

1 Postprint of: Tobiszewski M., Bystrzanowska M.: Monetary values estimates of solvents  
2 emissions, GREEN CHEMISTRY (2020), pp.1-16, DOI: [10.1039/D0GC03210G](https://doi.org/10.1039/D0GC03210G)

3

4 Monetary values estimates of solvents emissions

5

6 Marek Tobiszewski\*, Marta Bystrzanowska

7

8 Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, Gdańsk University of Technology  
9 (GUT), 11/12 G. Narutowicza St., 80-233 Gdańsk, Poland.

10 \* author for correspondence – [marek.tobiszewski@pg.edu.pl](mailto:marek.tobiszewski@pg.edu.pl), [marektobiszewski@wp.pl](mailto:marektobiszewski@wp.pl)

11

12 Abstract:

13 The impact values for environmental emissions of 52 solvents are estimated and expressed in  
14 monetary units. The impact values of solvents present in the air are calculated on the basis of 13  
15 impact indicators and for solvents present in water on additional 2 impact indicators. These  
16 impact values are weighted with the results obtained with multi-compartment distribution model,  
17 allowing to calculate the fraction of solvent emitted to the environment present in each of the  
18 compartments. The results show that the impact values of solvents emissions are in range  
19  $0.7 - 1179.51 \text{ \$ L}^{-1}$ , with mean value  $20.69 \text{ \$ L}^{-1}$ , expressed in USD<sub>2019</sub>. These impacts are  
20 considerably lower for short chain aliphatic hydrocarbons, alcohols, ethers, aldehydes, ketones  
21 and esters. High impact values are obtained for long chain aliphatic hydrocarbons, aromatic  
22 hydrocarbons, terpenes and extremely high value for carbon tetrachloride. Monetary values  
23 calculated to assess the solvents emissions impact have the advantage that they are quantitative,  
24 and easily applicable.

25  
26 Keywords: solvents; monetary accounting; monetary valuation; green chemistry; greenness  
27 assessment

28

## 29 **1. Introduction**

30 Solvents are applied in many industries as cleaning or degreasing agents, media for chemical  
31 reactions, are applied in separation technology, for dilution or as carriers of other substances.<sup>1</sup>

32 Organic solvents have many undesired environmental properties, high oral, inhalation or aquatic  
33 toxicity, potential to form tropospheric ozone or secondary atmospheric particles and some of  
34 them due to volatility are easily emitted to the environment.<sup>2,3</sup> Therefore, one of the trends in  
35 green chemistry is application of greener solvents, minimization of amounts of organic solvents  
36 used or application of solventless processes.<sup>4</sup> Also more detailed solvents environmental impact  
37 assessment methods are needed.

38 The assessment of the solvent greenness should take into consideration multiple criteria of  
39 different dimensions, units and importance. To make the assessment easily interpretable, it is  
40 good to bring all hazards impacts to single dimension and single unit. It has been done before, by  
41 the application of carbon footprint, which brings many impact categories into equivalent of CO<sub>2</sub>  
42 kilogram emission.<sup>5</sup> However, impact categories such as human or ecosystem toxicity, resources  
43 depletion or land use are poorly expressed as CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents. Another good candidate may be  
44 monetary value as the value of one dollar is single estimation of multiple hazards and human,  
45 biological or physical impacts can be translated to money and as a result can be directly  
46 compared.<sup>6</sup> The drawback of monetary valuation approach is that some aspects, such as the value  
47 of human life or biodiversity, are not easily directly measurable with monetary units. Another  
48 drawback is that the results are usually accompanied with rather large uncertainties.<sup>7</sup> Monetary

49 units were used to assess ammonium and imidazolium ionic liquids, acetone and glycerol in  
50 terms of direct production costs and ecosystem quality, resources damage and human health  
51 impact during their production.<sup>8</sup> These indirect costs can contribute to more than 50% of total  
52 solvent production cost. Economic sustainability was assessed for olive leaf waste valorization by  
53 different processes with and without solvent recovery.<sup>9</sup>

54 The aim of the study is to calculate the total impacts of solvents emitted to the environment,  
55 expressed as monetary values. It should be clearly stated that other aspects of solvents impacts,  
56 such as manufacturing or operational safety are not included. Distribution of solvents in the  
57 evaluative environment is considered as a good estimation of their environmental fate. The aim of  
58 the study is to assess the monetary values of emissions as a tool applied to solvents greenness  
59 assessment in the environmental emissions impacts. Monetary values estimates are based on  
60 solvent global warming potential, ozone depletion potential, potential to form secondary  
61 particles, oxygen demands to biodegrade and acute oral toxicity towards rats.

