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Abstract
The present study aims at examining a unique easel painting by the well-known Egyptian painter, Mahmoud Sa'id. It was painted over four years and displayed at the Agricultural Museum in Egypt. It experienced many deterioration phenomena. The study utilized some non-destructive and non-invasive analytical techniques, i.e. MA-XRF, SEM-EDX, ATR-FTIR, and GC-FID in addition to XRD and SM. Due to the case-study painting multilayers technique, the results of MA-XRF and EDX mapping and XRD patterns revealed using Ultramarine (Na,Ca)_{8}(AlSiO_{4})_{6}(SO_{4},S,Cl)_{2}, yellow ochre (Fe_{2}O_{3}·H_{2}O), red ochre (Fe_{2}O_{3}), and a mixture of graphite (C) and bone black (C,Ca_{5}(OH)(PO_{4})_{3}) as a coloring pigments in the blue, yellow, reddish brown and black samples, respectively. Moreover, Barite (BaSO_{4}) and Zincite (ZnO) were used in the ground layer with Hydrocerrussite (Pb_{3}(CO_{3})_{2}(OH)_{2}) and (Sphalerite (ZnS) in lightening colors. Linseed oil was asserted as the pigment binding media, while the binding media of the ground layer was not confirmed. Furthermore, fragility, brittleness, cleavages, peeling, cracks, macro cracks, stains, and ancient fault restoration were detected in the case-study painting. Accordingly, it urgently requires treatment.
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1. Introduction
Easel paintings are usually created on canvas supports made of natural organic fibers such as linen, cotton, and hemp [1,2]. The canvas is usually coated with a ground layer including inorganic white materials, such as calcium carbonate, zinc oxide, lead carbonate, barium sulfate...etc. [3,4]. It also include and organic binders, e.g. animal glue, fish glue, and casein glue [5, 6]. The white ground layer is painted using inorganic pigments such as azurite, malachite, zincite, red and yellow ochre, naples yellow, vermilion, ultramarine, verdigris, cobalt blue, bone black...etc. [7,8] and/or organic dyes such as madder, alizarin, indigo, Indian yellow, luteolin, quercetin etc. mixed with drying oil such as linseed oil, poppy seed oil, safflower oil...etc. Then, it may be covered by a varnish layer [9-11]. A considerable number of analytical methods have been employed to identify organic and inorganic painting materials. For example, the X-ray diffraction (XRD) and Macroscopic X-ray diffraction (MA-XRD) are used to identify inorganic chemical compounds in a destructive and non-destructive way. Scanning Electron Microscope with Energy Dispersive X-ray Spectroscopy (SEM-EDX) and X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) are used in the identification of the chemical elements in painting materials [12,13]. Moreover, the Macroscopic X-ray Fluorescence (MA-XRF) is one of the most efficient
and non-invasive techniques for mapping the elemental distribution in painted objects. It can visualize the entire painted surface and subsurface layers [14,15]. Hence, it offers many details about the process of painting creation and the technique of artists [16]. Some separation and spectroscopic techniques, including Chromatography techniques, e.g. Mass Spectroscopy (MS), Raman Spectroscopy (RS), Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) are successfully utilized to provide detailed information about the organic and inorganic materials, either natural or synthetic, in the painted objects [17-20]. Although these techniques can reveal both the chemical composition and characterization of the investigated painting materials, most of them, as well as others require a destructive or non-destructive sampling or hard and time-consuming sample preparation. Their continuous development has resulted in some non-invasive and higher performance instruments [21,22].

