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Abstract

Methods standardisation in microplastics research is needed. Apart from reagent-dependent effects on microplastics, varying target particle sizes can hinder result comparison between studies. Human health concerns warrant recovery of small microplastics. We compared existing techniques using Hydrogen peroxide, Proteinase-K, Trypsin and Potassium hydroxide to digest bivalve tissue. Filterability, digestion efficacy, recoverability of microplastics and subsequent polymer identification using Raman spectroscopy and a matching software were assessed. Only KOH allowed filtration at ≤25 µm. When adding a neutralisation step prior to filtration, KOH digestates were filterable using 1.2-µm filters. Digestion efficacies were >95.0 % for oysters, but lower for clams. KOH destroyed rayon at 60° C but not at 40° C. Acrylic fibre identification was affected due to changes in Raman spectra peaks. Despite those effects, we recommend KOH as the most viable extraction method for exposure risk studies, due to microplastics recovery from bivalve tissues of single-digit micrometre size.
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Introduction

Research into microplastic pollution is a relatively recent topic. Microplastics are generally defined as particles of 0.1 to 5,000 µm (Alexander et al., 2016; Arthur et al., 2009) and are a diverse group of particles in terms of shape and type (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012). Plastics is an umbrella term for synthetic and semi-synthetic materials, such as polypropylene, polyethylene and acrylic. Small plastics emerged as a contaminant in the marine environment in the early 1970s (Buchanan, 1971) and can be present in the environment as fragments, microfibres, microsheets and sphere-like particles (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012). Thompson et al. (2004) coined the term ‘microplastics’ in an analysis of microplastic concentrations in the marine environment. Since then, microplastics have become a globally recognised contaminant (Andrady, 2011) and research output has increased greatly. With this, a variety of methodologies has been used to extract microplastic particles from marine-based samples. These methodologies vary according to the matrix of interest, such as water, sediment or biota but even within the same matrix (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012; Lusher et al., 2017). There is a need to standardise methodologies to obtain comparable results, if this type of work is to be policy-relevant.

One matrix of interest is marine organisms. Demand for fish and shellfish is constantly rising; global per capita consumption was at 19.7 kg in 2013 (FAO, 2016), making microplastics in seafood a potential concern for human health. Within marine fisheries, bivalves deserve a special focus due to their value but also their exposure risk. Almost 13.6 million tonnes of bivalves were cultured globally in 2014 (FAO, 2016). As filter-feeders, many bivalves are at a greater exposure risk to microplastics (Wright et al., 2013). Mean concentrations of microplastics in such organisms have been reported as 2 particles per gram of the wet weight of the organism (g⁻¹) (e.g. De Witte et al., 2014; Li et al., 2015; Vandermeersch et al., 2015). While the microplastic load in fish is thought to be concentrated in their gastrointestinal tract (GIT) (Foekema et al., 2013; Kühn et al., 2017), which is often removed prior to consumption, bivalves are consumed whole presenting a potential pathway to exposure for humans (Alexander et al., 2016).

The presence of microplastics >500 µm in organisms is usually assessed via digestion of biological tissues and subsequent analysis of filtrates (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012; Lusher et al., 2017). Digestion techniques need to be able to deal with a number of different tissues, such as carapaces, scales and boney materials (Cole et al., 2014; Karami et al., 2017; Murray and Cowie, 2011). In addition, an
organism’s GIT contains its own digestive tissues but also materials ingested for alimentation that have not been broken down by digestive fluids nor excreted yet (Kühn et al., 2017). The focus of this study is on bivalve tissues.

Digestions of bivalve tissue are commonly performed with a range of acids (Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen, 2014), enzymes (Catarino et al., 2017), alkalis (Rochman et al., 2015) and oxidising agents, such as H$_2$O$_2$, the latter relying on the additional step of density separation (Li et al., 2015) (see examples in Table 1). Some digestion protocols apply numerous steps, which may increase the possibility of airborne contamination entering the sample. For example, Collard et al. (2015) performed various extraction steps on filtered gastrointestinal tracts of fish species after visual inspection. Reagents included nitric acid solution (Collard et al., 2015). Acid solutions accelerate natural breakdown of soft tissues, but also partly dissolve bones (Karami et al., 2017). However, acids are the least suitable reagents due to the reported damages to microplastics. Such damages include fusing of PS, PP, PET, LDPE and HDPE, total loss of PA and colour changes to most polymers (Avio et al., 2015; Catarino et al., 2017; Claessens et al., 2013). Alkaline solutions and enzymes also break down soft tissue by dissolving fats and proteins (Masse et al., 2001; Undeland et al., 2002). Limited, or no impacts on polymers have been reported for such reagents at generally applied concentrations (Catarino et al., 2017; Dehaut et al., 2016; Karami et al., 2017). Extensive information regarding visual damage to microplastics by individual reagents exists (Table 1). Damage to microplastics may also arise on a molecular level and can be assessed using techniques such as Raman and IR spectroscopy or pyrolysis-gas chromatography (Dehaut et al., 2016; Kaeppler et al., 2015; Loeder et al., 2015).

Standardisation of methods should be achieved by comparing existing techniques for their suitability in extracting microplastics. Suitability can be determined by assessing the digestion efficacy, the degradation impact on microplastics and recoverability of microplastics from dosed environmental samples (Table 1; Catarino et al., 2017; Cole et al., 2014; Courtene-Jones et al., 2017; Karami et al., 2017).
Table 1 – Digestion methods assessed for their efficacy, damage to microplastics and recovery rates based on tissues of *Mytilus edulis*, except for Cole et al. (2014) who used zooplankton and Karami et al. (2017) fish tissues. *further sampling treatment differences in brackets; **sample size in brackets; ***unknown concentrations; ****temperature and polymer type depending; Key to polymers: CA: cellulose acetate, ePS: expanded polystyrene, HDPE: high-density polyethylene, LDPE: low-density polyethylene, PA: polyamide, PC: polycarbonate, PE: polyethylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PL: polyester, PMMA: polymethyl-methacrylate, PP: polypropylene, PS: polystyrene, PSXL: cross-linked polystyrene, PTFE: polytetrafluoroethylene, PUR: polyurethane, PVC: polyvinyl chloride.

| Reagent* | Digestion efficacy | Damage to microplastics | Recovery rates |
|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
|          | Mesh (µm) | Mean efficacy (%) | n** | Polymer | Visual damage | n** | (%) | Study        |
| HCl      | 1M       | 3 50 | 82.6 (±3.7 SEM) | not assessed | not assessed | Cole et al. (2014) |
|          | 2M       | 3 50 | 72.1 (±9.2 SEM) | not assessed | not assessed | Cole et al. (2014) |
| HNO₃     | 35 % (v/v) | 2 0.8 or 1.6 | 100, but <0.01 g tissue remained | HDPE, PET, PA | fusing, total loss | not assessed | Catarino et al. (2017) |
| NaOH     | 1M       | 2 0.8 or 1.6 | 100, but <0.01 g tissue remained | HDPE, PA, PET | none reported | 3 (30 per polymer) | 93 (±10.8 SD) | Catarino et al. (2017) |
|          | 1M       | 3 50 | 90.0 (±2.9 SEM) | not assessed | not assessed | Cole et al. (2014) |
|          | 2M       | 3 50 | 85.0 (±5.0 SEM) | not assessed | not assessed | Cole et al. (2014) |
|          | 10M      | 3 50 | 91.3 (±0.4 SEM) | 1 (*** | PS, PA, PL, PE, PVC | none reported, partial destruction, some loss, some fusion, yellowing | not assessed | Cole et al. (2014) |
|                | KOH (60° C for 24 hours) | KOH (25, 40 & 50° C for 96 hours) | KOH (60° C for 96 hours) | Collagenase (frozen) | Corolase 7089 | Papain (frozen) | Proteinase-K | Trypsin (formaldehyde) |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|
|                | 10 % (v/w)               | 10 % (v/w)                      | 10 % (v/w)               | 0.31%                | 0.5 ml/100ml  | 0.31%          | 500 µg/ml    | 0.31%                  |
|                | 3 (10 fibres 100 of nylon)| 3 (0.5 g 84.7 - 105.2**** /polymer) | 3 (0.5 g 102.0 (4.31) /polymer) | 94 (±10.0 SD) polymer) | 94 (±10.0 SD) polymer) | 3 (30 per polymer) | 3 (30 per polymer) | 94 (±10.0 SD) polymer) |
|                | 1.6                      | 8                              | 8 (±0.17)                | 80                   | 0.8 or 1.6    | 30 per polymer) | 50          | 80                     |
|                | 99.6 - 99.8              | 97.1 - 98.9****                | 97.61 (±0.17)            | median c.78          | 100, but <0.01 g tissue remained | median c.75 | >97 (not reported) | 78 (±9.45 SD)          |
|                | none reported degraded  | none reported at 50° C yellowing | none reported          | not assessed         | not assessed | not assessed | none reported | not assessed           |
|                | change in shape          |                                 | none reported           |                      |              |               | none reported |                        |
|                | LDPE, HDPE, PA6, PA12, PC, PMMA, PP, ePS, PS, PTFE, PUR, PSXL, PVC CA PET | LDPE, HDPE, PA6, PET, PP, PS, PVC PA66 | PP | LDPE HDPE PS PA6 PA66 PET PVC | HDPE, PA, PET | not assessed | none reported |                        |
|                | none reported            | none reported                   | none reported           | not assessed         | not assessed | not assessed | none reported |                        |
|                | none reported            | none reported                   | none reported           |                      |              |               | none reported |                        |

Source: Dehaut et al. (2016), Karami et al. (2017), Courtene-Jones et al. (2017), Cole et al. (2014), Courtene-Jones et al. (2017)
|                |       |      |      |       |       |       |
|----------------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Trypsin (fresh)| 0.31% | 3    | 80   | 86    | (±13.39 SD) | PA, PE, PET, PP, PS, PVC none reported |
| Trypsin (frozen)| 0.31% | 3    | 80   | 88    | (±2.52 SD) | not assessed |

Courtene-Jones et al. (2017)
Evaluation of methods should go beyond the extraction capacity of techniques. Costs, potential hazards associated with the reagents and how much time a researcher will have to spend extracting microplastics from samples are also important considerations. The EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC) and other regionally organised commissions such as OSPAR may require their partners to perform long-term microplastics monitoring projects (Hanke et al., 2013). Currently, biota is excluded from such programmes due to lack of knowledge about suitable indicator species (Hanke et al., 2013). Monitoring programmes to influence policy-making rely on comparable data using standardised methods. OSPAR published a guidance protocol suggesting tissue digestions with an acid technique (Dehaut et al., 2016). As described above, such techniques may grossly underestimate certain microplastics. For this reason, it is important to highlight advantages of other digestion techniques.