62

## 63 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 64 2.1. Data collection

65 The input data to monetary accounting model are global warming potentials (GWP),  
66 photochemical ozone creation potentials (POCP), secondary organic aerosol (SOA) formation  
67 potentials. The most accurate estimates are taken from publications – GWP<sup>10</sup> (following  
68 “Monetary valuation of environmental impacts: models and data” handbook), POCP<sup>11,12,13,14</sup> and  
69 SOA formation potentials.<sup>15,16,17</sup> The values for these parameters may differ for respective  
70 sources, depending on geographical region, assumptions on meteorological factors, insolation and  
71 others. In such cases values representative for larger areas or calculated for more general  
72 environmental assumptions are taken. In case of some missing points for POCP and SOA

73 formation potentials are substituted with mean values for given class of chemicals. Such  
74 approach is applied in assessment of chemicals.<sup>18</sup> If all two or three of these parameters are  
75 missing, to avoid excessive substitution of missing points, such solvents are excluded from the  
76 analysis (but the examples breaking this rule are shown later).

77 The data for level I mass balance model is rather easily available and is taken mainly from  
78 material safety data sheets. The data extracted here is molar mass, water solubility, vapour  
79 pressure,  $\log K_{OW}$  and melting point.

80

## 81 2.2. Monetary accounting


82 The calculations of monetary values related to VOCs emissions and assumed uncertainty factors  
83 are made exactly after Steen [<sup>19</sup>]. However, in many cases different values of GWP, POCP and  
84 SOA are introduced to the model. Generally, the model incorporates the potential of solvent to  
85 cause cancer, form secondary particles, tropospheric ozone and contribute to global warming and  
86 water oxygen loss due to biodegradation. The details are presented in Supplementary  
87 Information.

88

## 89 2.3. Level I mass balance model

90 Level I mass balance model is the simplest from the family of multi-compartment models for  
91 prediction of environmental fates of chemicals.<sup>20</sup> It is applied to calculate the distribution of  
92 organic chemical between atmospheric air, water, soil and sediment. It is done on the basis of  
93 chemical physicochemical properties and within defined volumes of environmental  
94 compartments. In this case the assumed volumes of compartments are  $10^{14}$  m<sup>3</sup> for the  
95 atmospheric air,  $2 \times 10^{11}$  m<sup>3</sup> for water,  $9 \times 10^9$  m<sup>3</sup> for soil and  $10^8$  m<sup>3</sup> for sediments as presented  
96 in the figure 1. It is simplified regional 100,000 km<sup>2</sup> environment applied before,<sup>21</sup> simplification

97 is by neglecting fish and aerosols phases. Such evaluative environment is not real but realistic in  
98 terms of physicochemical properties of compartments and is representative for the habitat of the  
99 majority of human population. It is also representative as solvents are compounds with rather  
100 short environmental lifetimes have rather local impact, so this environment seems to be better  
101 estimation than global model.



102  
103 Figure 1. The evaluative environment used in this study.

104 In Level I model it is not important to which environmental compartment the compound is  
105 emitted, it will be distributed in the compartments according to its partitioning coefficients. This  
106 allows to neglect the type of emission of solvent. The amount of compound emitted is also not  
107 important, only percentage distribution is further needed as the output from this model.

108 The software is downloadable from <https://tuspace.ca/~dmackay/models.html>

109 The Excel sheet with all calculations is attached as Supplementary Information. It can be applied  
110 to assess other solvents if new endpoints will be available in literature. It can be also used in case  
111 of appearance of better, updated, more specific or more general (depending on the needs) data.

