

Abstract

 This study first measured concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in four selected workplace atmospheres, including the raw materials inlet, sintering grate, rough roll shredder and control room, and the outdoor environment of a sinter plant. Then, PAHs exposures and their resultant health-risks were assessed for sintering workers. We found that total PAH concentrations of the three selected sintering process areas were higher than that of the control room. The above results could be explained by the filtration effect of the air conditioning device installed inside the control room. PAH homologue distributions of the three selected sintering process areas were significantly different from that of the outdoor environment suggesting that PAHs found in the sintering workplace atmospheres were mainly contributed by process fugitives. Total PAH exposure levels were lower than the current permissible exposure limits, thus revealing that sintering workers are not a high risk group for long-term effects attributable to PAHs. Moreover, the lung cancer risks associated with the above PAH exposures were lower than the significant risk level defined by US Supreme Court further confirming that their exposures could be acceptable at this stage.

Keywords: Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, Sinter plant, Process fugitives, Exposure

assessment, Health risk assessment

1. Introduction

 It is known that several polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are mutagenic and/or carcinogenic in rodents, and some of them are human potential carcinogens [1]. PAHs can be generated from many human activities, such as industrial production, transportation, and waste incineration. In principle, the mechanisms associated with the generation and/or depletion of PAHs in the high-temperature combustion process followed three major pathways, including pyrosynthesis [2], direct emission of unburned fuel [3], and thermal destruction of fuel components [4]. For iron and steel industries, PAHs are released from coke manufacturing, sintering, iron making, casting, molding, cooling, and steel making processes [5]. PAHs emitted from iron and steel industries has been recognized as the second major source in Norway (accounting for 12% of the yearly total PAH emission) [6]. Intensive studies have been conducted to investigate PAH emissions from the stacks of various manufacturing processes in iron and steel industries [7]. However, measurements of process fugitive PAH concentrations in workplace atmospheres 60 have been focused mainly on coke ovens $[8-11]$. To the best of our knowledge, PAHs concentrations in sinter plant workplaces and their resultant health-risk impact on sintering workers have never been reported.

 To assess health risks associated with PAH exposures, it is important to know the total carcinogenic potency arising from the exposures of various PAH compounds. In principle, the carcinogenic potency of a given PAH compound can be assessed according to its 66 benzo[a]pyrene equivalent concentration (BaP_{eq}) . Calculating the BaP_{eq} concentration for a given PAH compound requires the use of its toxic equivalent factor (TEF; using benzo[a]pyrene as a reference compound) to adjust its original concentration [12-14]. Among the available TEFs lists, the one established by Nisbet and LaGoy in 1992 has been demonstrated to best reflect the actual state of knowledge of the toxic potency of each

 individual PAH species [14]. By using the TEF list the carcinogenic potency of total PAHs 72 (total BaP_{eq}) can be determined as the sum of BaP_{eq} concentrations of the 21 selected PAH compounds.

 For estimating the lung cancer risk associated with inhalatory PAH exposures, the 75 World Health Organization (WHO) has suggested a unit risk of 8.7 \times 10⁻² (μ g m⁻³)⁻¹ for the lifetime (=70 years) PAH exposure, assuming one was exposed to BaP concentration of 1 77μ g m⁻³ [15]. It is worth noting that the above unit risk was proposed for lifetime exposure, therefore, it has been adopted for assessing the exposure of general adults to the ambient atmospheric PAHs [16]. For occupational exposure, Pott established a relationship between BaP exposure and lung cancer risk [17], based on a data bank provided by an 81 epidemiological study conducted by Redmond et al. [18]. He suggested the unit risk of 7.0 82×10^{-2} (µg m⁻³)⁻¹ for a 25-year occupational PAHs exposure with the averaged BaP 83 concentration of 1 μ g m⁻³. By using the same data bank, the US Environmental Protection 84 Administration [19], however, suggested a different unit risk of 6.4 \times 10⁻⁴ (μ g m⁻³)⁻¹ for PAHs exposure based on its total PAH content (expressed as the benzene soluble fractions). Since a recent study has indicated BaP could be a better indicator than total PAH content on characterizing the carcinogenic potency of PAHs [20], the unit risk suggested by Pott in 1985 has been used in our previous study [21]. In this study, static air samplings were conducted in the above mentioned four workplaces to characterize PAH fugitive emissions from the sintering process. Time/activity patterns for workers of different job titles were recorded according to our field observation. By combining the above two types of information workers' PAH exposure levels were assessed and their resultant health risks were estimated. **2. Materials and Methods**

