

Occurrence and environmental distribution of 5 UV filters during the 1 summer season in different water bodies

Clémence Rohée, Richard Roe, Sonja K Fagervold, Alice M. S. Rodrigues, Muriel Bourrain, Didier Stien, Philippe Lebaron

▶ To cite this version:

Clémence Rohée, Richard Roe, Sonja K Fagervold, Alice M. S. Rodrigues, Muriel Bourrain, et al.. Occurrence and environmental distribution of 5 UV filters during the 1 summer season in different water bodies. Water, Air, and Soil Pollution, 2019, 230 (7), 10.1007/s11270-019-4217-7. hal-02331718

HAL Id: hal-02331718 https://hal.science/hal-02331718

Submitted on 24 Oct 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Occurrence and environmental distribution of 5 UV filters during the
2	summer season in different water bodies
3	
4	S. K. Fagervold ^{1,2} , A. S. Rodrigues ^{1,2} , C. Rohee ³ , R. Roé ³ , M. Bourrain ³ , D. Stien ^{1,2}
5	and P. Lebaron ^{1,2*}
6	
7	¹ Sorbonne Universités, CNRS, Laboratoire de Biodiversité et Biotechnologie
8	Microbiennes, LBBM, Observatoire Océanologique, 66650 Banyuls-sur-mer,
9	France
10	² Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Fédération de Recherche, Observatoire
11	Océanologique, 66650 Banyuls-sur-mer, France
12	³ Pierre Fabre Dermo-Cosmétique, Centre de Recherche & Développement Pierre
13	Fabre, 31000 Toulouse
14	
15	[*] Corresponding author: Philippe Lebaron. Email: <u>lebaron@obs-banyuls.fr</u>
16	Address: Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Laboratoire de Biodiversité et
17	Biotechnologie Microbienne, USR3579, Observatoire Océanologique, 66650
18	Banyuls-sur-mer, France
19	
20	Abstract
21	
22	Organic UV filters are used worldwide in various personal care products as well
23	as textiles, paints, plastic, food and adhesives. They are main ingredients in
24	sunscreen lotions that are used heavily by beachgoers in the summer season.
25	There is thus an increasing concern regarding the fate of organic UV filters in the

1 environment and their impact on living organisms. Many of the UV filters in use 2 are hydrophobic and are expected to accumulate in the sediment phase in 3 aquatic systems, but this has yet to be validated in situ. We targeted the UV filters 4 benzophenone 3 (BP3), butyl Methoxydibenzoylmethane (BMDBM), diethylhexyl 5 butamido triazone (DBT), bis-ethylhexyloxyphenol methoxyphenyl triazine 6 (BEMT) and methylene bis-benzotriazolyl tetramethylbutylphenol (MBBT) in a 7 freshwater lake and in a coastal bay in order to understand their distribution 8 during summer 2016. Further, we examined their environmental partitioning by 9 collecting samples from the surface water, the sediment phase and water surface 10 microlayer (SML). We show for the first time the presence of DBT, BEMT and 11 MBBT in environmental matrices (water, SML, and sediment). Notably, these UV 12 filters were detected at low amounts in surface waters with maximum 13 concentrations of 9.9 ng/L for DBT, 18.4 ng/L for BEMT and below detection 14 limits for MBBT, and somewhat higher concentrations in the SML, with 15 maximum concentrations of 43.3 ng/L for DBT, 5625.4 ng/L for BEMT and 45.6 16 ng/L for MBBT. These filters were detected at even greater concentrations in the 17 sediments, with maximum concentrations of 652.6 ng/g for DBT, 115.0 ng/g for 18 BEMT and 75.2 ng/g for MBBT (dry weight sediment). We also performed 19 controlled laboratory experiments to determine their partitioning behavior and 20 we verified the actual solubility of many of the filters. This will help in 21 determining the environmental fate and finally lead to a better risk assessment 22 of these compounds. Together, these results corroborate the hypothesis that 23 hydrophobic UV filters accumulate in the sediment phase and highlight the 24 importance of discerning whether these UV filters impact the benthic community 25 and their potential for bioaccumulation.

