<1
	m/z 317	1890	24,7%				2006	27,0%				21.6/32.4	>3	<1
5	m/z 196	7522	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	3886	51,7%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	1720	22,9%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
6	m/z 196	7891	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	3807	48,2%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	1826	23,1%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
7	m/z 196	9310	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	5130	55,1%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	2237	24,0%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
8	m/z 196	2013	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	1098	54,5%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	518	25,7%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
9	m/z 196	7439	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	3951	53,1%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	2006	27,0%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
10	m/z 196	7192	100,0%				8834	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	2862	39,8%			1	4061	46,0%				36.8/55.2	>3	<1
	m/z 317	1879	26,1%				2078	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1

Benzoylecgonine

			POOL			Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	Rel RT
1	m/z 240	88279	100,0%				37297	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	39276	44,5%			2	16604	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	26392	29,9%				11613	31,1%				24.9/37.4	>3	<1
2	m/z 240	37297	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	16604	44,5%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	11613	31,1%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
3	m/z 240	62814	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	31619	50,3%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	17150	27,3%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
4	m/z 240	45373	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	22730	50,1%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	13420	29,6%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
5	m/z 240	62684	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	28492	45,5%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	19624	31,3%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
6	m/z 240	56913	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	24547	43,1%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	17989	31,6%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
7	m/z 240	64802	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	27022	41,7%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	21047	32,5%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
8	m/z 240	15730	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	6838	43,5%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	5370	34,1%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
9	m/z 240	69862	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	31333	44,8%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	21593	30,9%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1
10	m/z 240	39290	100,0%				88279	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 94	16869	42,9%			1	39276	44,5%				35.6/53.4	>3	<1
	m/z 361	13052	33,2%				26392	29,9%				23.9/35.9	>3	<1

Codeine

			POOL			Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	Rel RT
1	m/z 178	62141	100,0%				27330	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	49967	80,4%			2	21536	78,8%				68.8/88.8	>3	<1
	m/z 234	39323	63,3%				16496	60,4%				50.4/70.4	>3	<1
2	m/z 178	27330	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	21536	78,8%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	16496	60,4%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
3	m/z 178	44539	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	35506	79,7%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	27188	61,0%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
4	m/z 178	31362	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	24836	79,2%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	18460	58,9%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
5	m/z 178	38496	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	31117	80,8%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	24723	64,2%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
6	m/z 178	38756	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	30841	79,6%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	23929	61,7%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
7	m/z 178	41563	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	34182	82,2%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	26538	63,9%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
8	m/z 178	12083	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	9709	80,4%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	7400	61,2%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
9	m/z 178	42189	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	33708	79,9%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	25936	61,5%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1
10	m/z 178	28250	100,0%				62141	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 196	23186	82,1%			1	49967	80,4%				70.4/90.4	>3	<1
	m/z 234	18114	64,1%				39323	63,3%				53.3/73.3	>3	<1

Morphine

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	ΔRel RT
1	m/z 429	23559	100,0%				10588	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	20072	85,2%			2	8810	83,2%				73.2/93.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	11543	49,0%				5258	49,7%				39.7/59.6	>3	<1
2	m/z 429	10588	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	8810	83,2%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	5258	49,7%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
3	m/z 429	38229	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	34386	89,9%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	19681	51,5%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
4	m/z 429	18636	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	17123	91,9%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	9771	52,4%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
5	m/z 429	16517	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	14516	87,9%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	7988	48,4%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
6	m/z 429	13318	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	11655	87,5%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	6534	49,1%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
7	m/z 429	51036	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	40560	79,5%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	23781	46,6%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
8	m/z 429	10555	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	9497	90,0%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	5495	52,1%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
9	m/z 429	27063	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	23131	85,5%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	12873	47,6%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1
10	m/z 429	7802	100,0%				23559	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 236	6049	77,5%			1	20072	85,2%				75.2/95.2	>3	<1
	m/z 414	3470	44,5%				11543	49,0%				39.2/58.8	>3	<1