The aim of this study was to establish the most suitable technique to digest bivalve tissues and recover microplastics based on a comparison of methods employed in recent studies: Trypsin, Proteinase-K, KOH and H$_2$O$_2$. Digestion protocols based on acids were excluded from this study due to the established damage to microplastics caused by those reagents (see Cole et al., 2014; Karami et al., 2016; and further references listed above). Protocols with numerous steps were also excluded to reduce the potential of introducing airborne contamination (such as Avio et al., 2015; Collard et al., 2015). Density separation techniques were also excluded due to the potential of underreporting of small microplastics (Haggett, 2017). Techniques were evaluated based on their digestion performance using three bivalve species, cost, expenditure of time and potential health risk of the reagents used. In addition, the most suitable technique was assessed for recoverability of dosed microplastics from oyster tissue. Recovery trials are often performed with microplastics of a single size and shape (Dehaut et al., 2016; Imhof et al., 2012). Since microplastics in the marine environment are variable in sizes and shapes (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012), dosing material should reflect this. Damage to microplastics was assessed through analysis of their Raman spectra.
Materials and methods

Sampling and sample preparation

*Magallana gigas* (n = 33, tissue wet weight (w.w.) 14.31 ± 5.84 g), *Ostrea edulis* (n = 12, 7.15 ± 4.63 g w.w.) and *Ruditapes philippinarum* (n = 4, 2.46 ± 0.14 g w.w.) were collected from coastal locations in southern England and stored at -20°C (Oaten et al., 2015). Defrosted soft tissues were removed from shells, placed in glass containers and re-frozen to -20°C.

Contamination control measures were 100% cotton clothing, use of glassware and samples covered with aluminium foil. Whenever possible, work was performed in a clean air cabinet (Bassaire 03VB, BS EN ISO14644, class 5, with additional cover). Background contamination enumeration was deemed unnecessary as the microplastic enumeration that took place was of materials of known conspicuous appearance.

Optimisation and efficacy of digestion protocols

Four digestion protocols were tested: H$_2$O$_2$, KOH and enzymes Trypsin and Proteinase-K (Table SI.1). Adaptations were made as follows: consistent with the Proteinase-K protocol (Cole et al., 2014), tissues were freeze-dried prior to digestion. Additionally, the cost and hazardousness of reagents and time expenditure of each method were compared to establish the most suitable digestion technique (see supplementary information ‘Costs, time needed and hazardousness of reagents’).

Filters used for digestions. Initially, cellulose filters (20-25 μm, Whatman grade 4) were used for all digestion protocols. This size was chosen to be the largest acceptable filter size to assess human exposure risks. Filtration through 25 μm was unsuccessful for enzymatic digestions. Due to the cost of Proteinase-K, this technique was abandoned. Filtration of trypsin, on the other hand, due to its lower cost and hazardousness as well as time needed (see supplementary information ‘Costs, time needed and hazardousness of reagents’) was attempted with 63 μm carbon fibre mesh. Optimisation of filtration to achieve filtering over smaller pore sizes was attempted for the remaining digestion protocols. For this, cellulose nitrate (5 μm, Whatman) and glass fibre (1.2 μm, Whatman GF/C) filters were used.
**H₂O₂.** Li et al. (2015) digest various bivalve species with 30% H₂O₂ in conjunction with a NaCl density separation based on a protocol for salt (Yang et al., 2015). For that matrix, digestate filtration is possible without a density separation step (Haggett, 2017), which was also attempted here. For this, 30% H₂O₂ (Fisher Scientific, UK) was added to individual oysters at 6x the tissue volume and left to stand for 24 hours in an oven at 60°C.

**Proteinase-K.** Karlsson et al. (2017) digested 0.2 g tissue of *Mytilus edulis* based on Cole et al. (2014). Adaptations were made as follows: 15 ml of homogenisation solution (prepared to 450 ml in pure water with 31.52 g Trizma-HCl (to 400 mM, Sigma Aldrich), 9.767 g EDTA (to 60 mM, Fisher Scientific), 4.383 g NaCl (150 mM, Fisher Scientific) and 5.0 g SDS (1%, Sigma Aldrich), adjusted to pH 8.0) was added, samples were homogenised and subsequently incubated in an oven at 50°C for 15 minutes. Proteinase-K (8 mg) was added and samples further incubated at 50°C for 2 hours. Sodium perchlorate (375 µl) was added. Jars were placed on a shaking table for 20 minutes and then further incubated at 50°C for 20 minutes. Karlsson et al. (2017) filtered over 1.2 µm borosilicate filters. Since common filter size for trials was set to 25 µm, volumes were not adjusted for the increase in tissue size.

**Trypsin.** Courtene-Jones et al. (2017) treated *M. edulis* with trypsin (0.3125 % v/v), filtering the digestate using 50-µm mesh. Based on initial trials, maximum optimisation was achieved using 4x tissue volume of trypsin (0.3125 % v/v, ThermoFisher) and samples placed on magnetic stirrer at 38–42°C at 250 turns per minute for four hours.

**KOH.** Similar to Rochman et al. (2015), samples were treated with KOH (10% w/v, 3x tissue volume, Acros Organics), but incubated without agitation at 60°C for 48 hours to increase filtration capacity. Since filtration over 25-µm filters was achieved, optimisation trials were performed to enable filtration through smaller pore sizes. Filtration issues when using cellulose nitrate (5 µm) and borosilicate glass filters (1.2 µm) were overcome by neutralising the digestate with 1 M citric acid solution (see supplementary information ‘Effect on filter papers’ for the in-depth assessment of reagent effects on filters). After slowly adding the citric acid (VWR Chemicals) to achieve a neutral pH, the solution was gently swirled once and then immediately filtered. This step allowed for
filtration to 1.2 µm. Efficacy was further tested with this adaptation incubating samples with 5 % and
10 % KOH at 40 °C for 48 hours similar to Kühn et al. (2017).

Digestion efficacy

Two digestion methods were excluded from further experiments: H₂O₂ due to excessive foaming
and therefore possible sample losses and Proteinase-K due to its cost. The trypsin protocol could not
be optimised to 25-µm filtration. However, its efficacy was assessed on M. gigas, filtering over 63-
µm mesh. This was done because of the negligible damage of enzymes to microplastics in the
digestion process (see references in Table 1). Tissue digestions were performed in triplicate. Reagent
controls were run alongside to establish effects on filters. The KOH protocol was applied to M. gigas,
O. edulis and R. philippinarum. Digestates were filtered over pre-weighed filters (Table 2), rinsed
with ultrapure water, dried overnight at 60° C and re-weighed at room temperature. Efficacy was
calculated by comparing the relative removal of organic material:

\[
\text{Efficiency in } \% = 100 - \frac{\text{Dry weight on filter paper (g) } \times 100}{\text{Wet weight entire organism’s tissue (g)}}
\]

Based on Karami et al. (2017), a method was deemed suitable when a digestion efficacy of ≥95.0 %
was achieved. The effect of the reagents was calculated by establishing the relative weight change of
dry filters:

\[
\text{Reagent effect in } \% = \frac{\text{Dry weight of filter after filtration (g) } \times 100}{\text{Dry weight of filter prior to filtration (g)}}
\]

Quality assurance of digestion method through recovery rate assessment

Microplastics were created from ten post-consumer items (Table SI.3). Fragments were produced
with an electrical coffee bean grinder and dry-sieved through 63 and 600 µm stainless steel sieves.
Particles <600 µm were retained. Fibres were obtained by plugging and cutting. Film/sheet was also
cut. Thirty particles of each material were added to M. gigas tissue. Containers used for storing
those particles prior to spiking were subsequently inspected for potentially left behind items. Spiked
samples were re-frozen and treated like efficacy experiment specimens. Since small pore size for
filtration is paramount when assessing human exposure rates (Wright and Kelly, 2017), only the
performance of the KOH digestion (10 %, 60° C) was tested (n = 4).
Handling controls were prepared by dosing ultrapure water (60 ml, \( n = 4 \)) and kept at room temperature for 48 hours. This was done to assess potential losses unrelated to the reagent, temperature or interaction with biological tissue. An additional water blank was run after filtering the samples to assess if any particles from previous samples could have contaminated subsequent ones. Samples were vacuum filtered (25-µm filters) and rinsed with 20 ml of ultrapure water. This amount was chosen because initial trials with tissue samples indicated that larger amounts of water were not filterable. During such trials, particles were observed stuck to the sample containers and filtration funnels. To enumerate potential losses, after sample filtration a new filter was placed in the unit and the sampling jars and funnel flushed with approximately 400 ml of ultrapure water. Filters were placed in lidded petri dishes and dried at 60°C overnight. Lids were secured with tape. Particle enumeration was conducted with a microscope (magnification 10x – 60x). See supplementary information for additional quantification of losses.