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. The case study painting

The case study is a historical oil painting on canvas, named "Lady on a Roof", fig. (1-a,b), exhibited at the Egyptian Agricultural Museum in Giza. It is signed by the well-known Egyptian painter, Mahmoud Sa'id (one of the pioneer Egyptian painters who established the modern Egyptian Painting School. While traveling to Europe, Sa'id studied the art of painting at the Académie Julian in Paris – France. He had his own and distinct painting technique from 1919 to 1964 (his death). In the beginning, he was influenced by impressionism. Later, he abandoned all artistic techniques to his own one affected by a mixture of the European legacy of art and the Ancient Egyptian art [23-25]. The painting measures 110×110 cm and dates back to 1928-1932 (as the painter inserted beside his signature in the lower right corner), fig. (1-c). It isn’t accurately known why it took four years to be implemented. Thus, it is worthy of research to detect the impact of the four-year period on the case-study painting, the painting layers it has, and the elemental mapping of painting materials according to the signals of the acquired elements. Artistically, the painting shows a standing Egyptian peasant lady on a roof, carrying a twin-hand basket. The background is a landscape of the sky, small houses, mosques, and a canal. The features are affected by Akhenaten style, especially in the lady’s face, hands and warm colors. In addition to the symbol of woman fertility with simplicity, it is coated with varnish and framed with a gilded simple wooden frame. The visual inspection of the object reveals that it consists of different pigment layers and a white ground layer, fig. (1-d). It has experienced many deterioration phenomena, e.g. cracks and macro-cracks, fig. (1-e), peeling and cleavage of the paint layer in some area, fig. (1-f), stains and dirt on the painting verso, fig. (1-g), ancient faulty inpaintings, fig. (1-h,i), and ancient faulty patching, fig. (2-j).
2.2. Sampling

Because the case-study painting is exhibited at the Egyptian Agricultural Museum in Giza, it is impossible to be moved to anywhere else for investigation in a non-invasive way. Thus, four macro-samples (blue, yellow, reddish brown and black) were collected to be directly investigated without preparation. They were carefully taken from edges of the painted canvas under the wooden frame, as pointed by the green arrows fig. (1-a). To be utilized in many investigations and analyses, the collected macro-samples were initially investigated by non-destructive methods, then by the XRD as a destructive method.

2.3. Macro x-ray fluorescence (MA-XRF)

Because of the possibility of MA-XRF scanning to collect spectra and maps from the surface of inorganic object without sampling [26,27], the study employed the MA-XRF scanning system (M6 Jetstream, Bruker Nano GmbH, Berlin, Germany) based on the Center for Modern Interdisciplinary Technologies, ICNT, Nicolaus Copernicus University UMK in Toruń, Poland. An X-ray tube with a rhodium target at 50 kV was used; an anode current of 600 μA, no filters and a 30 mm2 SDD with zirconium window were utilized. A range of X-ray energy from 0.35 keV to 40 keV was covered, the most important peaks were obtained from ~2 keV to ~18 keV. The scanning process was conducted in air pressure of 1055 mbar and the time of acquisition was 40 ms/pixel during the data collection of the four examined samples.

2.4. Scanning electron microscopy with EDX (SEM-EDX)

Due to the less sensitivity of MA-XRF for the low-Z elements such as Mg, Al, and Si [16,28], the use of other techniques with higher sensitivity such as SEM-EDX is generally recommended to detect a wider range of probable chemical elements of different inorganic pigments and other compounds in the painting layers jointly with other techniques like XRD [29]. The study used SEM-EDX (ZEISS LEO 1430VP, Bruker, Germany at the Faculty of Chemistry, UMK in Toruń, Poland). SEM-EDX mapping and analysis of the samples were carried out in low vacuum mode (100-120 Pa), at 15-20 kV acceleration voltage and backscattered electron detection. The samples were scanned with a focused electron beam and delivered images with information about the samples’ composition and topography in high-resolution information and superior contrast.
2.5. X-ray diffraction (XRD)

XRD analysis was conducted using a X-ray diffractometer system, PANalytical, X’pert PRO MPD, powered by a Philips PW3040/60 X-ray generator, Netherlands. The configuration were Cu tube anode, K-alpha1 [Å] 1.54060, start position [°2Th.] 8.0066, end position [°2Th.] 70.0116, scan type continuous, PSD mode scanning, PSD length [°2Th.] 3.35, generator settings 40 mA, 45 kV, diffractometer type 3195, at The Grand Egyptian Museum-Conservation Center (GEM-CC).