6-MAM

		POOL					Control					Criteria		
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	ΔRel RT
1	m/z 287	7194	100,0%				7570	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	4522	62,9%			3	4184	55,3%				45.3/65.3	>3	<1
	m/z 340	3431	47,7%				3450	45,6%				36.5/54.7	>3	<1
2	m/z 287	10324	100,0%				7570	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	4869	47,2%			3	4184	55,3%				45.3/65.3	>3	<1
	m/z 340	3937	38,1%				3450	45,6%				36.5/54.7	>3	<1
3	m/z 287	7570	100,0%				7194	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	4184	55,3%			1	4522	62,9%				52.9/72.9	>3	<1
	m/z 340	3450	45,6%				3431	47,7%				38.2/57.2	>3	<1
4	m/z 287	13678	100,0%				10222	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	2958	21,6%			6	2407	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
	m/z 340	2622	19,2%				2288	22,4%				17.4/27.4	>3	<1
5	m/z 287	10222	100,0%				13678	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	2407	23,5%			4	2958	21,6%				16.6/26.6	>3	<1
	m/z 340	2288	22,4%				2622	19,2%				14.2/24.2	>3	<1
6	m/z 287	7740	100,0%				7194	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	4442	57,4%			1	4522	62,9%				52.9/72.9	>3	<1
	m/z 340	3324	42,9%				3431	47,7%				38.2/57.2	>3	<1
7	m/z 287	8554	100,0%				10222	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	3952	46,2%			6	2407	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
	m/z 340	2447	28,6%				2288	22,4%				17.4/27.4	>3	<1
8	m/z 287	4684	100,0%				10222	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	1024	21,9%			6	2407	23,5%				18.5/28.5	>3	<1
	m/z 340	838	17,9%				2288	22,4%				17.4/27.4	>3	<1
9	m/z 287	10893	100,0%				7570	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	5248	48,2%			3	4184	55,3%				45.3/65.3	>3	<1
	m/z 340	4025	37,0%				3450	45,6%				36.5/54.7	>3	<1
10	m/z 287	6310	100,0%				13678	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 399	1406	22,3%			4	2958	21,6%				16.6/26.6	>3	<1
	m/z 340	1075	17,0%				2622	19,2%				14.2/24.2	>3	<1

Fentanyl

		POOL					Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	ΔRel RT	
1	m/z 245	5362	100,0%				5286	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	2569	47,9%			2	2513	47,5%				38.0/57.0	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	3043	56,8%				2687	50,8%				40.8/60.8	>3	<1	
2	m/z 245	5286	100,0%				5362	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	2513	47,5%			1	2569	47,9%				38.3/57.5	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	2687	50,8%				3043	56,8%				46.8/66.8	>3	<1	
3	m/z 245	7089	100,0%				5286	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	3271	46,1%			2	2513	47,5%				38.0/57.0	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	3587	50,6%				2687	50,8%				40.8/60.8	>3	<1	
4	m/z 245	6457	100,0%				5286	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	3051	47,3%			2	2513	47,5%				38.0/57.0	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	2752	42,6%				2687	50,8%				40.8/60.8	>3	<1	
5	m/z 245	6761	100,0%				5362	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	2727	40,3%			1	2569	47,9%				38.3/57.5	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	3285	48,6%				3043	56,8%				46.8/66.8	>3	<1	
6	m/z 245	5816	100,0%				5362	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	2919	50,2%			1	2569	47,9%				38.3/57.5	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	3187	54,8%				3043	56,8%				46.8/66.8	>3	<1	
7	m/z 245	5435	100,0%				5286	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	2536	46,7%			2	2513	47,5%				38.0/57.0	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	2256	41,5%				2687	50,8%				40.8/60.8	>3	<1	
8	m/z 245	7122	100,0%				5286	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	3961	55,6%			2	2513	47,5%				38.0/57.0	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	2947	41,4%				2687	50,8%				40.8/60.8	>3	<1	
9	m/z 245	6976	100,0%				5286	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	3378	48,4%			2	2513	47,5%				38.0/57.0	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	2871	41,2%				2687	50,8%				40.8/60.8	>3	<1	
10	m/z 245	7462	100,0%				5362	100,0%				-	>3	<1	
	m/z 146	3057	41,0%			1	2569	47,9%				38.3/57.5	>3	<1	
	m/z 189	3656	49,0%				3043	56,8%				46.8/66.8	>3	<1	

Buprenorphine

POOL						Control					Criteria			
		Abs area	Rel Area	S/N	Abs RT	Rel RT	A abs.	A rel.	S/N	TRA	TRR	Ionic ratio	S/N	▯Rel RT
1	m/z 450	871	100,0%				485	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	309	35,5%			2	166	34,2%				27.4/41.1	>3	<1
	m/z 506	170	19,5%				95	19,6%				14.6/24.6	>3	<1
2	m/z 450	485	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	166	34,2%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	95	19,6%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
3	m/z 450	1773	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	504	28,4%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	314	17,7%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
4	m/z 450	1152	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	335	29,1%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	176	15,3%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
5	m/z 450	1025	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	297	29,0%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	194	18,9%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
6	m/z 450	869	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	308	35,4%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	206	23,7%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
7	m/z 450	2832	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	849	30,0%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	511	18,0%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
8	m/z 450	582	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	201	34,5%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	129	22,2%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
9	m/z 450	1418	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	424	29,9%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	255	18,0%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1
10	m/z 450	723	100,0%				871	100,0%				-	>3	<1
	m/z 482	212	29,3%			1	309	35,5%				28.4/42.6	>3	<1
	m/z 506	130	18,0%				170	19,5%				14.5/24.5	>3	<1