Rayon was affected by 10% KOH at 60°C during the dosing experiment. Therefore, the effects of further treatments on rayon were investigated. Ten fibres (\( n = 4 \)) were treated as follows: 5% KOH, 10% KOH (both incubated at 40°C for 48 hours) and Trypsin (according to the optimised protocol). Samples were filtered over 11-µm and fibres counted.

**Effect of KOH on Raman spectra**

To establish the effect of KOH on the Raman spectra, microplastics from the following treatments were compared: untreated, exposed to ultrapure water at room temperature and to 10% KOH at 60°C for 48 hours. Further spectra were obtained from rayon and acrylic fibres exposed to 10% KOH at 40°C for 48 hours. Particles were transferred from filters onto quartz slides. Raman spectroscopy was performed using a 785 nm Renishaw inVia with Leica DM 2500 M microscope, 50x magnification lens. Particles were manually selected. Extended spectra were obtained at 1-5% laser power, 10 seconds exposure time and five accumulations. WiRE 4.1 software was used to process the data. BioRad KnowItAll was used to identify Raman spectra by individual and multi-components as well as agreement of spectral peaks.
Statistical analysis

Data are reported as means with one standard deviation. Statistical analyses were conducted with RStudio 1.0.153 using an alpha value of 0.05. Independence of data was assumed. Normality was assessed with Shapiro-Wilk tests and homogeneity of variance with Levene’s tests. Failing those tests, filter weight changes were assessed with Kruskal-Wallis tests. Recovery rates after KOH digestion were assessed with a two-way ANOVA (factors: polymer type and microplastic category, i.e. fragment, fibre or microsheet). A non-parametric $\chi^2$-squared test was performed to establish if recovery rates were significantly different from 100 %.

Results

Digestion efficacy and competitiveness. Treatments with $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ and Proteinase-K were abandoned due to excessive foaming and subsequent sample loss, and high cost respectively. Digestion efficacy for oysters treated with Trypsin and KOH were $\geq 95.0\%$ (Table 2). Trypsin digestates were only filterable using 63-µm mesh. KOH digestates were filterable with 25-µm and smaller filters. The lowest variability was achieved using 25-µm filter paper. Digestion efficacy of *Ostrea edulis* was comparable to *Magallana gigas* at 5-µm pore size: 97.0 ±2.7 % and 96.4 ±4.0 % respectively. The slightly lower efficacy and increased variation for *M. gigas* tissue is likely to be due to the presence of small pearls. Further optimisation by neutralising the KOH digestate allowed for filtration over 1.2-µm borosilicate filters (see Figure SI.1 for results on effects of KOH on filter papers). Reduced incubation temperature to 40° C did not affect the digestion efficacy but decreased variability for digestates of *M. gigas* tissue (Table 2). Digestion efficacy for the clam species *Ruditapes philippinarum* was 91.2 ±0.5 % at 1.2 µm pore size (Table 2). In absolute terms, when treated with 10 % KOH at 40° C and subsequent neutralisation with citric acid, 0.021 ±0.002 g of *R. philippinarum* was not digested in compared to 0.079 ±0.037 g of *M. gigas*.

Table 2 – Digestion efficacies of bivalve tissue and effect of reagent on blank filters. KOH treatment of 10 % solution strength and incubation at 60° C unless otherwise stated; * 5 % KOH, 40° C; **10 % KOH, 40° C. Mean values based on triplicates, except for ^ which consisted of duplicates.
| Treatment  | Species       | Filter | Efficacy % (mean±1 SD) | Effect of reagent on blank filters: change in weight in mg (mean ±1 SD) |
|------------|---------------|--------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Trypsin    | *M. gigas*    | 63 µm  | 95.8 (±2.4)            | +0.4 (±0.4)                                                      |
| KOH        | *M. gigas*    | 25 µm  | 98.2 (±0.3)            | -0.5 (±1.2)                                                      |
| KOH        | *M. gigas*    | 5 µm   | 96.4 (±4.0)            | +3.7 (±0.5)                                                      |
| KOH        | *O. edulis*   | 5 µm   | 97.0 (±2.7)            | n/a                                                              |
| KOH* ^     | *M. gigas*    | 1.2 µm | 96.8 (±0.7)            | +3.0 (±1.1)                                                      |
| KOH**      | *M. gigas*    | 1.2 µm | 96.9 (±1.0)            | n/a                                                              |
| KOH**      | *R. philippinarum* | 1.2 µm | 91.2 (±0.5)         | n/a                                                              |

The KOH protocol is the most economic digestion method at £0.55/sample (as of December 2017) out of the four methods tested (Table SI.2). In addition, together with H$_2$O$_2$, this digestion method took <120 minutes of researcher time over three and two days respectively (Table SI.2). Each digestion method scored once in health hazard category 1, except for Proteinase K, which scored twice (Table SI.2). Overall, trypsin did score once, the H$_2$O$_2$ method twice and the other methods five to 13 times in the health hazard class.

**Recovery rates.** The recovery rates (RR) of 10 types of microplastic (Table SI.3) were established for oyster tissue digestions using 10 % KOH (Figure 1). Rayon was not recovered after incubation at 60° C. Removing this outlier, overall recovery was 86.2 ±7.9 % from dosed tissue samples. Individual recoveries ranged 77.5 to 91.6 %. Mean RR from water controls was 78.2 ±12.4 %. Without rayon, there is no significant main effect of polymer type on recovery, ANOVA $F(1, 32) = 0.102, p = 0.751$. There is no significant main effect of microplastic category, $F(1,32) = 0.557, p = 0.461$. There is no significant interaction effect between polymer and microplastic category, $F(1,32) = 0.971, p = 0.332$. The recovery rates of individual types of microplastic are significantly different from 100 % ($\chi^2 (15) = 68.110, p < 0.001$).
Figure 1– Recovery rate of microplastic particles from oyster tissue exposed at 60° C for 48 hours.

Dosed ultrapure water controls (light bars) and oyster tissue digested with 10 % KOH (dark bars). Data are mean values ±1 SD, n=4. Recovery rates adjusted for particles that were not transferred into the samples and particles recovered through additional rinsing (see Table SI.3). Key for polymers: PS: polystyrene, PP: polypropylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PA: polyamide, PVC: polyvinyl chloride, LDPE: low-density polyethylene. Note that rayon was recovered when exposed to 10 % at 40° C (see paragraph 3 in ‘Recovery rates’)

Potential losses of microplastics during the experiment were quantified. Some microplastics were observed in storage containers after dosing (see supplementary information ‘Quantification of microplastic particle losses during the spiking experiment’). Recovery rate results were adjusted for those losses. Some microplastics stuck to glass sampling containers and funnel system were only recovered through additional rinsing. On average, 4.1 % of particles were recovered through additional rinsing from filtering spiked bivalve digestates and 17.0 % from spiked water controls. The highest potential losses from the water control were particles and fibres of low density (PS and PP), remaining types had lower loss rates. Recovery rate results were adjusted for these losses. Potential particle loss could also have arisen through accidental transfer of spiked microplastics from one sample to the next. However, filters of water blanks were empty suggesting negligible cross contamination between samples.
The effect of KOH and Trypsin on rayon fibres at 40° C was assessed. This reduction in incubation temperature from 60° led to a recovery of rayon similar to the other microplastic types (Figure 1).

Treating rayon fibres (10 fibres per treatment, n = 4) with 5 % KOH for 48 hours led to a recovery rate of 87.5 ±37.7 %. Recovery was 80.0 ±8.2 % for exposure to 10 % KOH for 48 hours. Exposing rayon to trypsin (4 hours, without using a magnetic stirrer) led to a recovery of 82.5 ±23.6 %. The increased variation for the trypsin exposure can be traced to a recovery of 50 % for one of the samples, the remaining samples yielded 80 – 100 % recovery. There is no significant difference in recovery between treatments (Kruskal-Wallis, H(2) = 0.128, p = 0.938).

Comparison of Raman spectra of microplastics after KOH exposure. Raman spectra were obtained from the microplastics used in this study prior to exposure and after 48-hour exposure to ultrapure water at room temperature and to 10 % KOH at 60° C (Figure 2). In general, fluorescence and subsequent baseline adjustments hindered comparison below a Raman shift of 700 cm⁻¹. Spectra of polypropylene fibres (A) and fragments (B) exhibited a decreased intensity at peak locations of 840 and 1150 cm⁻¹ after exposure to water and KOH. At 997 cm⁻¹, peak intensity increased with water and KOH exposure for fibres but was diminished for those treatments in PP fragments. No change in number of peaks or peak intensity was observed for PS fragments (C) across treatments. Changes were observed in spectra of acrylic fibres (D). Fluorescence hindered comparison of spectra between treatments, especially <1500 cm⁻¹. The number of peaks and their intensities varied between treatments. The peak at 1000 cm⁻¹, was most pronounced for untreated acrylic, reduced for the water-exposed and absent for the KOH-exposed fibres. Peaks observed at 1603 cm⁻¹ in untreated and KOH-exposed acrylic shifted slightly to 1590 cm⁻¹. Furthermore, a peak observed at 2240 cm⁻¹ for KOH-exposed fibres was not present in water-exposed and untreated acrylic. PET fibres were not evaluated due to issues with fluorescence and the small fibre diameter. Spectral acquisition of PET fragments was also hampered by fluorescence, but the number of peaks and their intensity was similar across treatments (E). A similar number of peaks was observed for LDPE microsheets across treatments (F). Peak intensities were reduced in untreated compared to water and KOH-exposed LDPE between 1250-1480 and 2830-2900 cm⁻¹. Conversely, at 1094 cm⁻¹, the peak was most pronounced for untreated LDPE. The intensity of peaks for PA fibre were generally similar (G) with the exception of the peak at 994 cm⁻¹. Here, a peak was observed for the untreated fibre, which was reduced for the KOH-treated and absent for the water-treated fibre. PVC sheet (H) only exhibited a
difference at 1003 cm\(^{-1}\); a peak was observed in the untreated but not in the two treated microsheets. The intensity and location of peaks for rayon fibres (I) were generally similar.