2.6. Stereo microscope (SM)

The study used an SM (SMZ800, Nikon, at the Faculty of Fine Arts, UMK in Toruń, Poland) to identify the painting layers based on cross-sectioned macro-samples. Some macro-samples were prepared using the polyester resin, then ground and polished by polisher/grinder with silicon carbide waterproof abrasive papers. Other samples were investigated directly without molding resin.

2.7. Attenuated total reflectance fourier-transform infrared microscopy (ATR-FTIR)

For the identification of the binding media and pigments in the painting, the study used the FTIR in ATR mode (Spotlight 200i FT-IR Microscopy System, Perkin Elmer) in the Josef Bank Laboratories, University of Lincoln, UK). The spectra were acquired between 4000⁻¹ and 400 cm⁻¹ with 64 acquisitions and 4 cm⁻¹ resolution.

2.8. Gas chromatography-flame ionization detector (GC-FID)

A gas chromatograph (Agilent Technologies Inc., 6890 series, CA, USA; DB23 capillary column, measures 60 m X 0.32 mm X 0.25 μm) equipped with a split injector and a flame ionization detector (FID), at the Agriculture Research Center in Cairo was used to identify the oil type in the samples. About 0.1mg of each sample was dissolved in a 30ml mixture of toluene: methanol (2:1), then evaporated, and methylated by a mixture of methanol, gasoline, and sulphuric acid (84:10: 4%) respectively, at 150 °C for 5min, then 170 °C for 3 min. The floating liquid was moved to a vial with conical inserts for injection into the GC. The detector was set at 270 ml/min airflow, 40 ml/min hydrogen flow and 25 ml/min nitrogen [30,31].

3. Results

3.1. MA-XRF

The results of macro-samples scanned by MA-XRF showed nine elements: Calcium (Ca), Chromium (Cr), Iron (Fe), Zinc (Zn), Barium (Ba), Lead (Pb), Strontium (Sr), as well as very low signals of Potassium (K) and Copper (Cu). Moreover, the elemental distribution mapping of the different elements is displayed in figs. (2-a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h), in addition, the spectra of the same elements are shown in fig. (2-i)
3.2. SEM-EDX

The SEM micrographs of the investigated samples in different magnifications indicated that the canvas is made of linen threads, glued and covered with ground and paint layers. It is very brittle and polluted by some dirt, fig. (3-a). The paint layer has experienced high fragility and decay until the surface layer is almost turned powder in some spots. In other investigated spots, the paint layer is cracked, macro-cracked, cleaved, or completely peeled away, fig. (3-b, c). EDX spectra and maps of the investigated blue sample, fig. (4-a), yellow sample, fig. (4-b), redish brown sample, fig. (4-c), and black sample, fig. (4-d) are composed of many elements: C, O, Mg, Al, Si, P, S, Cl, K, Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Sr, Cd, Ba, and Pb as shown in tab. (1).
Figure (4) shows results of EDX maps and spectra of macro-sample a. blue, b. yellow, c. reddish, d. black.

Table (1) the scanned samples and the % of EDX detected elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Al</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Zn</th>
<th>Sr</th>
<th>Cd</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>Pb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddish-brown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. XRD

XRD results of the four investigated macro-samples summarized in tab. (2) and shown in fig. (5) reveal that the blue sample contains ultramarine (lazurite) \((\text{Na, Ca})_8(\text{AlSi}_3\text{O}_9)(\text{SO}_4,\text{S,Cl})_2\)