2.1. The selected sintering process

 One sinter plant located in southern Taiwan, with a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) air pollution control device, was selected in this study. For the selected sintering process, it first involves the mixing of iron ore fines, iron-bearing recovery materials (such as 99 iron-bearing dusts and slag), and fluxes (lime or dolomite) with a \sim 5 % finely divided fuel, such as coke breeze or anthracite. The mixture is then placed on a traveling grate to form a sintering bed. The traveling grate resembles an endless loop of a conveyor belt, forming a shallow trough with small holes in the bottom. The bed is ignited by passing under an ignition burner which is fired with natural gas and air. During the ignition process, the air is pulled down through the bed as the grate moves slowly toward the discharge end. As the coke fines burn in the bed, the generated heat sinters/or fuses the fine particles. The temperature of the bed is around 1,300 to 1,500 ºC. Mean production rates are 20 to 40 107 metric tons $m² d⁻¹$ depending upon the characteristics of the ore materials and the sintering conditions [22]. Typical operation conditions for the sintering process have been described in more details elsewhere [23-24]. For sinter plant workers, they are required to perform their work tasks at the nearby of the raw materials inlet, sintering grate, rough roll shredder, and control room.

2.2. Sampling strategy and worker's time/activity pattern

 Three sampling sites located approximately 2 m away from the raw materials inlet (Site #1), sintering grate (Site #2), and rough roll shredder (Site #3) were selected to characterize PAH concentrations in the sintering workplaces of the selected sinter plant. For the selected sinter plant, the air introduced to the control room (located at the end of the sintering grate) was directly drawn from the workplace atmosphere of the sinter plant but was filtered by an air conditioner. Static air samplings were also conducted in the control room (Site #4) in order to characterize fugitives transferring from the sintering zone to the control room. The

 location of the above sampling sites in the selected sintering plant are shown in Figure 1. Field samplingswere also conducted on the outdoor environment located at the upwind side of the selected sinter plant (Site #5) for comparisons. All air samples were colleted by using a high-volume PS-1 sampler (Greaseby Anderson, GA). This sampler was equipped with a quartz-fibre filter to collect PAHs of the particle phase, and followed by a XAD-16 cartridge for collecting PAHs of the gas phase. To avoid effluent stream from PS-1 dilute the total suspended particle (TSP) and PAH concentration in control room, the effluent gas from PS-1 sampler was discharged to the outside of the control room. The sampling flow 129 rate was specified at \sim 0.18 m³ min⁻¹. Each sample was collected continuously for \sim 24 hrs 130 (i.e., sampling volume = \sim 250 m³). The time/activity patterns of the four selected groups sintering workers were recorded based on our field observation (Table 1). Group A (i.e., raw material charging workers) on average stayed at Site #1 (raw materials inlet) and Site #4 (control room) for 1.67 hr and 6.33 hr, accounting for 20.8% and 79.2% of their total work time (8hr), respectively. Group B (i.e., sintering grate workers) on average stayed at Site #2 (sintering grate) and Site #4 for 2.5 hr and 5.5 hr, accounting for 31.2% and 68.8% of their total work time, respectively. Group C (i.e., shredding workers) on average stayed in Site #3 (rough roll shredder) and Site #4 for 3.0 hr and 5.0 hr, accounting for 37.5% and 62.5% of their total work time, respectively. Group D (i.e., sintering process engineers and supervisors) on 140 average stayed in Site #1, Site #2, Site #3 and Site #4 for 1.33, 1.33, 1.33 and 4.0 hr, 141 accounting for 16.7%, 16.7%, 16.7% and 50.0% of their total work time, respectively. *2.3. PAH analysis*