Figure 2 – Raman spectra of microplastics from recovery rate experiment: polypropylene fibres (A), polypropylene fragments (B), polystyrene fragments (C), acrylic fibres (D), polyethylene terephthalate fragments (E), low-density polyethylene film (F), polyamide fibres (G), polyvinyl chloride film (H) and rayon fibres (I). Spectra were obtained using a 785 nm laser at 1-5 % power using a 50x magnification lens. Key for spectral colours: black (top) untreated, blue (middle) exposed to ultrapure water at room temperature for 48 hours and red (bottom) exposed to 10 % KOH at 60° C for 48 hours, except for rayon fibre where top fibres were exposed to 10 % KOH at 40° C instead.

Using a matching software to compare microplastics of unknown composition to a spectral library, most particles exposed to KOH were correctly identified (Table 3). Acrylic could circumstantially be identified as an anthropogenic fibre due to the identification of dye. A number of untreated and water-exposed microplastics were misidentified by the software. Rayon was only identified when exposed to KOH at 40° C.

Table 3 – Results of using a matching software to identify polymer types using Raman spectra. Spectral peak locations as well as individual and multi-component results were taken into account. “Likely to be” signifies that a choice had to be made by the researcher.

*Identification after exposure to KOH at 40° C.
A number of studies already set out to compare different digestion methods (Table 1). However, target methods are often evaluated against protocols not used in microplastics research. NaOH was compared to other reagents by four studies (Catarino et al., 2017; Cole et al., 2014; Karami et al., 2017; Phuong et al., 2018). This reagent has not been applied to environmental samples on its own to our knowledge, but only in conjunction with HNO₃ or sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) with the recommendation of further adding HCl to digest the GIT of fish (Budimir et al., 2018; Roch and Brinker, 2017). Reagent concentrations of 10 M (NaOH) (Cole et al., 2014; Dehaut et al., 2016) or 100 % (KOH) (Enders et al., 2017) are unlikely to yield satisfactory results, but were used for comparison studies. Here, four published methods were tested for their suitability to digest bivalve tissue in an attempt to derive a standardised method. Two of these were aborted during the trials. An optimisation attempt of an existing H₂O₂ technique resulted in unacceptable foaming. This would explain why previous studies had to rely on additional steps to extract microplastics from tissue using this technique. Karlsson et al. (2017) pre-treated their samples with enzymes. Such approach is likely to increase the cost of an already costly technique (Table SI.2). Li et al. (2015) added a NaCl flotation step. However, this approach is likely not to recover a large portion of microplastics (Haggett, 2017). Avio et al. (2015), using NaCl flotation followed by H₂O₂ digestion, successfully extracted microplastics from fish GITs, obtaining recovery rates of around 80 to 90 % depending on

| Microplastic      | Untreated     | Water-exposed | KOH-exposed  |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| LDPE microfilm    | Likely to be rayon | Polyethylene | Polyethylene |
| PA microfibre     | Likely to be nylon | Likely to be nylon | Nylon |
| Acrylic microfibre| Identified as plastic (polyester, computer disk or polystyrene) | Likely to be nylon | Likely to be identified as some sort of anthropogenic/plastic fibre due to dye |
| PET microfibre    | Polyester | Polyethylene terephthalate | Not assessed |
| PET fragment      | Polypropylene | Likely to be polyester | Likely to be Polyethylene terephthalate |
| PP microfibre     | Polypropylene | Polypropylene | Polypropylene |
| PP fragment       | Could be polypropylene or polystyrene | Polypropylene | Polypropylene |
| PS fragment       | Likely to be polystyrene | Polystyrene | Polystyrene |
| PVC microfilm     | Polyvinyl chloride | Polyvinyl chloride | Polyvinyl chloride |
| Rayon microfibre  | Not identifiable | Not identifiable | Lyocell* |
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particle size classes. However, it should be noted that they dosed samples with lower density polymers polyethylene and polystyrene only (Avio et al., 2015). Optimisation of an existing Proteinase-K approach would have resulted in unacceptable costs. Since previous studies digested only 0.2 g of tissue with Proteinase-K (Cole et al., 2014; Karlsson et al., 2017), the cost of digesting tissue of entire oysters would likely have increased fourfold or more (Table SI.2). Adjusting the tissue sample amount to suit the existing protocol is not advisable, as this would lead to sample heterogeneity. So far, most studies on European bivalves reported <1 microplastic/gram w.w. (De Witte et al., 2014; Van Cauwenberghe et al., 2015; Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen, 2014; Vandermeersch et al., 2015).

For continuing trials, efficacy of oyster tissue digestion efficacies (M. gigas and O. edulis) were above the set threshold of 95 % adopted from Karami et al. (2017). Trypsin digestions, while meeting the threshold (95.8 %), were only filterable using 63-µm mesh. This seems an improvement compared to digesting M. edulis. Courtene-Jones et al. (2017) obtained a digestion efficacy of 88 % when using 80-µm mesh. Depending on the research aim, such minimum particle size may be suitable for some studies, especially due to its relatively low cost (Table SI.2). An enzymatic digestion is usually preferred over other reagents due to the negligible effect on plastic polymers (Catarino et al., 2017; Cole et al., 2014). However, it should be noted that some enzyme digestion techniques also rely on oxidising reagents to be added, e.g. sodium perchlorate or hydrogen peroxide (Cole et al., 2014; Karlsson et al., 2017). Catarino et al. (2017) successfully tested Corolase 7089 (AB Enzymes) for bivalve digestion; however, this enzyme is not commercially available any more. Here, we find that an adapted KOH protocol yielded the best results in terms of filtration ability, extraction costs, hazardousness of reagents and approximate time needed for digestions. It is worth noting that a recent study by Wagner et al. (2017) conceived a protocol to extract microplastics from fish GITs without digestion using H2O and pulsed ultrasonication. While this extraction method has a short sample turnaround time and does not involve hazardous chemicals, Caron et al. (2018) suggest that ultrasonication may lead to fragmentation of microplastics into smaller particles. In addition, it remains to be tested if ultrasonication would work for entire specimens of bivalves compared to relatively loose tissues and other aggregates in digestive tracts.

Our adapted KOH digestion technique can cope with a large fraction of the entire microplastics range, therefore being suitable for a range of studies. Earlier studies of bivalve tissues achieved recovery with single-digit µm filters, but might have underestimated microplastic concentrations.
These studies either employed a combination of digestion and density separation (Li et al., 2015; Phuong et al., 2018), digested with acids (Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen, 2014) or digested only small amounts of tissue (Dehaut et al., 2016; Karlsson et al., 2017). Interestingly, while Catarino et al. (2017) achieved a digestion efficacy of 100 % for bivalve tissues using a similar reagent (1 M of NaOH) over 0.8 μm filters, Cole et al. (2014) obtained 90 % zooplankton tissue removal over 50 μm filters. This suggests that digestion techniques may not universally applicable between different phyla. We achieved digestate filtration over 1.2 μm. Capturing smaller particles still comes with further challenges as confirmation of chemical composition through spectro-fingerprinting (Raman and FTIR approaches) is limited at these sizes (Käppler et al., 2016; Loeder et al., 2015).

Target particle size will depend on the aim of individual studies. Aims may include potential health effects on individuals, their populations or consumers such as humans. Observation from the natural environment suggest that microplastics are ingested by bivalves beyond the size of their natural prey particles. Particle retention of *M. gigas* is highest between 4 and 12 μm and reported absent for particles of 15 μm (Ropert and Goulletquer, 2000). Van Cauwenbergh and Janssen (2014) found mainly microplastics <25 μm in *M. gigas*, but larger items were also present. Rochman et al. (2015) found fibres between 2,300 and 15,800 μm in length in *M. gigas*. Fibre length may not be crucial for microplastic size determination as the particle could be present compacted or knotted up (Thompson et al., 2004). However, diameters of those fibres were 20 to 50 μm (Rochman et al., 2015). In addition, Courtene-Jones et al. (2017) found fragments and film >52 μm in *M. edulis*, a species with a particles retention range of 2 -12 μm (Cranford et al., 2016). In a laboratory setting, the ribbed mash mussel *Geukensia demissa* ingested microbeads of 250-300 μm in size, which is beyond their usual feeding range (Khan and Prezant, 2018). This shows that an extraction technique needs to be able to cope with a large size range. For studies relating to potential human health implications, authorities suggest <150 μm as a suitable target size (Alexander et al., 2016; Wright and Kelly, 2017). Translocation of microplastics from the digestive system to other body parts seems most likely for particles <500 μm (Browne et al., 2008; Collard et al., 2017). Most evidence, especially in mammalian and human observations, indicate that <130 μm could be the potential threshold for particle toxicology, with particles <10 μm potentially posing a greater risk (Browne et al., 2008; Papageorgiou et al., 2014; Volkheimer, 2001; Wright and Kelly, 2017). Potential effects on bivalves were assessed with <10 μm diameter microbeads in laboratory studies. Effects shown so far range from translocation of microbeads from the digestive to the circulatory system to changes in gene
expression to effects on offspring (Browne et al., 2008; Paul-Pont et al., 2016; Sussarellu et al., 2016).