112 It can be applied with data originating from other evaluative environment, applied in multimedia  
113 modelling.

114

### 115 **3. Results and Discussion**

#### 116 3.1. The results of monetary accounting

117 The results of impact values for different solvents, according to methods presented in  
118 Supplementary Information are presented in the table 1.  $IV_{AIR}$  are in  
119 the range of 0.6-1181.78  $\$ L^{-1}$  with mean equal to 42.19  $\$ L^{-1}$ . The solvents with higher  $IV_{AIR}$  are  
120 aromatic hydrocarbons, long chain aliphatic hydrocarbons, terpenes and some of chlorinated  
121 solvents. This is mainly due to SOA formation potentials of some solvents (terpenes and aromatic  
122 hydrocarbons). The sums of impact values of YLL and YLD via secondary particles are in ranges  
123 20.18 – 52.75  $\$ L^{-1}$  for aromatic hydrocarbons and 72.59 – 77.70  $\$ L^{-1}$  for terpenes and contribute  
124 to >89% of total impact values of solvents emitted to air. The solvent with extreme  $IV_{air}$  is carbon  
125 tetrachloride, because of its high GWP, equal to 2019. As a result impact values of YLL,  
126 undernutrition, working capacity and crop loss via climate change are 650, 35.7, 439 and  
127 13.3  $\$ L^{-1}$ , respectively. The solvents with low  $IV_{air}$  are C<sub>5</sub>-C<sub>7</sub> aliphatic hydrocarbons  
128 (1.32 – 1.95  $\$ L^{-1}$ ), ethers (1.2 – 1.32  $\$ L^{-1}$ ), aldehydes (1.46 – 1.88  $\$ L^{-1}$ ), ketones  
129 (0.9 – 2.03  $\$ L^{-1}$ ) and organic acids (0.60 – 1.17  $\$ L^{-1}$ ). They have low or moderate GWP and  
130 POCP values and they have SOA formation potentials equal to 0.

131  $IV_{WAT}$  for solvents are in range 0.03 – 333.80  $\$ L^{-1}$ , with mean value 23.18  $\$ L^{-1}$ , so they are  
132 considerably lower in comparison to  $IV_{AIR}$  values.  $IV_{BOD}$  seems to be negligible in comparison to  
133  $IV_{WAT}$ , as the contribute to <1 % of  $IV_{WAT}$ . As  $IV_{DRINK}$  are dependent on LD<sub>50</sub> towards rats and  
134 biodegradability half-lives, solvents such as benzene, methanol, butanol, o-cresol, formic acid or  
135 chlorinated solvents are characterized by high  $IV_{DRINK}$  values.

Table 1. The impact values for solvents emitted to atmospheric air and to water.

Group	Compound	Impact value for solvents emission to air [\$ L <sup>-1</sup> ]*	Impact value for solvents emission to water [\$ L <sup>-1</sup> ]*
hydrocarbons	pentane	1.32	2.20
	hexane	1.38	0.03
	cyclohexane	3.02	16.29
	heptane	1.95	5.12
	octane	9.60	12.02
	nonane	21.73	12.02
	decane	31.82	12.02
	undecane	43.83	12.02
	dodecane	57.54	3.01
	benzene	56.34	7.79
	toluene	50.98	2.20
	o-xylene	51.85	3.62
	m-xylene	50.38	17.59
	p-xylene	23.25	6.04
alcohols	methanol	13.16	0.91
	ethanol	10.17	0.04
	propanol	9.56	3.21
	isopropanol	8.91	0.73
	butanol	9.20	8.68
	isobutanol	8.64	7.27
	sec-butyl alcohol	9.03	7.50
	tert-butyl alcohol	8.17	7.03
	o-cresol	25.04	2.35
	ethers	diethyl ether	1.32
tert-butyl methyl ether		1.20	1.79
aldehydes	ethanal	1.46	3.31
	propanal	1.83	12.82
	butanal	1.88	5.18
ketones	acetone	0.95	1.91
	2-butanone	1.44	11.06
	2-pentanone	1.69	6.65
	3-pentanone	0.90	8.08
	methyl isobutyl ketone	1.72	11.93
	2-hexanone	1.79	5.12
terpenes	cyclohexanone	2.03	7.83
	(R)-(+)-limonene	78.36	5.63
	p-cymene	80.21	10.67