 For PAH analysis, each collected sample (including particulate and gaseous PAH samples) was extracted in a Soxhlet extractor with a mixed solvent (n-hexane and

to check their response factors, the recovery efficiencies for PAHs analysis and to

 determine final concentrations. The recovery efficiencies of 21 individual PAHs and these two internal standards were determined by processing a solution containing known PAH concentrations through the same experimental procedure used for the samples. Recovery efficiency was measured via analyzed mass of PAH divided by input mass of known PAH. This study showed the recovery efficiencies for the 21 PAH compounds range from 0.795 to 0.972, with an average value of 0.881. The recovery efficiencies of two internal standards (phenanthrene-d10 and perylene-d12) were between 85.7% and 93.5 and were fairly constant. The recovery efficiencies of these two internal standards (phenanthrene-d10 and perylene-d12) were averaged and used for the quantification. This action will control the analysis error to be less than 15%, which guarantees the reported data of this study being at an excellent level. Analyses of field blanks, including aluminum foil, glass fiber filter and an PUF/XAD-16 cartridge, revealed no significant contamination (GC/MSD integrated area < detection limit).

2.4. Data analysis

 In this study, the total-PAH concentration represents the sum of the concentrations of 21 PAH compounds for each collected sample. PAHs were grouped into three categories based on their molecular weights, including low molecular weight PAHs (LMW-PAHs, containing two- and three-ringed PAHs), middle molecular weight PAHs (MMW-PAHs, containing four-ringed PAHs), and high molecular weight PAHs (HMW-PAHs, containing five- to seven-ringed PAHs).

 In this study, the carcinogenic potencies associated with PAH emissions to each workplace atmosphere were also determined. Here, the carcinogenic potency of a given PAH compound was assessed according to its benzo[a]pyrene equivalent concentration (i.e., BaPeq) by using the TEFs list established by Nisbet and LaGoy in 1992 [14]. The

196 carcinogenic potency of total PAHs (i.e., total BaP_{eq}) was determined as the sum of BaP_{eq} concentrations of the 21 selected PAH compounds. To assess workers' excessive lung cancer risks associated with a 25-yr occupational exposure, the unit risk suggested by Pott 199 in 1985 (= 7×10^{-5} (BaPeq ng m⁻³)⁻¹) was used in the present study [17]. This is mainly because BaP is a better indicator than total PAH content on characterizing the carcinogenic potency of PAHs [20].

202 All measured and estimated concentrations were presented in their means \pm standard 203 deviation $(\pm SD)$. Statistical significance was examined by using the *t*-test.

204 **3. Results and Discussion**

205 *3.1. TSP concentrations in sintering workplaces and the outdoor environment*

206 Table 2 shows the mean total suspended particle (TSP) concentrations of the four 207 selected workplaces and the outdoor environment of the selected sinter plant. For the four 208 selected workplaces, the highest TSP was found at Site #1 (=2690 μ g Nm⁻³), which was 209 considered due to dust emissions from the raw material charging process. The second and 210 third highest TSP were found at Site #2 and Site #3 (=2130 and 1600 μ g Nm⁻³,

211 respectively), bur their concentrations were much lower than that of Site $#1 (p<0.05)$. This

212 might be because the strong airflow was pulled down through the sintering bed resulting in

213 less fugitive TSP emitted into the sintering zone. TSP concentrations in Site #1, Site #2 and