KOH has previously been used for many types of tissue, including digestive tracts of fish and oyster tissue (e.g. Foekema et al., 2013; Rochman et al., 2015; Tanaka and Takada, 2016; Wesch et al., 2016) indicating its suitability for a range of tissues. However, digestion efficacy will depend on filter sizes. Rochman et al. (2015) recovered particles >500 µm from *M. gigas*. Here we show that digestion and filtration with 1.2-µm filters is possible for this species. The digestion efficacy of *R. philippinarum* was below 95 %. However, it should be noted that – being of smaller body size – the absolute quantity remaining on the filter was almost four times lower compared to *M. gigas*. Such lower particle load should allow for adequate visual inspection of the material.

For successful filtration of KOH digestates with 1.2 µm borosilicate filters, it was necessary to neutralise the digestate. Wagner et al. (2017) prevented damage to polycarbonate filters through neutralising KOH with 10 % HNO₃. Dehaut et al. (2016) filtered over 1.6 µm borosilicate filters without neutralisation. However, their specimens of *M. edulis* were almost one third the size of *M. gigas* in this study (Dehaut et al., 2016). Filtration of such digestates with lower tissue load may be able to be performed quickly enough without affecting the filter matrix. Issues with filtering KOH solution without prior neutralisation using borosilicate filters may be related to the effect of KOH on the glass. The increase in filter weight may be explained by redistribution of borosilicate within the filters preventing complete filtration of samples and water afterwards. Previous studies have reported effects of KOH on borosilicate and other glass. Interestingly, Molchanov and Prikhid’ko (1958) and Kouassi et al. (2010) report reductions in glass weight after exposure to KOH. However, Kouassi et al. (2010) report the formation of precipitates. They quantified the glass loss using 40-µm filters (Kouassi et al., 2010). It may be that those precipitates were small enough to escape in their study, but - if formed during our experiment - be leading to precipitates decreasing filtration capacity by blocking the filter. This issue seems to be avoidable by neutralising the KOH solution prior to filtration. Short-term exposure to citric acid should not damage plastic polymers according to freely available on-line chemical resistance tables (e.g. Bürkle, 2017; TedPella, 1996-2019).

Overall recovery rate of spiked microplastics is similar to overall recovery rates reported elsewhere for alkaline reagents. Some individual recovery rates were lower while others were higher than
reported by Karami et al. (2017) for KOH digestions indicating general variability in microplastics recovery from environmental samples. While our recovery rate is lower than a desirable 100%, we attempted to recover particles from a range of polymers, categories and sizes, which may be more in line with environmental samples (Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012). Spiking particle size has been shown to affect recovery rates. Dehaut et al. (2016) obtained a high recovery rate for PA fibres of 500 μm; however, Avio et al. (2015) noted significantly lower recovery rates of microplastics <100 μm. In line with this, a study of microplastics recovery from sediments recovered 99.7% of large microplastics (2,000 – 5,000 μm), but only 39.8% of particles ranging 40 – 309 μm (Imhof et al., 2012). The spiking particles used in our study potentially covered a large portion of the microplastics range (≥63 μm). Some of the microplastics created for this experiment were prone to stick to jars and equipment despite copious rinsing. This issue was also observed by others with environmental samples (Haggett, 2017; Karlsson et al., 2017). Recoveries from spiked tissue samples and water controls were similar. This suggests that the handling process may still be the source of the reduced recovery rate and flushing of the equipment with >500 ml of water may be required. Furthermore, microplastics may have been electrically charged and therefore escaped during processing. This was previously suggested for polyamide (Catarino et al., 2017) and was observed for PET fibres and fragments and PS fragments during this study.

In addition to previous studies (Catarino et al., 2017; Karami et al., 2017), we found that 10% KOH is also suitable for recovery of acrylic and rayon fibres, PP and PET in fibre-form and film of PVC and LDPE. The digestion temperature needs to be carefully chosen. At 60° C, rayon was not recovered. It seems that rayon was dissolved by the alkaline reagent, similar to the process of producing rayon where cellulose is dissolved in NaOH and fibres subsequently recovered from the solution (Jarvis, 2003). However, decreasing the incubation temperature to 40° C allows for recovery of rayon fibres in the same range as the other tested microplastic polymers. In line with previous research (Table 1), no effects were observed on most other polymers. No obvious visual impacts were observed on polymers during enumeration of spiked microplastics from the recovery experiment, suggesting negligible impact on those. Dehaut et al. (2016) reported damage to PC, with 50% being physically degraded. This degradation was observed at 60° C. An incubation temperature of 40° C using 10% KOH is therefore recommended for the recovery of all microplastics types assessed here.
The degree of polymer damage through KOH exposure seems acceptable as most obtained Raman spectra were correctly identified by a matching to a spectral database. Acrylic fibre was only identified circumstantially by the presence of the dye ‘Eriochrom Blue’ that is used in the textile industry (Ding and Freeman, 2017). Acrylic fibre may be affected on a molecular level as revealed by Raman spectroscopy. It appears that acrylic fibres are easily hydrolysed by alkalis. Gupta et al. (2004) observed similar changes in nitrogen, amide and carboxyl groups during acrylic exposure to NaOH. A reduction in digestion temperature to 40° C did not improve the identification. The effect of KOH on the Raman spectra of the remaining microplastics was limited. This is in line with previous studies (Dehaut et al., 2016; Karami et al., 2017). Some differences, however, do exist. For example, Karami et al. (2017) observed a reduced intensity at 1610 cm\(^{-1}\) in PET when exposed to 10 % at 50 or 60° C for 96 hours. It could be possible that this effect may show when exposing the polymer for >48 hours as neither we (48 hours at 60° C) nor Dehaut et al. (2016) (24 hours at 60° C) observed this. Changes in spectra of LDPE observed here but not elsewhere (Dehaut et al., 2016) may also be related to differences in exposure time. Changes observed in PP and PVC were not reported elsewhere (Dehaut et al., 2016; Karami et al., 2017). It could therefore be possible that those were induced by a temperature >40° C and an exposure time exceeding 24 hours. In addition, we found that changes in Raman spectra of LDPE, PA, PP and PVC observed in this study may be due to the exposure to a liquid in general for 48 hours rather than KOH-specific. Since no study to our knowledge has assessed the effect of pure water on polymers, conclusions are difficult to draw.

**Conclusion**

Assessment of potential health risks to humans is likely to rely on quantification of microplastics on the lower end of their size range. We compared digestion techniques previously applied by other studies. Based on the evidence presented here, 10 % KOH is a suitable digestion technique for bivalve tissues, even when the target particles are of single-micrometre size. Filtration was achieved using filter papers of 1.2 µm when neutralising the digestate prior to filtration. The digestion temperature is important and effects on semi-synthetic polymers (e.g. rayon) can be minimised by choosing an incubation temperature of 40° C or lower. The lower temperature also delivered more consistent results. The use of a matching software to assess the Raman spectra of the microplastics used in this study showed that all types were identifiable after KOH exposure. KOH is also the most economical and least time-consuming method. Its hazardousness to human health is similar to or less than other reagents used for tissue digestions. Since KOH has also successfully been used for
other tissues, we suggest that this method is adapted as a standard method for biological tissue
digestions to extract microplastics. Such a harmonised approach will allow for comparability
between studies and make such results more policy-relevant.

Data availability

Data supporting this study are openly available from the University of Southampton repository at
http://dx.doi.org/10.5258/SOTON/xxxxx.

Statement of competing interest

The authors declare no competing interest.

Funding

This work was supported by the EPSRC Doctoral Programme, Leverhulme Trust Doctoral Scholarship
and the Blue Marine Foundation, London, UK. The funding bodies did not have any involvement in
this study.

Disclosure of previous publications

A small selection of results from this manuscript were presented at EMCON 2018, Oslo, Norway, in
June 2018 as a poster.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr Jasmin Godbold and Prof Ian Williams for reviewing an earlier draft of this
work. We are grateful for the continuous feedback from Prof David Coggon during the execution and
write-up of this study. We would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this manuscript for their constructive feedback. We are indebted to the laboratory technicians – especially to Pilar Pascual-Hidalgo - of the Faraday laboratory of the University of Southampton for the support in executing this study.
References

Alexander, J., Barregard, L., Bignami, M., Ceccatelli, S., Cottrill, B., Dinovi, M., Edler, L., Grasl-Kraupp, B., Hogstrand, C., Hoogenboom, L. (Ron), Knutsen, H.K., Nebbia, C.S., Oswald, I., Petersen, A., Rogiers, V.M., Rose, M., Roudot, A.-C., Schwerdtle, T., Vleminckx, C., Vollmer, G., Wallace, H., Chain, E.P.C.F., 2016. Presence of microplastics and nanoplastics in food, with particular focus on seafood. EFSA J. 14. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4501

Andrady, A.L., 2011. Microplastics in the marine environment. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 62, 1596–1605. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.05.030

Arthur, C., Baker, J., Bamford, H., 2009. Proceedings of the International Research Workshop on the Occurrence, Effects, and Fate of Microplastic Marine Debris, NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS-OR&R-30.