	$\alpha$ -pinene	82.05	18.67
	$\beta$ -pinene	76.22	16.13
organic acids	formic acid	0.60	1.11
	acetic acid	0.86	1.87
	propionic acid	1.17	1.02
esters	ethyl acetate	14.37	3.28
	methyl formate	15.29	2.56
	methyl acetate	12.41	1.72
	methyl lactate	7.55	3.01
chlorinated	dichloromethane	5.80	12.17
	chloroform	11.32	36.40
	carbon tetrachloride	1181.78	333.80
	trichloroethene	3.94	133.44
	tetrachloroethene	3.15	234.21
	1,1,1-trichloroethane	94.54	162.96

138 \* in USD<sub>2019</sub>

139

### 140 3.2. Combination of monetary accounting with multimedia model

141 The second step is combination of  $IV_{AIR}$  and  $IV_{WAT}$  to calculate total impact value.

142 The information from Level I mass balance model is very useful to evaluate the risk related to the

143 presence in each environmental compartment. The fractions of solvent present in air and water

144 are used to calculate total impact values ( $IV_{TOTAL}$ ) and it is done according to:

$$145 IV_{TOTAL} = IV_{AIR} * A_{AIR} + IV_{WAT} * A_{WAT}$$

146 Where  $A_{AIR}$  and  $A_{WAT}$  are amounts of solvent, expressed in % of total amount, present in air and

147 water in evaluative environment under equilibrium.  $A_{SOIL}$  and  $A_{SED}$ , being amounts of solvent in

148 soil and sediment, are neglected. Except of some high molecular weight solvents, they do not

149 tend to be present in soil nor sediment and the potential impacts are also not well studied and

150 probably negligible. The results of partitioning of solvents in the environment are presented in

151 table 2.

152

153

154

155



Table 2. The distribution of solvents emitted to evaluative environment and total impact value

Group	Compound	A <sub>AIR</sub> [%]	A <sub>WAT</sub> [%]	A <sub>SOIL</sub> [%]	A <sub>SED</sub> [%]	IV <sub>TOTAL</sub> [\$ L <sup>-1</sup> ]*	Purchase cost [\$ L <sup>-1</sup> ]* <sup>+</sup>
hydrocarbons	pentane	99.993	0.002	0.005	0	1.32	79.70
	hexane	99.97	0	0.03	0	1.38	105.00
	cyclohexane	99.89	0.03	0.08	0	3.02	105.00
	heptane	99.95	0	0.05	0	1.95	102.00
	octane	99.73	0	0.26	0.01	9.58	301.00
	nonane	99.61	0	0.38	0.01	21.65	641.00
	decane	74.11	0.03	25.3	0.56	23.58	117.00
	undecane	73.64	0	25.78	0.58	32.28	342.00
	dodecane	40.44	0	58.26	1.3	23.27	309.00
	benzene	98.67	0.846	0.473	0.011	55.66	96.30
	toluene	98.99	0.74	0.26	0.01	50.48	65.50
	o-xylene	96.99	1.37	1.6	0.04	50.34	110.00
	m-xylene	97.72	0.94	1.31	0.03	49.39	142.00
	p-xylene	97.97	0.91	1.1	0.02	22.83	108.00
alcohols	methanol	9.83	90.15	0.02	0	2.12	67.10
	ethanol	6.59	93.37	0.04	0	0.70	128.00
	propanol	10.73	89.13	0.14	0	3.89	99.00
	isopropanol	14.62	85.29	0.09	0	1.92	73.00
	butanol	15.25	84.17	0.57	0.01	8.71	87.10
	isobutanol	46.97	52.97	0.06	0	7.91	95.20
	sec-butyl alcohol	14.06	85.61	0.32	0.01	7.69	62.30
	tert-butyl alcohol	27.36	72.49	0.14	0.01	7.33	113.00
	o-cresol	4.37	88.02	7.44	0.17	3.16	79.30
ethers	diethyl ether	93.66	6.3	0.04	0	1.32	100.00
	tert-butyl methyl ether	91.99	7.95	0.06	0	1.24	81.80
aldehydes	ethanal	80.53	19.42	0.05	0	1.82	208.00
	propanal	62.18	37.69	0.13	0	5.97	167.00
	butanal	85.14	14.76	0.1	0	2.36	128.00
ketones	acetone	61.54	38.44	0.02	0	1.32	68.20
	2-butanone	42.02	57.88	0.1	0	7.01	77.10
	2-pentanone	43.92	55.7	0.37	0.01	4.45	103.00
	3-pentanone	48.84	50.79	0.36	0.01	4.55	114.00
	methyl isobutyl ketone	73.06	26.37	0.56	0.01	4.40	88.30
	2-hexanone	37.57	61.1	1.3	0.03	3.80	-
terpenes	cyclohexanone	11.89	87.6	0.5	0.01	7.10	48.70
	(R)-(+)-limonene	97.82	0.08	2.05	0.05	76.66	153.60
	p-cymene	95.41	0.44	4.06	0.09	76.58	56.60
	α-pinene	99.31	0.03	0.65	0.01	81.48	290.00