214 Site #3 were 18.4, 14.6 and 10.9 times in magnitude higher than that in Site #4 (=146 μg

215 Nm⁻³) (p <0.05). This might be explained either by the location of the control room being

216 far away from the sintering process, or by the filtration efficiency (TSP reduction fraction

 $217 \rightarrow 95\%$) of the air conditioning device used in the control room. The permissible TSP

218 concentration in workplace environment in Taiwan is 10,000 μ g Nm⁻³, which was

219 significantly higher than that of Site $#1$ –Site $#4$ ($p \le 0.05$). Nevertheless, it should be noted

220 that the concentrations found in Site $#1-Site$ #3 were still higher than that of the outdoor

221 environment (i.e., Site $#5 = 143 \mu g Nm^{-3}$) ($p < 0.05$). The above result suggests that TSP 222 concentrations found in the sintering process areas were mainly contributed by the process 223 fugitives, rather than those transported from the outdoor environment.

224

225 *3.2. Characterization of PAH concentrations in sintering workplaces and the outdoor* 226 *environment*

227 Table 3 shows the mean PAH concentrations (gas- + particle-phase) of the four 228 selected workplaces and the outdoor environment of the sinter plant. For the mean total 229 PAH concentrations, we found that Site #2 (30.4 μ g Nm⁻³) was significantly higher than 230 that of Site #1 (17.9 μ g Nm⁻³) and Site #3 (16.3 μ g Nm⁻³) (p <0.05), which was considered 231 due to molten process in the furnace. The concentrations found in the above three selected 232 sintering zone workplaces were significantly higher than that of the Site #4 (8.37 μ g Nm⁻³) 233 (*p*<0.05). The relatively low total PAH concentrations found in the Site #4 (i.e., control 234 room) could be explained again either by its location being far away from the sintering 235 zone, or the filtration effect of the air conditioning device used in the control room. 236 Moreover, we also found that the PAH concentrations obtained from the sintering zones 237 (Site #1-Site #3 = 16.3 - 30.4 µg Nm⁻³) were much higher than that of outdoor environment 238 (Site $#5 = 7.42 \mu g Nm^{-3}$) ($p < 0.05$). The above results further confirmed that PAHs found in 239 the workplace atmospheres could be mainly contributed by sintering process fugitives, 240 rather than that transported from the outdoor environment. 241 Regarding the measured total BaP_{eq} concentrations (i.e., gas- + particle-phase), the

242 concentration found in the Site #2 (0.16 μ g Nm⁻³) was higher than those found in Site #1 243 and Site #3 (0.12 and 0.13 μ g Nm⁻³, respectively) (p <0.05). The pattern was similar to that 244 found in the corresponding total PAH concentrations, since the above three selected 245 sampling sites shared with similar PAH homologue distributions. Finally, total BaP $_{eq}$

concentrations in the workplace atmospheres

266 Table 4 shows gas- and particle-phase PAHs containing in total PAH and total BaP_{eq}

concentrations for samples collected from the workplace atmosphere of the selected sinter

- 268 plant. For total PAH, concentrations of the gas-phase PAHs $(8.33-30.1 \,\mu g Nm^3)$, accounting
- for 98.3%-99.5% total PAHs) were consistently higher than that of particle-phase
- 270 $(0.042 0.365 \,\mu g \,\text{Nm}^3)$, accounting for 0.5%-1.7% total PAHs) for any given studied

271 workplaces $(p<0.05)$. The above results can be explained by total PAHs were dominated by

272 LMW-PAHs (Table 3). For total BaP_{eq} , concentrations of the gas-phase (0.037-0.121 µg)

273 Nm⁻³) were also higher than that of particle-phase $(0.003$ -0.039 μ g Nm⁻³) for any given

274 studied workplaces (*p*<0.05). However, particle-phase PAHs had more contribution to total

275 BaP_{eq} $(8.1-24.1\%)$ than to total PAHs $(0.5\%-1.7\%)$. The above results can be explained by

276 total PAHs were dominated by LMW-PAHs which are known with low TEFs (Table 3).