Avio, C.G., Gorbi, S., Regoli, F., 2015. Experimental development of a new protocol for extraction and characterization of microplastics in fish tissues: First observations in commercial species from Adriatic Sea. Mar. Environ. Res. 111, 18–26. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.06.014

Browne, M.A., Dissanayake, A., Galloway, T.S., Lowe, D.M., Thompson, R.C., 2008. Ingested microscopic plastic translocates to the circulatory system of the mussel, Mytilus edulis (L). Environ. Sci. Technol. 42, 5026–5031. doi:10.1021/es800249a

Buchanan, J.B., 1971. Pollution by synthetic fibres. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2, 23. doi:10.1016/0025-326X(71)90136-6

Budimir, S., Setälä, O., Lehtiniemi, M., 2018. Effective and easy to use extraction method shows low numbers of microplastics in offshore planktivorous fish from the northern Baltic Sea. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 127, 586–592. doi:10.1016/J.MARPOLBUL.2017.12.054

Bürkle, 2017. Chemical resistance of plastics [WWW Document]. URL http://www.buerkle.de/en/downloads/chemical-resistance (accessed 2.24.17).

Caron, A.G.M., Thomas, C.R., Berry, K.L.E., Motti, C.A., Ariel, E., Brodie, J.E., 2018. Validation of an optimised protocol for quantification of microplastics in heterogenous samples: A case study using green turtle chyme. MethodsX 5, 812–823. doi:10.1016/j.mex.2018.07.009

Catarino, A.I., Thompson, R., Sanderson, W., Henry, T.B., 2017. Development and optimization of a standard method for extraction of microplastics in mussels by enzyme digestion of soft tissues.
Claessens, M., Van Cauwenberghe, L., Vandegehuchte, M.B., Janssen, C.R., 2013. New techniques for the detection of microplastics in sediments and field collected organisms. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 70, 227–233. doi:10.1016/j.marpollbul.2013.03.009

Cole, M., Webb, H., Lindeque, P.K., Fileman, E.S., Halsband, C., Galloway, T.S., 2014. Isolation of microplastics in biota-rich seawater samples and marine organisms. Sci. Rep. 4, 4528. doi:10.1038/srep04528

Collard, F., Gilbert, B., Compère, P., Eppe, G., Das, K., Jauniaux, T., Parmentier, E., 2017. Microplastics in livers of European anchovies (Engraulis encrasicolus, L.). Environ. Pollut. 229, 1000–1005. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2017.07.089

Collard, F., Gilbert, B., Eppe, G., Parmentier, E., Das, K., 2015. Detection of Anthropogenic Particles in Fish Stomachs: An Isolation Method Adapted to Identification by Raman Spectroscopy. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 69, 331–339. doi:10.1007/s00244-015-0221-0

Courtene-Jones, W., Quinn, B., Murphy, F., Gary, S.F., Narayanaswamy, B.E., 2017. Optimisation of enzymatic digestion and validation of specimen preservation methods for the analysis of ingested microplastics. Anal. Methods 9, 1437–1445. doi:10.1039/C6AY02343F

Cranford, P., Strohmeier, T., Filgueira, R., Strand, Ø., 2016. Potential methodological influences on the determination of particle retention efficiency by suspension feeders: Mytilus edulis and Ciona intestinalis. Aquat. Biol. 25, 61–73. doi:10.3354/ab00660

De Witte, B., Devriese, L., Bekaert, K., Hoffman, S., Vandermeersch, G., Cooreman, K., Robbens, J., 2014. Quality assessment of the blue mussel (Mytilus edulis): Comparison between commercial and wild types. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 85, 146–155. doi:10.1016/j.marpollbul.2014.06.006

Dehaut, A., Cassone, A.-L., Frère, L., Hermabessiere, L., Himber, C., Rinnert, E., Rivière, G., Lambert, C., Soudant, P., Huvet, A., Duflos, G., Paul-Pont, I., 2016. Microplastics in seafood: Benchmark protocol for their extraction and characterization. Environ. Pollut. 215, 223–233. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.05.018

Ding, Y., Freeman, H.S., 2017. Mordant dye application on cotton: optimisation and combination with natural dyes. Color. Technol. 133, 369–375. doi:10.1111/cote.12288

Enders, K., Lenz, R., Beer, S., Stedmon, C.A., 2017. Extraction of microplastic from biota: recommended acidic digestion destroys common plastic polymers. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 74, 326–
FAO, 2016. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsw173

Foekema, E.M., De Gruijter, C., Mergia, M.T., van Franeker, J.A., Murk, A.J., Koelmans, A.A., 2013. Plastic in North Sea Fish. Environ. Sci. Technol. 47, 8818–8824. doi:10.1021/es400931b

Gupta, M.L., Gupta, B., Oppermann, W., Hardtmann, G., 2004. Surface modification of polyacrylonitrile staple fibers via alkaline hydrolysis for superabsorbent applications. J. Appl. Polym. Sci. 91, 3127–3133. doi:10.1002/app.13486

Haggett, E.A., 2017. The occurrence of microplastics in European culinary sea salt. University of Southampton.

Hanke, G., Galgani, F., Werner, S., Oosterbaan, L., Nilsson, P., Fleet, D., Kinsey, S., Thompson, R., Andreja, P., Van Franeker, J.A., Vlachogianni, T., Scoullos, M., Veiga, J.M., Matiddi, M., Alcaro, L., Maes, T., Korpinen, S., Budziak, A., Leslie, H., Gago, J., Liebezeit, G., 2013. Guidance on monitoring of marine litter in European seas. JRC Sci. Policy Reports. doi:10.2788/99475

Hidalgo-Ruz, V., Gutow, L., Thompson, R.C., Thiel, M., 2012. Microplastics in the Marine Environment: A Review of the Methods Used for Identification and Quantification. Environ. Sci. Technol. 46, 3060–3075. doi:10.1021/es2031505

Imhof, H.K., Schmid, J., Niessner, R., Ivleva, N.P., Laforsch, C., 2012. A novel, highly efficient method for the separation and quantification of plastic particles in sediments of aquatic environments. Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods 10, 524–537. doi:10.4319/lom.2012.10.524

Jarvis, M.C., 2003. Primary products | Cellulose, in: Encyclopedia of Applied Plant Sciences. Elsevier, pp. 865–871. doi:10.1016/B0-12-227050-9/00122-8

Käppler, A., Windrich, F., Loeder, M.G.J., Malanin, M., Fischer, D., Labrenz, M., Eichhorn, K.-J., Voit, B., 2015. Identification of microplastics by FTIR and Raman microscopy: a novel silicon filter substrate opens the important spectral range below 1300 cm(-1) for FTIR transmission measurements. Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 407, 6791–6801. doi:10.1007/s00216-015-8850-8

Käppler, A., Fischer, D., Oberbeckmann, S., Schernewski, G., Labrenz, M., Eichhorn, K.-J., Voit, B., 2016. Analysis of environmental microplastics by vibrational microspectroscopy: FTIR, Raman or both? Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 408, 8377–8391. doi:10.1007/s00216-016-9956-3
Karami, A., Golieskardi, A., Choo, C.K., Romano, N., Ho, Y. Bin, Salamatinia, B., 2017. A high-performance protocol for extraction of microplastics in fish. Sci. Total Environ. 578, 485–494. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.213

Karlsson, T.M., Vethaak, A.D., Almroth, B.C., Ariese, F., van Velzen, M., Hassellöv, M., Leslie, H.A., 2017. Screening for microplastics in sediment, water, marine invertebrates and fish: Method development and microplastic accumulation. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 122, 403–408. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.06.081

Khan, M.B., Prezant, R.S., 2018. Microplastic abundances in a mussel bed and ingestion by the ribbed marsh mussel Geukensia demissa. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 130, 67–75. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.03.012

Kouassi, S.S., Andji, J., Bonnet, J.-P., Rossignol, S., 2010. Dissolution of waste glasses in high alkaline solutions. Ceram. – Silikáty 54, 235–240.