2 1 Introduction

3

4 Over the past fifteen years, public interest in sunscreens has increased because 5 of their potential ecological risk in aquatic environments. Sunscreens use organic 6 UV filters as ingredients in their formulations to protect human skin from 7 sunburns, premature skin aging and skin cancer. Organic UV filters include a 8 heterogeneous group of molecules characterized by conjugated aromatic groups 9 that can absorb UV-A (320-400 nm) and UV-B (280-320 nm) radiation. These 10 UV filters are also added to textiles, plastics, paints, food and adhesives to protect 11 polymers and pigments against photo degradation and to prevent discoloring. In 12 sunscreen lotions, formulations generally combine several filters and ingredients 13 to cover a broad UV spectrum and to improve skin application and water 14 resistance (Osterwalder et al. 2014). More than 50 different UV filters are on the 15 market (Shaath 2010), and their usage varies depending on the regulations of the 16 region.

17

18 UV filters enter the aquatic environment directly from recreational activities and 19 indirectly from wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), see Ramos et al. (2016) 20 and references therein, or leaching from solid waste disposal sites on land. UV 21 filters enter the sewage systems when people shower following bathing or from 22 industrial discharge. Once in the environment, partitioning between water and 23 sediment occurs depending on the lipophilicity of the compound, which is 24 estimated by the octanol-water partition coefficient (log k_{ow}) value. Those 25 compounds with low aqueous solubility tend to accumulate in sediments and

1	sludge (Ramos et al. 2015). Environmental concentrations of different UV filters
2	are found in numerous reports, with recent reviews summarizing their
3	concentrations in different matrices (Montes-Grajales et al. 2017) including
4	wastewater treatment plants (Ramos et al. 2016), sediments (Tsui et al. 2015)
5	and water bodies (Ramos et al. 2015;Sánchez-Quiles and Tovar-Sánchez 2015).
6	
7	The possibility that these compounds have negative effects on non-target
8	organisms is one factor that raises concern about the release of UV filters into the
9	environment. This is especially true in areas, like the Mediterranean, that are
10	highly impacted by tourism (Tovar-Sanchez et al. 2019). Further, because UV
11	filters have been detected in various biological materials, such as fish (Balmer et
12	al. 2005; Fent et al. 2010; Tsai et al. 2014; Langford et al. 2015; Gago-Ferrero et
13	al. 2015; Emnet et al. 2015; Sang and Leung 2016), dolphins (Gago-Ferrero et al.
14	2013; Alonso et al. 2015) and bird eggs (Molins-Delgado et al. 2017),
15	biomagnification is a real concern (Fent et al. 2010; Sang and Leung 2016;
16	Molins-Delgado et al., 2017). Many UV filters are thought to impact non-target
17	organisms via endocrine disruption (Díaz-Cruz and Barceló 2009; Sánchez-
18	Quiles and Tovar-Sánchez 2015). Recently, benzophenone 3 (BP3) was shown to
19	have toxic effects on many living organisms (Downs et al. 2016; Wnuk et al.
20	2018). As a consequence, this compound was banned in the state of Hawaii, USA
21	("Office of the governor — news release — Governor David Ige signs bill making
22	Hawaii first in the world to ban certain sunscreens" 2018).
23	
24	Diethylhexyl butamido triazone (DBT), methylene bis-benzotriazolyl