Supplementary data S2 – Homocedasticity study results, per compound

Panel /work range	Analite	Level	Inj. 1	Inj. 2	Inj. 3	Inj. 4	Inj. 5	Average	<u>SD</u>	(S ²)	(CV) (%)	F _{crit}	F _{calc}	
		(ng/mL)												
Set 1 50-4000 ng/mL	Tramadol	50	97.2	91.2	91.8	92.1	96.6	93.7	2.87	8.24047	3.1	6.388	3097.973	
		4000	4070	3976	4164	3917	3743	3974	159.8	25528.75	4.0			
	Ketamine	50	205	191	197	192	196	196	5.7	32.42913	2.9		1960.534	
		4000	4285	4155	4067	4101	3619	4045	252.1	63578.41	6.2			
Set 2 5-100 ng/mL	Buprenorphine	5	5.39	5.64	4.51	4.66	5.21	5.08	0.482	0.23197	9.5		56.86972	
		100	94.5	90.7	96.4	90.3	87.2	91.8	3.63	13.19207	4.0			
	Fentanyl	5	8.11	3.07	3.25	3.20	4.73	4.47	2.145	4.601	48.0		11.53239	
		100	106	90.4	97.5	97.9	87.1	95.7	7.28	53.06052	7.6			
	6-MAM	5	5.0	4.25	3.87	3.94	3.91	4.20	0.492	0.24217	11.7		19.89788	
		100	98.9	95.1	96.6	95.3	92.9	95.8	2.20	4.81867	2.3			
	Cocaethylene	5	8.4	6.97	6.72	7.04	6.97	7.22	0.680	0.46183	9.4		87.0479	
		100	105.5	99.6	102	102	89.0	99.7	6.34	40.20133	6.4			
	PCP	5	6.6	5.93	5.55	5.39	5.53	5.79	0.474	0.22442	8.2		17.72645	
		100	102	98.1	101	97.0	100	99.6	1.99	3.97817	2.0			
Set 3 25-1000 ng/mL	EME	25	48.5	43.7	46.3	56.8	37.4	46.5	7.08	50.1569	15.2		185.3114	
		1000	1019	961	895	908	760	908	96.4	9294.647	10.6			
	d-Propoxiphen	25	-1.04	-1.41	0.37	22.7	-3.23	3.48	10.826	117.2079	311			4.972601
		1000	977	1032	989	994	969	992	24.1	582.8281	2.4			
	Pethidine	25	18.7	-1.90	9.86	29.9	8.84	13.1	11.91	141.9234	911	6.388	14.06543	
		1000	1024	945	960	990	1053	994	44.7	1996.214	4.5			
	N- Desmethyltramadol	25	39.4	41.2	39.5	46.3	38.4	41.0	3.18	10.1166	7.8		5344.046	
		1000	982	1160	1083	1042	567	967	232.5	54063.58	24.1			

Painel 3 (25-1000 ng/mL)	O- Desmethyltramadol	25	32.6	26.7	28.0	40.6	24.7	30.5	6.36	40.4935	20.9		55.07628
		1000	1021	1001	1021	977	907	986	47.2	2230.231	4.8		
	EDDP	25	37.1	41.1	42.0	54.8	46.7	44.3	6.77	45.80207	15.3		42.77132
		1000	1001	1030	1006	986	913	987	44.3	1959.015	4.5		
	3-Meo-PCP	25	21.8	9.2	16.8	34.6	14.1	19.3	9.67	93.50408	50.1		10.13058
		1000	1003	938	969	984	930	965	30.8	947.2508	3.2		
	Methadone	25	38.3	31.4	50.4	40.6	41.6	40.5	6.82	46.47527	16.8		833.9143
		1000	999	738	1164	901	1223	1005	196.9	38756.39	19.6		
	Cocaine	25	43.1	37.1	40.3	54.4	39.6	42.9	6.79	46.11958	15.8		26.33187
		1000	1037	951	995.2	973	957	983	34.9	1214.415	3.5		
	Benzoylcegonine	25	32.6	25.1	26.9	41.0	27.0	30.5	6.47	41.89983	21.2		20.22621
		1000	1004	989	982	950	933	972	29.1	847.4749	3.0		
	Codeine	25	1.25	0.27	10.2	4.52	8.66	4.99	4.399	19.35333	88.2		389.3838
		1000	883	833	997	808	987	901	86.8	7535.873	9.6		
	Morphine	25	20.0	19.5	27.1	22.4	25.4	22.9	3.30	10.87957	14.4		1552.65
		1000	969	934	1153	863	1144	1013	130.0	16892.17	12.8		

Supplementary data S3 - Results of the uncertainty study of the proposed method: u' accuracy corresponds to the relative uncertainty associated with precision, Rm is equivalent to the mean recovery, (Rm) indicates the uncertainty associated with fairness, t_{exp} represents the $t_{experimental}$ value obtained after the t-student test and $u'(Rm)$ corresponds to the relative uncertainty associated with accuracy.