In addition, the black sample contains graphite (C) as a black pigment. Moreover, many white materials, e.g. barite (BaSO\(_4\)), Zincite (ZnO), hydrocerussite (Pb\(_3\)(CO\(_3\))\(_2\)(OH)\(_2\)) and sphalerite (ZnS), and Quartz (SiO\(_2\)), are detected.
Table (2) the results of XRD analysis for the case-study samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Color</th>
<th>Detected compounds</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Zincite (ZnO)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ultramarine (Na,Ca)(AlSiO₃)₆(SO₄,S,Cl)₂</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barite (BaSO₄)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sphalerite (ZnS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zincite (ZnO)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barite (BaSO₄)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow ocher (Fe₂O₃·H₂O)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barite (BaSO₄)</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zincite (ZnO)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddish brown</td>
<td>Red ocher (Fe₂O₃)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quartz (SiO₂)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sphalerite (ZnS)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barite (BaSO₄)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zincite (ZnO)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphite (C)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (5) shows the XRD pattern of the investigated macro-samples: a. blue, b. yellow, c. reddish brown and d. black

3.4. SM

The SM macrographs of the investigated samples show the multilayers technique of the case-study painting which consists of the canvas, glue layer, white ground layer, and two/three paint layers, fig. (6-a,b,c). The canvas is a plain linen textile weaved in 1/1 technique with a linear density of the threads about 25. The threads are well-covered by the glue layer and well-penetrated by the white ground layer, fig. (6-d,e). The yellow sample reveals out multilayers technique and mixtures of pigments in different colors like the greenish, light brown and white, fig. (6-f). The black layer looks attenuated and includes only one pigment layer upon the canvas and a white ground layer, fig. (6-g,h).
Figure (6) shows SM results of the paint macro-samples; a and b, surface micrographs show the multilayer technique; c, cross section micrograph of blue sample, d, cross section micrograph of canvas, e, surface micrographs of canvas, f, cross section micrograph of yellow sample, g, cross section micrograph of reddish brown sample, h, cross section micrograph of black sample.

3.5. ATR-FTIR Spectroscopy

Comparing the obtained spectra from the investigated samples by FTIR in ATR mode with the reference spectra of the expected materials, fig. (7), reveals that the binding media is linseed oil and the large band of C=O stretching that appeared at 1704 cm$^{-1}$ and 1740 cm$^{-1}$ is consistent with the presence of linseed oil and varnish resin. The bands at 721 cm$^{-1}$, 1095 cm$^{-1}$, 1175 cm$^{-1}$ and 1245 cm$^{-1}$ are also assigned to linseed oil, while the bands at 1379 cm$^{-1}$, 1459 cm$^{-1}$, 2856 cm$^{-1}$ and 2929 cm$^{-1}$ are assigned to linseed oil and resin (dammar or mastic) [32]. Regarding the coloring pigments, the blue sample bands characterize ultramarine, hydro-cerussite and linseed oil, fig. (7-a). The yellow sample contains yellow ochre and linseed oil, fig. (7-b), while the reddish brown sample contains red ochre and linseed oil, fig. (7-c). Moreover, the black sample contains bone black, mastic resin and linseed oil, fig. (7-d).

Figure (7) shows FTIR spectra of the case-study samples and the references spectra, a, blue sample, b, yellow sample, c, reddish brown sample, d, black sample spectrum.
3.5. GC-FID

The selected spectrum of the GC analyses, fig. (8), for the four macro-samples show using linseed oil as a binding media in the pigments of the painting. The oleaginous binding media is indicated by the saturated monocarboxylic acids, palmitic and stearic acids. Moreover, the ratio of palmitic acid to stearic acid (P/S) characterizes the drying oils in ancient paintings. This P/S approach can determine the well-known paint media like walnut oil, linseed oil and poppy seed oil [9,33]. By comparing the P/S ratio of the investigated sample (1.6) to the reference ratio of binding media in other pieces of literature, we may suggest that linseed oil (which P/S ratio is 1.9±0.5) is the drying oil in the case-study painting [34-36].