25 tetramethylbutylphenol (MBBT) and bis-ethylhexyloxyphenol methoxyphenyl

1	triazine (BEMT) have very high predicted log K_{ow} values (Table 1) and have not
2	been reported in any environmental matrix to date. BP3 and butyl
3	Methoxydibenzoylmethane (BMDBM), have lower log K_{ow} values (Table 1) and
4	are technically easier to detect: butyl methoxydibenzoylmethane (BMDBM), has
5	been detected in various compartments, including seawater and freshwater
6	(Bratkovics and Sapozhnikova 2011; Giokas et al. 2005; Sánchez Rodríguez et al.
7	2015; Poiger et al. 2004) and in WWTP effluents and influents (Rodil et al. 2009;
8	Tsui et al. 2014) and BP3 has been found in many environmental matrices (ex.
9	(Montes-Grajales et al. 2017; Ramos et al. 2016)). However, for a proper
10	assessment of the environmental fate of these filters, we also need to determine
11	the solubility and the partitioning behavior of these compounds experimentally.
12	
13	In the current study, we determined the concentration of the widely studied UV
14	filter BP3 and compared the concentration of BP3 with that of less investigated
15	but relatively broadly utilized compounds. We investigated a coastal marine site,
16	the Bay of Banyuls-sur-mer, and a freshwater lake, Villeneuve de la Raho Lake.
17	Both sites experience a high number of sunbathers during the summer months
18	(June to August). In addition to determining the dynamics of the filters during
19	the summer months, we determined in which compartment these UV filters are
20	found. For example, the surface microlayer (SML) has different chemical and
21	biological characteristics than those of the underlying water (Obernosterer et al.
22	2005) and this air-sea boundary, in which hydrophobic compounds may
23	accumulate and living organisms may be present (Rahlff et al. 2018), can be
24	important in the aquatic environment. Further, given the fairly high log K_{ow} of
25	many UV filters; the expectation is that these compounds will eventually

7	2 Materials and methods
6	
5	environments.
4	important to better understand the fate of these compounds in aquatic
3	sediments over time. Therefore we also set out to resolve several factors
2	how long this partitioning will take and whether UV filters will accumulate in
1	concentrate into the solid/sediment compartment. However, we do not know

9 2.1 Chemicals and solvents

The molecular structures and physicochemical properties of the studied 10 11 compounds are shown in Table 1. Analytical standards of MBBT, (97 %), BEMT 12 (98 %), DBT (98 %), BMDBM (99 %) and BP3 (98%) were purchased from 13 Sigma-Aldrich (Lyon, France). Analytical or LC-MS grade methanol was 14 purchased from Biosolve (Biosolve Chimie France, Dieuze). Analytical-grade 15 dichloromethane, 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone (NMP) and formic acid (98 %) were 16 obtained from Sigma-Aldrich. Pure water was obtained from Elga Purelab Flex 17 System (Veolia LabWater STI, Antony, France). In order to avoid contamination, 18 glassware was cleaned with dichloromethane and dried at 450 °C for 2 hours.

19

Standard solutions of individual UV filters were prepared in NMP at a concentration of 1 mg/mL. These solutions were kept at -20°C and protected from light. A standard mixture solution was prepared by diluting each individual standard solution with NMP/water (8:2, volume/volume (v/v)) in order to get a concentration range from 1024 to 4 ng/mL. A calibration curve was built both with LC-MS/MS and LC/DAD using these solutions. These standard solutions 1 were also used for spiking seawater and sediments for recovery studies.

2

3 2.2 Sampling sites

4 All samples were collected from April to October 2016 from two different sites: 5 the main beach in Banyuls-sur-mer (Latitude 42°28'57.5" N, Longitude 6 3°07'55.4" E), and a nearby artificial lake in Villeneuve-de-la-Raho (Latitude 7 42°37'46.3" N, Longitude 2°54'18.0" E). Both these sites see highly increased 8 tourism pressure during the summer months. Lake Villeneuve measures more 9 than 200 ha, with 16 ha dedicated to touristic activities including a bathing zone 10 and a 800 m-wide beach. Banyuls-sur-Mer is a small tourist town in the south of 11 France, where the main beach measures 350 meters and is partially enclosed and 12 protected from heavy ocean currents. We sampled the surface water, the water 13 surface microlayer (SML) and the sediment in Villeneuve Lake and Banyuls Bay 14 during the summer season from April to October. We sampled at 5 time points 15 from Villeneuve Lake and at 9 from Banyuls Bay (Table S1). The first time point 16 was before the bathing season for both sites.