Analite/Parameter	u' accuracy (%)	Rm (%)	$u(Rm)$ (%)	t_{exp}	$u'(Rm)$ (%)	u' accuracy (%)	Rm (%)	$u(Rm)$ (%)	t_{exp}	$u'(Rm)$ (%)	u' accuracy (%)	Rm (%)	$u(Rm)$ (%)	t_{exp}	$u'(Rm)$ (%)
Panel 1 50-4000 ng/mL		CQ 1 (500 ng/mL)				CQ 2 (1500 ng/mL)				CQ 3 (3000 ng/mL)					
Tramadol	12.01	93.42	2.80	2.3470	3.00	4.00	91.56	0.92	9.2055	1.00	8.81	90.94	2.00	4.5249	2.20
Ketamine	13.61	86.87	2.96	4.4420	3.40	14.44	80.09	2.89	6.8888	3.61	14.78	84.36	3.12	5.0197	3.69
Panel 2 5-100 ng/mL		CQ 1 (5 ng/mL)				CQ 2 (10 ng/mL)				CQ 3 (70 ng/mL)					
Buprenorphine	17.72	96.35	4.56	0.7996	4.56	19.34	119.43	6.17	3.1467	5.17	15.67	126.84	5.31	5.0515	4.19
Fentanyl	37.03	138.78	13.73	2.8232	9.90	15.84	105.52	4.47	1.3204	4.47	10.10	87.54	2.21	5.6337	2.53
6-MAM	20.62	127.59	6.58	4.1938	5.16	8.68	123.38	2.68	8.7326	2.17	11.04	99.82	2.76	0.0651	2.76
Cocaethylene	14.30	88.13	3.15	3.7691	3.58	16.29	88.66	3.86	2.9386	4.35	12.44	90.28	2.81	3.4610	3.11
PCP	17.03	102.21	4.35	0.5085	4.35	9.99	98.84	2.47	0.4710	2.47	11.15	82.07	2.29	7.8366	2.79
Panel 3 25-1000 ng/mL		CQ 1 (100 ng/mL)				CQ 2 (400 ng/mL)				CQ 3 (700 ng/mL)					
EME	19.79	97.70	4.83	0.4751	4.83	15.25	97.42	3.71	0.6960	3.71	17.91	96.77	4.33	0.7453	4.33
d-Propoxiphen	18.70	99.21	4.96	0.1599	4.96	12.67	89.49	2.83	3.7084	3.17	13.41	78.59	2.82	7.6010	3.58
Pethidine	30.89	90.76	7.49	1.2328	7.49	18.14	103.20	4.68	0.6839	4.68	14.95	94.80	3.79	1.3738	3.79
N-Desmethyltramadol	31.90	99.30	8.46	0.0832	8.46	27.37	101.99	7.46	0.2661	7.46	27.18	109.27	7.94	1.1681	7.94
O-Desmethyltramadol	11.59	90.54	2.62	3.6057	2.90	12.47	92.63	2.89	2.5500	3.12	11.98	91.23	2.73	3.2101	3.00
EDDP	10.81	91.91	2.48	3.2577	2.70	10.07	98.25	2.47	0.7064	2.47	12.13	100.27	3.04	0.0875	3.04
Methadone	14.64	95.87	3.51	1.1761	3.51	13.14	97.54	3.20	0.7686	3.20	6.99	96.39	1.69	2.1413	1.75
3-MeO-PCP	17.84	105.07	4.69	1.0822	4.69	12.35	102.59	3.17	0.8183	3.17	13.87	94.63	3.51	1.5301	3.51
Cocaine	12.29	92.40	2.84	2.6793	3.07	13.19	100.45	3.31	0.1355	3.31	6.10	97.71	1.49	1.5377	1.49
Benzoylcegonine	22.58	91.95	5.19	1.5502	5.19	8.48	95.66	2.03	2.1399	2.12	10.06	95.83	2.41	1.7303	2.41
Codeine	16.46	112.63	4.63	2.7250	4.11	9.80	109.12	2.67	3.4105	2.45	5.20	94.17	1.22	4.7662	1.30
Morphine	21.95	92.36	5.07	1.5073	5.07	12.53	102.24	3.20	0.6994	3.20	7.65	96.36	1.84	1.9775	1.84