	$\beta$ -pinene	98.25	0.08	1.63	0.04	74.90	96.70
organic acids	formic acid	0.48	99.49	0.03	0	1.11	131.00
	acetic acid	5.07	94.89	0.04	0	1.82	65.10
	propionic acid	3.72	96.1	0.18	0	1.03	36.10
esters	ethyl acetate	73.51	26.36	0.13	0	11.43	81.30
	methyl formate	90.11	9.89	0	0	14.03	132.00
	methyl acetate	88.6	11.38	0.02	0	11.19	79.70
	methyl lactate	0.53	99.46	0.01	0	3.03	-
chlorinated	dichloromethane	97.51	2.45	0.04	0	5.95	67.10
	chloroform	98.66	1.25	0.09	0	11.62	84.90
	carbon tetrachloride	99.76	0.17	0.07	0	1179.51	451.00
	trichloroethene	99.32	0.56	0.12	0	4.66	113.00
	tetrachloroethene	99.58	0.31	0.11	0	3.87	124.00
	1,1,1-trichloroethane	99.61	0.31	0.08	0	94.68	-

157 \* in USD<sub>2019</sub>

158 + price for one liter container of reagent grade or anhydrous solvent. Taken from Sigma-Aldrich  
159 webpage. Accessed 19.05.2020.

160  
161 Organic solvents tend to be present in atmospheric air (mean 66.7 %), then in water  
162 (mean 30.7 %), in minor amounts in soil (mean 2.6 %) and sediments (mean 0.06 %). There is  
163 clear distinction between nonpolar solvents, such as aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbons, ethers,  
164 terpenes and chlorinated solvents that are generally partitioned towards air and polar ones, such  
165 as alcohols and organic acids, that are present in water. Aldehydes, ketones and esters partition to  
166 both phases in considerable amounts. The application of multimedia distribution model makes the  
167 results valid for any emission regarding type of emission source, environmental compartment or  
168 the amount of solvent emitted.

169  $IV_{TOTAL}$  are in range 0.7 – 1179.51 \$ L<sup>-1</sup> (mean 20.69 \$ L<sup>-1</sup>), following the pattern of  $IV_{AIR}$   
170 values, with higher impact of aromatic hydrocarbons, terpenes and some of chlorinated solvents.  
171 Solvents with low  $IV_{TOTAL}$  are C<sub>5</sub>-C<sub>7</sub> aliphatic hydrocarbons, ethanol, isopropanol, ethers,  
172 aldehydes, ketones, organic acids and methyl lactate. The purchase costs of these solvents are in  
173 range 36.1 – 641 \$ L<sup>-1</sup> (mean 132.41 \$ L<sup>-1</sup>), what means that calculated  $IV_{TOTAL}$  contribute to  
174 0.54 – 261.43 % of purchase cost (mean 20.69 %). The solvents with the highest  $IV_{TOTAL}$  to