Figure (8) shows the results of GC-FID analysis of the binding media (linseed oil)

4. Discussion

The results of MA-XRF analysis of the macro-samples report nine elements: Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Ba, Pb, Sr, K, and Cu. Due to the higher ability of the EDX unit to detect more elements than the MA-XRF, the results of the EDX spectra and maps of the same samples show more elements. This is one of the MA-XRF’s well-known limitations [16,28]. While MA-XRF detected only 9 elements, EDX detected 16 (i.e. C, O, Mg, Al, Si, P, S, Cl, K, Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Sr, Cd, and Ba) in the blue sample. The data obtained by the EDX help promote the interpretation and expect-ation of the pigments in each sample [37, 38]. Based on the results of the MA-XRF and EDX, the presence of Pb suggests Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₄), while Ca, and some other elements like Na, S, Si and Al may refer to Ultramarine (lazurite) (Na₆Ca₁₈(AlSiO₄)₆(SO₄, S, Cl)) [39]. Moreover, Ca with other elements, such as P and S refer to the bone black pigment [40]. P, Na, S, Si, and Al are undetectable by the MA-XRF [16, 27,41]. Fe may refer to the reddish brown and yellow iron oxides (Fe₂O₃/ Fe₂O₃.H₂O) used as pigments in the reddish brown and yellow paint layers in different shadows [7,42]. The strong signal of Ba may refer to Barite (BaSO₄) and Zn to Zincite (ZnO) that were used in the white ground layer [43,44], especially Barite which has a strong signal of Ba in the colorless white area in the right lower edge of the blue sample. Other elements like Sr, Cr, K, and Cu may refer to some impurities either in the coloring materials or in the ground layer, or even some kind of outsider dirt that polluted the painting over time, especially Cu which has not been detected by EDX and K which has been detected only in the blue sample. Sr in the blue sample is detected only in the ground layer. It is normally detected as an impurity with Barite (BaSO₄) in the ground layer [43]. Moreover, it is not detected in the yellow sample, while it appears in both the
reddish brown and black samples. This may suggest the incompatibility of the ingredients used in brushing the ground layer, which may vary from one area to another in the painting, or it may show that the blue and yellow pigment layers are too thick. Consequently, the white ground layers are undetectable. It is also observed that MA-XRF notably detected nine chemical elements in all samples. This may be due to the many layers of different colors the painter had repeatedly applied over time. This result may interpret why the painter spent four years to implement that unique painting. 

Na in the ultramarine pigment is not detected in the blue sample. It is not easily detectable either by EDX or MA-XRF. Furthermore, the ultramarine has variant formulas that usually differ from a reference to other. The presence of Cl, in the presence of the probably undetected Na, may refer to a small amount of Sodium chloride which might be undetected neither by MA-XRF because of its limitations, nor XRD because of some expected differences between the two samples according to the difference of the object areas where both samples were collected. Moreover, other detected elements like Mg, K, Cr, and Sr may refer to some traces of earth minerals as impurities either the coloring pigments or the ground layer or they may pollute the painting object as outsider dirt, tab. (3) [45-49].