277 Finally, it should be noted that the concentrations of both gas- and particle-phase

278 PAHs found in the outdoor environment (site #5) were consistently lower than that of the

279 sintering zone (i.e., Site #1-Site #3) (*p*<0.05) (Table 4). Particularly, the contributions of

280 gas- and particle-phase PAHs to both total PAHs and total Ba P_{eq} for samples collected from

281 the outdoor environment were quite different from that of sintering zone $(p<0.05)$ (Table 4).

282 The above results further confirm that PAHs found in the workplace environments were

283 mainly contributed by the process fugitives rather than the outdoor environment.

284 *3.4. Health-risk assessment for sintering workers exposed to PAHs*

285 In this study, worker's time-weighted average exposure was estimated based on the 286 following equation:

287 $C_{ave} = (C_i \times T_i)/\Sigma T_i$

288 Where, C_{ave} was the worker's time-weighted average exposure to total PAHs (denoted as

289 total PAHs_{ave}) and total BaPeq (denoted as total BaPeq_{ave}); C_i was the worker's exposure

290 concentration to total PAHs at the ith site (i.e., total PAHs_i, see Table 3) and to total BaPeq

291 at the ith site (i.e., total BaPeq_i, see Table 2); T_i was the time of the given worker spent at

292 the ith site (see Table 1); and ΣT_i was the time for the given worker spent at all involved

293 work sites.

294 Table 5 shows total PAHs_{ave} and total BaPeq_{ave}, and their corresponding gas-phase 295 and particle-phase concentrations. In addition, the estimated lung cancer risks for the four 296 selected exposure groups based on their total BaPeq_{ave} and the corresponding gas-phase and 297 particle-phase concentrations were also presented in Table 5. For total PAHs_{ave,} its 298 corresponding gas-phase concentration $(=82.3-121 \text{ ng m}^{-3})$ was consistently higher than 299 that of particle phase $(=0.685-23.3 \text{ ng m}^3)$ $(p<0.05)$. Particularly, all selected exposure 300 groups were found with total PAHs_{ave} $(=83.0-122 \text{ ng m}^3)$ significantly lower than the 301 current permissible exposure limit regulated in Taiwan for PAHs $(=200,000 \text{ ng/m}^3)$ 302 (*p*<0.05). The above results suggest that PAH exposures to sintering workers might not be 303 particularly significant. In this study, the unit risk suggested by Pott in 1985 ($=7 \times 10^{-5}$) 304 (BaPeq ng m⁻³)⁻¹) was used to assess workers' any excess of risk for lung cancer associated 305 with a 25-yr occupational exposure [17]. We found that the total BaP_{ave} fell to the range of 306 0.454–0.705 ng m⁻³. The corresponding gas-phase concentration (=0.450–0.614 ng m⁻³) 307 was significantly higher than that of particle-phase $(=0.004-0.137 \text{ ng m}^3)(p<0.05)$ 308 suggesting that the former had a more contribution on worker's lung cancer risk. However, 309 by taking both gas- and particle-phase together (i.e., total BaP_{ave}), the resultant lung cancer 310 risks $(=3.18\times10^{-5}-4.98\times10^{-5})$ were consistently lower than the significant risk level $(=10^{-3})$ 311 which was defined by the US Supreme Court [30]. The above results further confirm that 312 PAH exposures to sintering workers might be acceptable at this stage.

313

314 **4. Conclusions**

 The present paper shows that both TSP and total PAH concentrations of the three selected sintering process areas were higher than that of the control room. The above results could be explained by the filtration efficiency of the air conditioning device installed inside the control room. PAH homologue distributions of the three selected sintering process areas were significantly different from that of the outdoor environment suggesting that PAHs found in the sintering workplace atmospheres were mainly contributed by process fugitives.