175 purchase cost ratio are carbon tetrachloride (261.43 %), p-cymene (135.30 %),  $\beta$ -pinene  
176 (77.46 %), toluene (77.07 %), benzene (57.80 %). This is strong implication that estimated  
177 monetary values of solvents emissions should be considered during extended economic,  
178 feasibility assessments of various processes and products, wherever solvents are applied. It is  
179 advised to select as first preferences solvents with  $IV_{TOTAL}$  less than 8 \$ L<sup>-1</sup> and avoid those with  
180 higher  $IV_{TOTAL}$ . As environmental aspects are taken into consideration not overall greenness, it is  
181 recommended to support the assessment with other metrics.

182 The results are useful in economic – environmental analyses of chemical processes. For example,  
183 hexane and ethanol are applied for soybean oil extraction in closed system but the losses of  
184 ethanol are 0.0063 and 0.0051 kg kg<sup>-1</sup> of soybean oil and for ethanol and hexane, respectively.<sup>22</sup>  
185 The costs of these emissions (calculated in our study as  $IV_{TOTAL}$ ) if considered in this economic  
186 assessment would be 0.006 and 0.019 \$ kg<sup>-1</sup> of oil for ethanol and hexane. Another example of  
187 solvent emission costs incorporation is the process of methacrylic acid extraction from water.<sup>23</sup>  
188 The costs of cyclohexane (1012.37 \$ t<sup>-1</sup>), toluene (914.16 \$ t<sup>-1</sup>) and hexane (1000 \$ t<sup>-1</sup>) would be  
189 corrected with  $IV_{TOTAL}$  of 2123, 58022 and 3922 \$ t<sup>-1</sup>, for cyclohexane, toluene and hexane,  
190 respectively, multiplied by solvent loss fraction in this process. The third example can be the  
191 application of heptane and decane for lipid extraction from microalgae.<sup>24</sup> In this continuous  
192 process heptane is lost at rate of 0.921 kmol h<sup>-1</sup> and decane loss rate is 0.099 kmol h<sup>-1</sup>.  
193 The calculated  $IV_{TOTAL}$  of these losses would be 264.3 and 454.1 \$ h<sup>-1</sup> for heptane and decane,  
194 respectively. These simple considerations show that emission costs can be significant.

195

### 196 3.3. Assessment of green solvents

197 The assessment procedure is applied to assess solvents that are generally considered to be green.  
198 They are solvents from solvent selection guide<sup>18</sup> and PolarClean<sup>25</sup>, Cyrene,<sup>26</sup> butylpyrrolidone<sup>27</sup>,



199 recently applied green solvents. As for these compounds the values of GWP, ODP and SOA  
 200 formation potentials are not available the mean values for chemical class these solvent belongs to  
 201 are substituted. Therefore, the results presented in Table 3 should be treated as the best estimate  
 202 for present time.

203 Green solvents are characterized by rather low estimated  $IV_{TOTAL}$  monetary values. Two solvents  
 204 with slightly deviated values are 1-octanol, because it is readily biodegradable in water and  
 205 Cyrene because mean SOA value for terpenes is substituted.

206 Table 3. The estimates for  $IV_{TOTAL}$  for green solvents

Solvent	$IV_{TOTAL}$ [ $\$ L^{-1}$ ]	Purchase cost [ $\$ L^{-1}$ ]
1-pentanol	6.57	70.80
1-hexanol	7.42	50.80
1-heptanol	6.87	62.70
1-octanol	0.11	83.00
<i>t</i> -amyl alcohol	7.08	115.00
isobutyl acetate	6.06	67.80
amyl acetate	5.77	79.00
isoamyl acetate	5.98	103.00
2-ethylhexyl acetate	5.97	62.00
diethyl carbonate	6.90	48.90
methyl oleate	5.16	-
dimethyl succinate	3.94	104.00
glycerol diacetate	6.28	70.00
glycerol triacetate	2.77	191.00
polarclean (5-(dimethylamino)-2-methyl- 5-oxopentanoate)	2.56	-
lactic acid	2.69	104.00
furfural	2.51	103.00
Cyrene (dihydrolevoglucosenone)	15.70	191.00
butylpyrrolidinone	1.69	-