Kühn, S., van Werven, B., van Oyen, A., Meijboom, A.A., Bravo Rebolledo, E.L., van Franeker, J.A., 2017. The use of potassium hydroxide (KOH) solution as a suitable approach to isolate plastics ingested by marine organisms. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 115, 86–90. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.034

Li, J., Yang, D., Li, L., Jabeen, K., Shi, H., 2015. Microplastics in commercial bivalves from China. Environ. Pollut. 207, 190–195. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.09.018

Loeder, M.G.J., Kuczera, M., Mintenig, S., Lorenz, C., Gerdts, G., 2015. Focal plane array detector-based micro-Fourier-transform infrared imaging for the analysis of microplastics in environmental samples. Environ. Chem. 12, 563–581. doi:10.1071/EN14205

Lusher, A.L., Welden, N.A., Sobral, P., Cole, M., 2017. Sampling, isolating and identifying microplastics ingested by fish and invertebrates. Anal. Methods 9, 1346–1360. doi:10.1039/C6AY02415G

Masse, L., Kennedy, K., Chou, S., 2001. Testing of alkaline and enzymatic hydrolysis pretreatments for fat particles in slaughterhouse wastewater. Bioreour. Technol. 77, 145–155. doi:10.1016/S0960-8524(00)00146-2

Molchanov, V.S., Prikhid’ko, N.E., 1958. Corrosion of silicate glasses by alkaline solutions. Communication 4. Corrosion of glasses by solutions of various hydroxides. Bull. Acad. Sci. USSR, Div. Chem. Sci. 7, 893–897.
Murray, F., Cowie, P.R., 2011. Plastic contamination in the decapod crustacean Nephrops norvegicus (Linnaeus, 1758). Mar. Pollut. Bull. 62, 1207–1217. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.03.032

Oaten, J.F.P., Hudson, M.D., Jensen, A.C., Williams, I.D., 2015. Effects of organism preparation in metallothionein and metal analysis in marine invertebrates for biomonitoring marine pollution. Sci. Total Environ. 518–519, 238–247. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2015.03.003

Papageorgiou, I., Marsh, R., Tipper, J.L., Hall, R.M., Fisher, J., Ingham, E., 2014. Interaction of micron and nano-sized particles with cells of the dura mater. J. Biomed. Mater. Res. B. Appl. Biomater. 102, 1496–505. doi:10.1002/jbm.b.33129

Paul-Pont, I., Lacroix, C., González Fernández, C., Hégaret, H., Lambert, C., Le Goïc, N., Frère, L., Cassone, A.-L., Sussarellu, R., Fabioux, C., Guyomarch, J., Albertos, M., Huvet, A., Soudant, P., 2016. Exposure of marine mussels Mytilus spp. to polystyrene microplastics: Toxicity and influence on fluoranthene bioaccumulation. Environ. Pollut. 216, 724–737. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.06.039

Phuong, N.N., Zalouk-Vergnoux, A., Kamari, A., Mouneyrac, C., Amiard, F., Poirier, L., Lagarde, F., 2018. Quantification and characterization of microplastics in blue mussels (Mytilus edulis): protocol setup and preliminary data on the contamination of the French Atlantic coast. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 25, 6135–6144. doi:10.1007/s11356-017-8862-3

Roch, S., Brinker, A., 2017. Rapid and Efficient Method for the Detection of Microplastic in the Gastrointestinal Tract of Fishes. Environ. Sci. Technol. 51, 4522–4530. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b00364

Rochman, C.M., Tahir, A., Williams, S.L., Baxa, D. V., Lam, R., Miller, J.T., Teh, F.-C., Werorilangi, S., Teh, S.J., 2015. Anthropogenic debris in seafood: Plastic debris and fibers from textiles in fish and bivalves sold for human consumption. Sci. Rep. 5, 14340. doi:10.1038/srep14340

Ropert, M., Goulletquer, P., 2000. Comparative physiological energetics of two suspension feeders: polychaete annelid Lanice conchilega (Pallas 1766) and Pacific cupped oyster Crassostrea gigas (Thunberg 1795). Aquaculture 181, 171–189. doi:10.1016/S0044-8486(99)00216-1

Sussarellu, R., Suquet, M., Thomas, Y., Lambert, C., Fabioux, C., Pernet, M.E.J., Le Goïc, N., Quillien, V., Mingant, C., Epelboin, Y., Corporeau, C., Guyomarch, J., Robbens, J., Paul-Pont, I., Soudant, P., Huvet, A., 2016. Oyster reproduction is affected by exposure to polystyrene microplastics. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 113, 2430–2435. doi:10.1073/pnas.1519019113
Tanaka, K., Takada, H., 2016. Microplastic fragments and microbeads in digestive tracts of planktivorous fish from urban coastal waters. Sci. Rep. 6, 34351. doi:10.1038/srep34351

TedPella, 1996-2019. Plastics: Chemical Resistance [WWW Document]. URL https://www.tedpella.com/company_html/PlasticsChemResistance.htm (accessed 2.15.19).

Thompson, R.C., Olsen, Y., Mitchell, R.P., Davis, A., Rowland, S.J., John, A.W.G., McGonigle, D., Russell, A.E., 2004. Lost at sea: where is all the plastic? Science (80-. ). 304, 838. doi:10.1126/science.1094559

Undeland, I., Kelleher, S.D., Hultin, H.O., 2002. Recovery of Functional Proteins from Herring (Clupea harengus) Light Muscle by an Acid or Alkaline Solubilization Process. J. Agric. Food Chem. 50, 7371–7379. doi:10.1021/JF020199U

Van Cauwenberghe, L., Claessens, M., Vandegehuchte, M.B., Janssen, C.R., 2015. Microplastics are taken up by mussels (Mytilus edulis) and lugworms (Arenicola marina) living in natural habitats. Environ. Pollut. 199, 10–17. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.01.008

Van Cauwenberghe, L., Janssen, C.R., 2014. Microplastics in bivalves cultured for human consumption. Environ. Pollut. 193, 65–70. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2014.06.010

Vandermeersch, G., Van Cauwenberghe, L., Janssen, C.R., Marques, A., Granby, K., Fait, G., Kotterman, M.J.J., Diogène, J., Bekaert, K., Robbens, J., Devriese, L., 2015. A critical view on microplastic quantification in aquatic organisms. Environ. Res. 143, 46–55. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2015.07.016

Volkheimer, G., 2001. The phenomenon of persorption: Persorption, dissemination, and elimination of microparticles, in: Old Herborn University Seminara Monograph. Herborn Litterae.

Wagner, J., Wang, Z.-M., Ghosal, S., Rochman, C., Gassel, M., Wall, S., 2017. Novel method for the extraction and identification of microplastics in ocean trawl and fish gut matrices. Anal. Methods 9, 1479–1490. doi:10.1039/c6ay02396g

Wesch, C., Barthel, A.-K.K., Braun, U., Klein, R., Paulus, M., 2016. No microplastics in benthic eelpout (Zoarces viviparus): An urgent need for spectroscopic analyses in microplastic detection. Environ. Res. 148, 36–38. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2016.03.017

Wright, S.L., Kelly, F.J., 2017. Plastic and Human Health: A Micro Issue? Environ. Sci. Technol. 51, 6634–6647. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b00423
Wright, S.L., Thompson, R.C., Galloway, T.S., 2013. The physical impacts of microplastics on marine organisms: A review. Environ. Pollut. 178, 483–492. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.02.031

Yang, D., Shi, H., Li, L., Li, J., Jabeen, K., Kolandhasamy, P., 2015. Microplastic Pollution in Table Salts from China. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 13622–13627. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b03163
Supplementary Information to ‘Evaluation of existing methods to extract microplastics from bivalve tissue: adapted KOH digestion protocol improves filtration at single-digit pore size’ by Thiele, Christina J.; Hudson, Malcolm D.; Russell, Andrea E.

Content of file:

- Table SI.1 – Existing approaches of extracting microplastics from bivalve tissue with the exception of acid digestions.
- Section on ‘Costs, time needed and hazardousness of reagents’.
- Table SI.3 – Microplastics produced in-house from consumer products by polymer and used for a range of recovery experiments by our research group, including relative densities and approximate global production in 2015 in million metric tonnes.
- Section on ‘Effect on filter papers’.
- Section on ‘Quantification of microplastic particle losses during the spiking experiment’.
| Reagent & study | Types of bivalves | General approach | Filter type & size | Notes |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|
| H₂O₂ by Li et al. (2015) | Scapharca subcrenata, Tegillarca granosa, Sinonovacula constricta, Ruditapes philippinarum, Meretrix lusoria, Cyclina sinensis, Patinopecten yessoensis, Alectryonella plicatula, Mytilus galloprovincialis | 200 ml of 30 % H₂O₂ to sample (1 – 5 specimens) Incubation at 65° C for 24 hours, additional incubation at room temperature for 24 – 48 hours Flotation with NaCl solution | Cellulose nitrate, 5 µm | Optimisation attempt to cut out density separation step led to unacceptable levels of foaming. |
| KOH by Rochman et al. (2015) | Magallana gigas | 3 times volume of tissue of 10 % KOH to sample (entire specimen), incubation at 60° C overnight | n/a | (Microplastics of >500 µm were directly visualised with microscope) Optimisation by increasing incubation time to 48 hours. Effects on filter papers and filtration efficiency removed by neutralisation of digestate prior to filtration. Decrease in incubation temperature and KOH strength possible (details in text). |
| Trypsin by Courtene-Jones et al. (2017) | Mytilus edulis | Entire specimen, 0.3165 % Trypsin, 20 ml per specimen, incubation at 38-42° C for 30 minutes | 80 µm mesh gauze | Optimisation achieved by adding 4 times volume of wet tissue to sample and incubate for 4 hours, filtration over 63-µm mesh. |
| Proteinase-K by Karlsson et al. (2017) based on Cole et al. (2014) | Mytilus edulis | sample: 0.2 g of tissue, additionally used Tris-HCl, SDS, CaCl₂, H₂O₂, incubated at 60° C and filtered next day | 1.2 µm GF/C | Digestion of whole specimens (c.1.0-1.2 g DW) with additional Tris-HCl, EDTA, SDS, NaCl, sodium perchlorate similar to Cole et al. (2014). Quantities not adjusted, but filter size increased to 25 µm. Digestate was not filterable with vacuum filtration. |
**Costs, time needed and hazardousness of reagents**

Costs of digestion per sample were based on a mean oyster tissue volume of 20 ml (11.8 ±6.4 g w.w.). When optimisation was not possible, calculations were performed with the most promising protocol (e.g. observation of highest digestion rates). Prices were taken of the website from Fisher Scientific, or Sigma Aldrich if not available at the former, on 29th December 2017. The cost of ultrapure water- which will be laboratory-dependant - was estimated at £0.232/litre based on the following estimates:

- DI pack for ultrapure - £556.00 (replaced approximately every 9 months on average)
- UV lamp for ultrapure - £141.00 (replaced approximately every 18 months)
- Delivery speed of pump – 2L/min
- Estimated daily usage – 10 L
- Average month: 30 days
- Consumables that provide the water in the tank to get it to a certain grade to feed the ultrapure water are not included.