The XRD results confirm the suggested used materials detected by MA-XRF and EDX in tab. (3). They confirm that the blue, yellow, red, and black macro-samples contain ultramarine, yellow ocher, red ocher, and graphite, respectively as coloring pigment, in addition to many white materials (i.e. Barite, Zincite, Hydrocerussite, and Sphalerite ZnS). These white pigments are probably used either as pigments in lightening the color tones or as components forming the white ground layer. Quartz (SiO₂) in the ground layer is probably an impurity [50,51]. The results of FTIR also confirm the most used materials detected by MA-XRF and EDX. In accordance with the XRD results, this may also except the result of the black sample. The FTIR result of the black sample is incompatible, to some extent, with XRD result, which proved that it is graphite [52] because of the difference between the FTIR analyzed spot macro-sample and the XRD analyzed powdered sample. The XRD results confirming the presence of graphite and the FTIR spectrum that attribute to bone black, especially the bands characterizing phosphate group: \(\nu_3 (PO_4)^{3-}\) is shown at 1087 cm\(^{-1}\) and 1038 cm\(^{-1}\), \(\nu_1 (PO_4)^{3-}\) is shown at 875 cm\(^{-1}\) and 962 cm\(^{-1}\), \(\nu_4 (PO_4)^{3-}\) is shown at 630 cm\(^{-1}\), 604 cm\(^{-1}\), 567 cm\(^{-1}\), and \(\nu_2 (PO_4)^{3-}\) is shown at 469 cm\(^{-1}\). [51] cannot be ignored. These results were notably confirmed by the EDX results which include C, Ca, and P; the main ingredients in bone black. Sometimes graphite and bone black represent confusion between XRD and EDX results [53] because both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample color</th>
<th>EDX detected elements</th>
<th>Used chemical compounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>C, O, Mg, Al, Si, P, S, Cl, K, Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Sr, Cd, Ba</td>
<td>Ultramarine (Na,Ca)₉(AlSiO₄)₆(SO₄,Cl)₂ - Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂) - Barite (BaSO₄) - Zincite (ZnO) - Sphalerite (ZnS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>C, O, Al, Si, Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Cd, Ba, Pb</td>
<td>Yellow ocher (Fe₂O₃·H₂O) - Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂) - Zinc white (ZnO) - Barite (BaSO₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddish brown</td>
<td>C, O, Mg, Al, Si, P, S, Cl, K, Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Ba, Pb</td>
<td>Zinc white (ZnO) - Red ocher (Fe₂O₃) - Quartz (SiO₂) - Sphalerite (ZnS) - Barite (BaSO₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>C, O, Mg, Al, Si, P, Cl, K, Ca, Cr, Fe, Zn, Ba, Pb</td>
<td>Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂) - Zinc white (ZnO) - Barite (BaSO₄) - Graphite (C) - Bone black (C,Ca₉(OH)₄(PO₄)₃)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
materials are obtained. Therefore, it is important to use additional techniques like EDX and FTIR along with XRD to get complete information about the investigated samples [29,53]. The SM results may provide an additional interpretation for the confusion of the results of the different techniques. They confirm the multilayers used in the case-study object. Therefore, the difference in the results of the same samples may be attributed to the difference in the components of each sample even if they all are collected from the same area in the object. In other words, it is the same area in the object, but it includes different components in different layers.

5. Conclusion
The present study is a valuable insight into the painting materials and techniques of “Lady on a Roof”, a unique oil painting by the well-known Egyptian painter Mahmoud Sa'id, which has experienced deterioration. The utilized techniques reported the multilayers technique used by the painter over the four years of the painting’s implementation. Therefore, the elemental distribution mapping of the scanned samples by MA-XRF almost revealed the same elements in all samples. It was confirmed by EDX and XRD. Ultramarine, yellow ochre, red ochre, as well as bone black and graphite were reported as coloring pigments in the investigated blue, yellow, reddish brown and black samples, respectively. Moreover, Zincite (ZnO), Lazurite (Na,Ca)₈(AlSiO₄)₆(SO₄,S,Cl)₂, Barite (BaSO₄), Hydrocerussite (Pb₃(CO₃)₂(OH)₂), Sphalerite (ZnS) and Quartz (SiO₂) were detected in the painting and the ground layers. Linseed oil was proved to be used as binding media. Hydrocerussite mixed with zinc oxide and barite was used as a white ground layer. A glued linen textile was utilized as a canvas. Finally, the investigations and analysis techniques showed how much the case-study painting experienced deterioration phenomena e.g. cracks, cleavages, fragility, brittleness and fault ancient restorations, including inpainting and patching. Accordingly, the painting requires utmost new re-treatment and preservation. In Egypt, and due to the lack of the most non-invasive techniques in the investigation and analysis of the cultural heritage objects, the author was obliged to utilize macro-sampling of the painting and to implement the required non-destructive and non-invasive analysis abroad only on the collected macro-samples. Furthermore, it is not possible to move the heritage objects from the museum in Egypt for studying. Thus, the study recommends establishing a high-tech non-invasive investigation lab in Egypt and facilitating the movement of the heritage objects from the Egyptian museums to this lab for investigation and analysis.
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