207  
 208 3.4. Sensitivity and uncertainty analyses  
 209 Sensitivity analysis is performed to investigate how variations in the input data influence the final  
 210 result. We assume that the values of GWP, ODP, SOA formation potential, oral  $LD_{50}$  towards



211 rats and biodegradation half-lives can change randomly in the range of  $\pm 50\%$  of initial value with  
212 uniform distribution. The values of  $IV_{TOTAL}$  are calculated 25 times with randomly changed input  
213 data and the results are presented in form of mean value  $\pm$  standard deviation in Table S1. The  
214 average relative standard deviation is 0.27 what is acceptable in this type of analysis.  
215 The uncertainty analysis is performed with Monte Carlo simulation to investigate how the initial  
216 assumptions on calculation respective impact indicators influence the final result. The uncertainty  
217 factors are taken from Steen (2019) handbook<sup>17</sup> and normal distribution is assumed. The analysis  
218 is repeated 500 times and the calculated mean values with standard deviations are presented in  
219 Table S1. The average relative standard deviation is 1.96, which is not unusual uncertainty for  
220 monetization studies,<sup>28,29</sup> as many components with high uncertainty factors are considered.

221

### 222 3.5. Metrics limitations

223 The presented metric despite having merits is characterized by certain limitations:

- 224 • The availability of input data is limited. The values of GWP, ODP, SOA generation  
225 potentials are not available for many solvents. They may be substituted with values for  
226 similar compounds or mean value for the chemical group solvent belongs to. However,  
227 this generates additional uncertainty of result.
- 228 • Link of acute or chronic solvents toxicity towards fish with monetary impacts is the  
229 problem to overcome.
- 230 • The model does not consider information on solvents operational safety issues nor  
231 environmental problems during production, information if solvents origin from fossil  
232 fuels or bio-based, renewable sources. So the applicability as greenness metric tool is  
233 limited.



- 234 • Uncertainties for the estimated values are large.
- 235 • Presence of solvents in soils and sediments is neglected.

236

#### 237 **4. Conclusions**

238 In this study we present the methodology to estimate the monetary estimates of solvents  
239 emissions to the evaluative environment and calculate impact values for 52 solvents. Solvents  
240 with lower impact values are alcohols, esters, aldehydes, ketones and organic acids. These with  
241 higher impact values are aromatic hydrocarbons, terpenes and carbon tetrachloride. The results  
242 can be used during environmental-economic assessment studies of various products, materials or  
243 chemical processes. Few examples show that emissions monetary impact values can be large in  
244 chemical processes.

245 As this is one of the first attempts to calculate monetary impact values of solvents emissions the  
246 procedure and the results probably could be improved when new data will be available. For  
247 example toxicity towards aquatic organisms, DALY related to inhalation exposure through non-  
248 cancer diseases and soil and sediment related impacts could make the results more complete.

249

#### 250 **Conflict of interests**

251 There are no conflict of interests to declare.

252

#### 253 **References:**

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Sherman, B. Chin, P.D. Huibers, R. Garcia-Valls and T.A. Hatton, *Environ. Health Perspect.*,

<sup>2</sup> I.T. Horváth, *Green Chem.*, 2008, **10(10)**, 1024-1028.

<sup>3</sup> C. Capello, U. Fischer and K. Hungerbühler, *Green Chem.*, 2007, **9(9)**, 927-934.