17

18 2.3 Sampling procedures

All samples were collected using gloves and in order to minimize contamination,
the people involved in sampling did not use any UV protection cream. The
sampling was always performed in the afternoon where wind conditions were
favourable. Water samples were collected in the middle of the bathing zones
using an inflatable boat. For Banyuls Bay this was approximately 50 meters from
the beach and for lake Villeneuve the sampling was preformed approximately 10
m from the beach. Samples from the water column (approximately 50 cm below

1 the surface) were collected using a bucket and poured into glass bottles and 2 closed with PTFE caps. The bucket and glass bottles were rinsed several times 3 before final sampling and 3 x 1L were collected at each time point. The SML was 4 collected with a glass plate system (Harvey and Burzell 1972) resulting in 3 x 0.5 5 L SML samples per time point. The superficial layer (top 5 cm) of sediments from 6 the same zone was collected in glass jars. This was done manually in Lake 7 Villeneuve because the water depth was less than 1 meter, and by 8 snorkeling/freediving in Banyuls bay, where the sediment depths were around 9 7-8 meters

10

11 2.4 Water extraction and LC-MS/MS analysis

12 Collected water samples were filtered through 47 mm glass microfiber filters 13 with a pore size of 1.6 µm (GF/A Whatman, GE Healthcare, Little Chalfont, UK), 14 using a glass filtration system. All samples were acidified with formic acid (0.1%) 15 v/v) and extracted using an automated liquid handler GX-271 ASPEC® (Gilson 16 International, Villiers-le-Bel, France) using HypersepTM phenyl SPE cartridges 1 17 g/6 mL (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Illkirch, France). All the eluents were acidified 18 with formic acid (0.1% v/v) to pH 3. Before loading, the cartridges were 19 conditioned with 10 mL of methanol followed by 10 mL of water. Next, an entire 20 1 L sample was percolated through the cartridge with a constant flow rate (8 21 mL/min). The cartridge was dried under nitrogen for 10 min (AirLiquide, 22 Toulouse, France). Then, the analytes were extracted with 10 mL of methanol 23 followed by 10 mL of methanol/dichloromethane (1:1, v/v). The extracts were 24 evaporated to dryness under vacuum in an HT-4X system (Genevac, Biopharma 25 Technologies France, Lyon, France) and dissolved in 500 µL of NMP/water (8:2,

3 LC-MS/MS is more sensitive than LC-DAD (lower limits of detection (LODs)) for 4 the detection of these UV filters. Water samples were analyzed with LC-MS/MS 5 because UV filter concentration was lower in these samples, while sediment 6 samples were analyzed with LC-DAD. Here, chemical analyses were conducted 7 with a Q Exactive Focus Orbitrap System coupled to an Ultimate 3000[™] UHPLC 8 system (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Analyses of water samples and standards (5 9 µL injected) were performed in electrospray positive ionization mode in the 10 53.4–800 m/z range in profile mode. The parameters were as follow: spray 11 voltage: 3 kV; sheath flow rate: 75; aux gas pressure: 20; capillary temperature: 12 350°C; heater temperature: 430°C. The analysis was conducted in FullMS data 13 dependent MS2 mode (confirming ions). Resolution was set to 70,000 in Full MS 14 mode, and the AGC (automatic gain control) target was set to 1x10⁶. In MS2, 15 resolution was 35,000, AGC target was set to $1x5e^4$, isolation window was 3 m/z. 16 and normalized collision energy was 35 eV, with an inclusion table. The UHPLC 17 column was a Kinetex Biphenyl 2.6 µm, 150 x 4.6 mm column (Phenomenex). 18 The column temperature was set to 50°C, and the flow rate was 1 mL min⁻¹. The 19 solvent system was a mixture of water (A) with increasing proportions of 20 methanol (B), with both solvents modified with 0.1% formic acid. The gradient 21 was as follows: 20% B 4 min before injection, then from 1 to 7 min, a gradient 22 increase of B up to 100% (curve 2), followed by 100% B for 8 min. The flow was 23 injected into the mass spectrometer starting from 6,5 min after injection. All data 24 were acquired and processed using Trace Finder 3.1 software Trace Finder[™] 3.1 25 software (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Obtained retention times (RT) were the

following: 6,68 min for BP-3; 7,84 min for BM-DBM; 9,26 min for DBT; 13,68 min
 for BEMT; and 12,79 min for MBBT.