 Total PAH exposure levels in the selected areas of the sintering plant were lower than the current permissible exposure limits, thus suggesting that sintering workers are usually exposed to quite low PAH concentrations. Consistently, our risk estimate for the lung cancer risks associated with the above PAH exposures gave lower values as compared to the significant risk level defined by US Supreme Court. **Acknowledgments:** This research was supported in part by the Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH) of the Council of Labor Affairs in Taiwan. Mr. H.C. Hou and Miss UnSam Ha, Department of Environmental Engineering, National Cheng Kung University, are appreciated for assisting in the laboratory work. **References** [1] Internal Agency for Research on Cancer, IARC monographs on evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans, overall evaluation of carcinogenicity: An updating of monographs. IARC Monogr. Eval. Carcinog. Risk Chem. Hum., Lyon, 1-42(1987) 1-440. http://monographs.iarc.fr [2] A. Bjørseth, Handbook of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, vol. 1. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1983.

- [3] P.T. Williams, M.K. Abbass, G.E. Andrews, Diesel particulate emission: the role of unburned fuel, Combustion Flame 75(1989) 1-24.
- [4] P.J. Tancell, M.M. Rhead, R.D. Pemberton, J. Braven, Survival of polycylic aromatic hydrocarbons during diesel combustion, Environ. Sci. Technol. 29(1995) 2871-2876.
- [5] D. Nelson, P.A. Scheff, C. Keil, Characterization of volatile organic compounds contained in coke plant emissions. In: The 84th Annual meeting & Exhibition of Air
- & Waste Manage. Assoc., Vancouver, BC, vol. 6. pp. 79–91, 1991.
- http://www.awma.org or Keil email: ckeil@bgnet.bgsu.edu
- [6] A. Bjorseth, T. Ramdahl, Sources and emissions of PAH. In: Emission Sources and
- Recent Progress in Analytical Chemistry Handbook of Polycyclic Aromatic
- Hydrocarbons, vol. 2. Marcel Dekker, New York and Barcel, 1985.
- [7] H.-H Yang, S.-O. Lai, L.-T. Hsieh, H.-J. Hsueh, T.-W. Chi, Profiles of PAH
- emission from steel and iron industries, Chemosphere 48(2002) 1061-1074.
- [8] W.L. Lloyd, Long-term study of steelworkers-respiratory cancer in coke plant workers. J. Occup. Med. 13(1971) 53–68.
- [9] E.S. Gibson, R.H. Martin, J.N. Lockington, Lung cancer mortality in a steel foundry. J. Occup. Med. 19(1977) 807–812.
- [10] N.R. Khalili, P.A. Scheff, T.M. Holsen, PAH source fingerprints for coke ovens,
- diesel and gasline engines, highway tunnels, and wood combustion emissions. Atm. Environ. 29(1995) 533-542.
- [11] L. Pyy, M. Mäkelä, E. Hakala, K. Kakko, T. Lapinlampi, A. Lisko, E. Yrjänheikki,
- K. Vähäkangas, Ambient and biological monitoring of exposure to polycyclic
- aromatic hydrocarbons at a coking plant. Sci. Total Environ. 199(1997) 151-158.
- [12] M-M. Chu, C.-W. Chen, Evaluation and estimation of potential carcinogenic risks of
- polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons; Conference Record of the 1984 Pacific Rim
- Risk Conference on polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the workplace, Honolulu,
- HI, 1984.
- [13] T. Thorslund, D. Farrer, Development of relative potency estimated for PAHs and
- hydrocarbon combustion product fractions compared to benzo(a)pyrene and their
- use in carcinogenic risk assessments; U.S. Environmental Protection Administration
- (EPA), Washington DC, 1991.
- [14] C. Nisbet, P. LaGoy, Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), Reg. Tox. Pharmocol 16(1992) 290-300.