The length of time needed per digestion was recorded during optimisation and efficacy trials. H-phrases of the individual reagents were obtained from Material Safety Data Sheets from the two suppliers. Categories of health hazards associated with each method was used as a proxy for hazardousness. The results can be seen in Table SI.2.
Table SI.2 – Cost, expenditure of time and hazardousness of different digestion methods.

Reagent cost were calculated in December 2017 (website of Fisher Scientific, or Sigma Aldrich if not found at the former). Health hazard scores according to Material Safety Data Sheets from the same suppliers divided into categories C1 to C4.

| Digestion method | Reagent costs per sample (£) | Type 1 water (£) cost | Cost per sample (£) | Approximate time needed for digestion (per batch) | Health hazard category scores | Notes |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| 10 % KOH (with C₆H₈O₇) | 0.52                         | 0.03                  | 0.55                | Day 1: block of <60 min, day 3: block of <60 min | C1: 1; C2: 3; C4: 1          |       |
| 30 % H₂O₂        | 2.88                         | 0.05                  | 2.93                | Day 1: block of <60 min, day 2: block of <60 min | C1: 1; C4: 1                 |       |
| Trypsin          | 0.98                         | 0.02                  | 1.00                | <120 min over one day (approx. 4 hours of unoccupied time) | C1: 1; Cost could increase as method not optimised |       |
| Proteinase K (with NaClO₄, SDS, NaCl, EDTA, Trizma-HCl) | 2.98                         | >0.01                 | 2.98                | Day 1: c.120 min over ½ day (c.2 hours unoccupied time), day 2: block of <60 min; occasional preparation of reagents 60 min | C1: 2, C2: 6, C3: 2, C4: 3 | Method not optimised; amount for 0.2 g tissue, average oyster dry weight 1.5 g |
Making of microplastics for spiking experiment

Table SI.3 – Microplastics produced in-house from consumer products by polymer and used for a range of recovery experiments by our research group, including relative densities and approximate global production in 2015 in million metric tonnes.

Key for polymers: PS: polystyrene, PP: polypropylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PA: polyamide, PVC: polyvinyl chloride, LDPE: low-density polyethylene. Relative densities were obtained from Andrady (2011), Gooch (2017), Taiseisha (1970) cited in http://www.pvc.org/en/p/specific-gravity-density, https://www.natureworks/Technical-Documents/Fact-Sheets/Fibers/FactSheet_Fabrics_Fiber_FabricProperties_pdf.pdf?la=en&la=en, http://www.dotmar.com.au/propertiestables.php;

Global production values were obtained from Geyer et al. (2017) estimates of fibre production from https://www.cirfs.org/statistics/key-statistics/world-production-fibre, * including other polyester fibres, ** including other cellulosic fibres

| Polymer type | Microplastic category | Colour | Origin | Relative density of virgin polymer | Approximate global production in 2015 (in million tonnes) |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| PS           | Fragment              | White  | Lid of disposable coffee cup      | 1.04-1.05                                        | 24                                                       |
| PP           | Fragment              | Clear  | Single-use ready meal container   | 0.57-0.91                                        | 68                                                       |
| PET          | Fragment              | Green  | Olive oil bottle                  | 1.29-1.44                                        | 32                                                       |
| PP           | Fibre                 | Cream  | Carpet                           | 1.04-1.05                                        | 4                                                        |
| PA           | Fibre                 | Yellow | Tutu fabric                       | 1.11-1.29                                        | 4                                                        |
| PET          | Fibre                 | White  | Fleece blanket                    | 1.29-1.44                                        | 50*                                                      |
| acrylic      | Fibre                 | Blue   | Fleece fabric                     | 1.2                                              | 1.7                                                      |
| Rayon        | Fibre                 | Black  | Garment fabric                    | 1.52                                             | 5**                                                      |
| PVC          | Microsheet            | Clear  | Table cloth                       | 1.25-1.47                                        | 36                                                       |
| LDPE         | Microsheet            | White  | Lining of disposable coffee cup   | 0.91-0.92                                        | 62                                                       |

Additional references used

Geyer, R., Jambeck, J. R. & Law, K. L. Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made. Sci. Adv. 3, e1700782 (2017).

Gooch, J. W. Encyclopedic Dictionary of Polymers. Springer-Verlag New York (2017).
**Effect on filter papers.** Initial trials revealed that KOH affected the filtering capacity of filter papers, e.g. the longer the digestate took to filter the more difficult it was to flush the filter with pure water afterwards. This effect was tested by subjecting pre-weighed cellulose (Whatman Grade 4), cellulose nitrate (5.0 µm Whatman) and borosilicate (Whatman GF/C) filters to three different neutralisation treatments in triplicate. Samples of 25 ml of 10 % KOH solution were heated to 60° C. The following treatments were used: 1) no neutralisation, 2) part-neutralisation with 15 ml of 1 M citric acid and 3) complete neutralisation with 22 ml of 1 M citric acid. Mixtures were transferred immediately to the vacuum filtration unit. To mimic slow filtration, the pump was not switched on for 90 seconds, during which time part of the mixture passed through the filter gravitationally. The remainder (c.10 ml) was filtered using the vacuum. Filters were rinsed with 20 ml ultrapure water, transferred to petri dishes, dried at 60° C overnight and re-weighed at room temperature. The pH of the each mixture was established using paper indicator strips. The relative weight change of the filters was used as a measure of effect (Equation 4, supplement information).

The effect of the solution on the filter papers can be seen in Figure 3 (main text). Cellulose nitrate filters seem to become heavier with neutralised solutions (Kruskal-Wallis, H(1) = 3.86, p = 0.05). It is worth noting that cellulose nitrate filters exhibited only a small change in weight using the original solution despite one of the filters partly disintegrating. In addition, two filters split and all filters turned yellow. The weight of cellulose filters using original and neutralised solution was similar, 4.36 ±3.32 and 4.03 ±1.78 % respectively (Kruskal-Wallis, H(1) = 0.05, p = 0.83). Conversely, borosilicate filter weights increased by 15.78 ±5.21 % using the original solution, but only by 3.56 ±1.27 % when filtering neutralised KOH solution (Kruskal-Wallis, H(1) = 3.86, p = 0.05). No visual damage was observed for cellulose and glass filters.
Figure SI.1 – Effect of neutralised (light grey bars) and not neutralised 10 % KOH solution (dark grey bars) on mean weight of filter papers of cellulose nitrate, cellulose and borosilicate glass (n = 3). Filter papers were subjected to the solution mixture for 90 seconds prior to flushing. Difference in weight changes were tested using Kruskal-Wallis.
Quantification of microplastic particle losses during the spiking experiment.

Incorrectly counted out microplastics in preparation for the spiking experiment. Prior to spiking, known amounts of microplastics were placed into glass petri dishes. Spot checks of closed dishes showed that quantities were often below 30 particles per type of microplastic. In four containers, between six and all ten reference material types were recounted. All fragments and microsheets were counted. Estimation of number of fibres proved difficult when fibres were present in agglomerations. Dishes were not opened during this process to prevent additional losses through particles jumping or sticking to tools. In no case were there more than 30 particles. The minimum number of fragments was 24 for PP, 27 for LDPE microsheet and 28 PP fibres. Based on these findings, it can be assumed that a mean of 28.75 ±1.91 fragments, 29.00 ±0.76 fibres and 29.25 ±1.04 microsheets was prepared for each sample. Since only a fraction of prepared reference materials was recounted, results were not adjusted for those estimated losses. Otherwise, recovery rates would have increased between 2.1 and 3.9 %, except for rayon.

Lack of transfer of counted out reference materials from their storage container to the sample. Counted out microplastics were transferred from petri dishes to samples. Petri dishes were sealed with tape and inspected for non-transferred particles. In 16 out of 21 containers some particles remained. Mean particle content in those 16 was 5.4 ±6.1. The maximum number of particles that remained in one dish was 21. Out of the microplastics created, PS and PET fragments, PA fibres and LDPE sheet all transferred to the samples. Between two and five particles were not transferred for PP fragments, PP, rayon and acrylic fibres respectively. Forty-four pieces of PVC microsheet and 29 PET fibres did not transfer overall. The results shown in Figure 1 (main text) were adjusted for those losses.

Microplastics recovered through additional rinsing

As mentioned in the results section, Figure 1 was adjusted for microplastics that were only recovered through additional rinsing. Those additional recovery rates can be found in Table SI.4.
Table SI.4 - Recovered microplastics after thorough rinsing of the filtration unit from spiked oyster tissue. Data are percentage mean values (±SD) based on four replicates.

| Sample ID | Fragments | Fibres | Sheet |
|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|
|           | PS        | PP     | PET   | PA    | PP | PET | Acrylic | Rayon | PVC | LDPE |
| RR6       | 0         | 1      | 0     | 0     | 1  | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0   | 0    |
| RR8       | 1         | 3      | 1     | 2     | 0  | 0   | 1       | 0     | 0   | 1    |
| RR10      | 3         | 0      | 4     | 3     | 2  | 0   | 2       | 0     | 1   | 0    |
| RR12      | 3         | 4      | 1     | 0     | 4  | 0   | 3       | 0     | 0   | 6    |