<sup>4</sup> P. Anastas and N. Eghbali, Green chemistry: principles and practice. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2010,

**39(1)**, 301-312.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> A. Laurent, S.I. Olsen, M.Z. Hauschild, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2012, **46(7)**, 4100-4108.
- <sup>6</sup> M. Pizzol, B. Weidema, M. Brandão and P. Osset, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2015, **86**, 170-179.
- <sup>7</sup> S. Schmidt, A.M. Manceur and R. Seppelt, *PloS one*, 2016, *11(3)*.
- <sup>8</sup> H. Baaqel, I. Díaz, V. Tulus, B. Chachuat, G. Guillén-Gosálbez and J.P. Hallett, *Green Chem.* 2020, **22(10)**, 3132-3140.
- <sup>9</sup> V. Voros, E. Drioli, C. Fonte, and G. Szekely, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.* 2019, **7(22)**, 18444-18452.
- <sup>10</sup> G. Myhre, D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestvedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura and H. Zhang, 2013: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing Supplementary Material. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]
- <sup>11</sup> R.G. Derwent, M.E. Jenkin, N.R. Passant and M.J. Pilling, *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2007, **10(5)**, 445-453.
- <sup>12</sup> R.G. Derwent, M.E. Jenkin, S.M. Saunders, & M.J. Pilling, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1998, **32(14-15)**, 2429-2441.
- <sup>13</sup> M.E. Jenkin and G.D. Hayman, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1999, **33(8)**, 1275-1293.
- <sup>14</sup> Y. Andersson-Sköld and L. Holmberg, *Atmos. Environ.*, 2000, **34(19)**, 3159-3169.
- <sup>15</sup> M. Martín-Reviejo and K. Wirtz, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2005 **39(4)**, 1045-1054.
- <sup>16</sup> R.G. Derwent, M.E. Jenkin, S.R. Utembe, D.E. Shallcross, T.P. Murrells and N.R. Passant, *Sci. Tot. Environ.*, 2010, **408(16)**, 3374-3381.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> S.N. Pandis, R.A. Harley, G.R. Cass and J.H. Seinfeld, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1992, **26(13)**, 2269-2282.
- <sup>18</sup> C.M. Alder, J.D. Hayler, R.K. Henderson, A.M. Redman, L. Shukla, L.E. Shuster and H.F. Sneddon, *Green Chem.*, 2016, **18(13)**, 3879-3890.
- <sup>19</sup> B. Steen, *Monetary Valuation of Environmental Impacts*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2019.
- <sup>20</sup> D. Mackay, (2001). *Multimedia environmental models: the fugacity approach*. CRC press.
- <sup>21</sup> D. Mackay, A. Di Guardo, S. Paterson and C.E. Cowan, *Environ. Tox. Chem.*, 1996, **15(9)**, 1627-1637.
- <sup>22</sup> E. Potrich, S.C. Miyoshi, P.F. Machado, F.F. Furlan, M.P. Ribeiro, P.W. Tardioli, R.L.C. Giordano, A.J.G. Cruz and R.C. Giordano, *J. Clean. Prod.* 2020, **244**, 118660.
- <sup>23</sup> J. Li, Z. Peng, C. Li, P. Li and R. Gani, *Chin. J. Chem. Eng.* 2019, **27(12)**, 2909-2916.
- <sup>24</sup> H. Nezammahalleh, T.A. Adams II, F. Ghanati, M. Nosrati, and S.A. Shojaosadati, *Algal Res.* 2018, **35**, 547-560.
- <sup>25</sup> L. Cseri, and G. Szekely, *Green Chem.* 2019, **21(15)**, 4178-4188.
- <sup>26</sup> D. Haddleton, A. Marathianos, E. Liarou, E. Hancox, J.L. Grace, and D.W. Lester, *Green Chem.* 2020, **22**, 5833-5837.
- <sup>27</sup> G. Beatriz, A. Kumar, M. Alhassan, C. Bucher, F. Albericio, and J. Lopez, *Green Chem.* 2020, **22(10)**, 3162-3169.
- <sup>28</sup> E. Brunelle-Yeung, T. Masek, J.J. Rojo, J.I. Levy, S. Arunachalam, S.M. Miller, S.R.H Barret, S.R. Kuhn and I.A. Waitz, *Transp. Policy*, 2014, **34**, 21-28.
- <sup>29</sup> H. Yin, M. Pizzol, L. Xu, *Environ. Pollut.* 2017, **226**, 356-369.