- [15] WHO, Air quality guideline for Europe. WHO European Series, WHO Regional office for Europe, Copenhagen, 1987, 105-117. http://www.euro.who.int/air
- [16] D. Zmirou, P. Masclet, C. Boudet, F. Dor, J. Dechenaux, Personal exposure to
- atmospheric polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in a general adult population and
- lung cancer risk assessment, J. Occup. Environ. Health 42(2000) 121-125.
- [17] F. Pott, Pyrolyseagase, PAH und lungenkrebrisiko daten und bewertung.
- Staub-Reinhaltung dedr Luft 45(1985) 368-379.
- [18] C. Redmond, B. Strobino, R. Cypess, Cancer experience among coke by-product workers. Ann. NY Acad. Sci. 217(1976) 102-115.
- [19] US EPA., Health effects assessments for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).
- US Environmental Protection Agency EPA, Environmental Criteria and Assessment
- Office, EPA 549/1-86-013, Cincinnati, OH, 1984.
- http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=38617
- [20] T. Petry, P. Schmid, C. Schlatter, The use of toxic equivalency factors in assessing
- occupational and environmental health risk associated with exposure to airborne
- mixtures of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), Chemosphere 32(1996)
- 639-648.
- [21] P.-J. Tsai, H.-Y. Shieh, W.-J. Lee, , S.-O. Lai, Health-risk assessment for workers
- exposed to polycyclic aAromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in a carbon black
- 392 manufacturing industry. Sci. Total Environ. 278(2001) 137–150.
- [22] U.S. EPA, Database of sources of environmental releases of dioxin like compounds
- in the United States. EPA/600/C-01/012. Washington, DC: U. S. Environmental
- Protection Agency, 2001. http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/2001-jan.htm
- [23] M.K. Cieplik, J.P. Carbonell, C. Muńoz, S. Baker, S. Krüger, P. Liljelind, S.
- Marklund, R. Louw, On dioxin formation in iron ore sintering,. Environ Sci Technol 37(2003) 3323-3331.
- [24] L.-C. Wang, W.-J. Lee, P.-J. Tsai, W.-S. Lee, G.-P.Chien-Chang, Emissions of
- polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans from stack flue gases of sinter plants. Chemosphere 50(2003) 1123-1129.
- [25] P.-J. Tsai, H.-Y. Shieh, W.-J. Lee, S.O. Lai, Characteristics of the exposure profiles
- for workers exposed to airborne dusts and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)
- in the carbon black manufacturing industry. J Occup Health 43(2001) 118-128.
- [26] H.-H. Mi, W.-J. Lee, S.-J. Chen, T.-C. Lin, T.-L.Wu, J.-C. Hu, Effect of the Gasoline Additives on PAH Emission. Chemosphere 36(1998) 2031-2041.
- [27] H.-H. Mi, W.-J. Lee, P.-J. Tsai, C.-B. Chen, A Comparison on the Emission of
- Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and Their Corresponding Carcinogenic
- Potencies from a Vehicle Engine Using Leaded and Lead-Free Gasoline. Environ Health Persp 109(2001) 1285-1290.
- [28] C.-T. Li, Y.-C. Lin, W.-J. Lee, P.-J. Tsai, 2003. Emission of polycyclic aromatic
- hydrocarbons and their carcinogenic potencies from cooking sources to the urban atmosphere. Environ. Health Persp. 111(2001) 483-487.
- [29] Y.-C. Lin, W.-J. Lee, H.-W. Li, C.-B. Chen, G.-C. Fang, P.-J. Tsai, Impact of using
- fishing boat fuel with high poly-aromatic content on the emission of polycyclic
- aromatic hydrocarbons from the diesel engine. Atm. Environ. 40(2006) 1601-1609.
- [30] J.V. Rodrics, S.M. Brett, G.C. Wrenn, Significant risk decisions in Federal regulatory
- agencies, Regul. Toxicol. Pharmocol. 7(1987) 307-320.

Table Captions