3

4 2.5 Sediment extraction and LC-DAD analysis

5 Collected sediments were frozen at -20°C and then freeze-dried for 24 h. The 6 freeze-dried samples (5 g) were passed through a 1 mm pore sieve and stored at 7 -20°C until extraction. Freeze-dried sieved sediment (1 g) were extracted twice 8 with 5 mL of a mixture of methanol/dichloromethane (1:1, v/v), with 0.1% 9 formic acid and a 10 min sonication. All the supernatants were combined and 10 evaporated under vacuum in an HT-4X system (Genevac, Biopharma 11 Technologies) and dissolved in 1 mL of NMP/water (8:2, v/v) before analysis.

12

13 Samples (30 µL injected) were analyzed with an Ultimate 3000[™] HPLC system, 14 equipped with a DAD detector (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and a Phenomenex 15 Kinetex Biphenyl 2.6 μ m, 150 x 4.6 mm column. The oven temperature was set to 16 50°C, and the flow rate was 1 mL min⁻¹. The solvent system was a mixture of 17 water (A) with increasing proportions of methanol (B), with both solvents 18 modified with 0.1% formic acid. The gradient was as follows: 10% B 4 min 19 before injection, then from 1 to 15 min, a gradient increase of B up to 100% (curve 2), followed by 100% B for 10 min. The data acquisition software was 20 21 Chromeleon[™] 7.2 (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Standard solutions were injected to 22 generate ten-point calibration curves for the quantification of target compounds. 23 Peak areas were within the linear range of the curve. The obtained retention 24 times (RT) were the following: 9,4 min for BP-3; 11,76 min for BMDBM; 14,9 min 25 for DBT; 20,6 min for BEMT; and 19,5 min for MBBT.

Sediment samples were also analyzed for organic carbon and granulometry.
Dried sediments were decarbonized with repeated additions of H₃PO₄ (1M) and
HCl (2M) until no effervescence occurred. Decarbonated sediment were dried
again at 40 °C at least 24 hours. POC content were then measured using an
Elementar Variomax elemental analyzer. Particle size analyses (range: 0.1-3500
µm) was performed using a Malvern3000 laser diffraction particle size analyzer
coupled with Hydro EV unit (Wet dispersion).

9

10 2.6 Method performance

11 Water and sediment extraction recovery was determined using spiked samples 12 (100 ng/L for water samples or 100 ng/g dry sediment). Net recovery was 13 calculated by subtracting the analyte concentration observed in unspiked 14 samples from the concentrations in the corresponding spiked samples. The LODs 15 were determined based on the concentrations in a signal-to-noise ratio of 3 and 16 ranged from 1.3 to 5.2 ng/L. The LODs in the sediment samples ranged from 4.6 17 to 8.6 ng/g. The concentrations were corrected for the contributions from the 18 blanks. Recovery rate and LODs of each compound are shown in Table 2. The 19 values we report in the paper are not corrected for recovery rates.

20

21 2.7 Sediment/water distribution coefficient experiment

Dry sediment (3 g) was placed into 250 mL Erlenmeyer flasks. A mix of the different UV filters dissolved in acetone was added to the sediment and left overnight in a chemical hood to evaporate the acetone. The final amounts (total) added were 100 ng, 1 μg, and 10 μg of each of the UV filters tested, each in

1	triplicate. MilliQ water, 100 mL, was then added, and the flasks were incubated in
2	the dark for 24 h at 25°C with constant shaking. The liquid and solid phase were
3	then separated by filtration and extracted, and the UV filters quantified as
4	described above.
5	
6	3 Results and discussion
7	
8	3.1 Detection of hydrophobic UV filters in different environmental matrices and
9	experimental solubility measurements.
10	
11	The UV filters we tested had varying chemical characteristics, with predicted log
12	K_{ow} values from 3.79 to 14.06 (Table 1 and (Ramos et al. 2016)) and many of
13	them were very hydrophobic. Therefore, a method that effectively includes the
14	wide range of chemicals targeted in this study had to be developed for the
15	extraction and concentration from the different environmental matrices tested.
16	For testing the extraction efficiency from water samples, we used spiked
17	seawater and tap water and tested different extraction protocols using different
18	solvents (data not shown). The optimum extraction protocol determined for both
19	the water and sediment samples was a compromise among the different filters.
20	The recovery of BP3, DBT, BEMT and MBBT filters from tap water, seawater and
21	sediment samples ranged from 47 to 80%, but was only 10% for BMDBM
22	extracted from tap water and seawater samples and 2% from sediment (Table
23	2). Therefore, we must consider these extraction efficiency values when
24	interpreting our data, particularly for BMDBM.

1 For many filters, the only available data regarding solubility are predicted values. 2 To investigate the water solubility of the five UV filters in greater detail, a private 3 and independent analytical laboratory (Intertek France) measured the water 4 solubility by conducting a water saturation study in pure water and seawater. 5 Solubilities were low ranging from $< 4 \ge 10^4$ to 1.3. $\ge 10^8$ ng/L. The least water 6 soluble UV filter is MBBT (2500 fold less than BP3), followed by BEMT, DBT and 7 BMDBM (approximatively 500-, 300- and 10-fold less soluble than BP3 8 respectively; Table 1). Indeed, values for MBBT were not obtained because the 9 saturated water concentration was below the defined limit of detection (LOD) for 10 this study. 11 12 This study shows, for the first time, experimental values for the water solubility 13 of BEMT, DBT and MBBT (Table 1). The experimental and predicted values are 14 comparable for BP3 and BMDBM, but for BEMT and DBT, experimental values 15 are much higher. This difference demonstrates the difficulty in predicting the 16 fate of these extremely hydrophobic UV filters in the environment. The 17 hypothesis that such compounds should not be detected in the water column 18 (Ramos et al. 2015) was not supported by the experimental values. Although the 19 solubility of the UV filters was very low in filtered seawater, one can expect that 20 a portion of these compounds might also absorb onto planktonic 21 microorganisms and suspended matter. Indeed, we filtered the water before we 22 passed the water through SPE columns, so we did not measure any UV filter 23 absorbed to particles bigger than 1.6 µm. Therefore, our values represent 24 dissolved UV filter and filters absorbed to very small particles. For example, 25 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) have been detected in water (water

1	accommodated fraction), although they are also virtually insoluble in water
2	(Forth et al. 2017). In the water column, PAHs are predominantly associated
3	with the solid-phase particulate matter that eventually settles in marine
4	sediments (Hassan et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2001). This is most likely also the case
5	for many of the hydrophobic UV filters.
6	
7	3.2 Temporal dynamics of UV filter concentrations in Lake Villeneuve and Banyuls
8	Bay
9	
10	3.2.1 Surface water
11	In many samples from surface waters, we could not detect any of the UV filters in
12	quantities above LOD. For clarification, the graphs in Figure 1 depict the
13	sampling points where all three replicates from one timepoint contained the
14	specific UV filter above the LOD, while figure 2 depict maximum values for any
15	one sample (not triplicates). Generally, we could not detect any of the filters in
16	surface waters in the early summer season. The highest concentrations in the
17	lake were found for BMDBM and BEMT in July and August with average
18	concentrations of 14.5 and 7.2 ng/L, respectively, whereas MBBT and DBT
19	concentrations were below LOD. In Banyuls Bay, only BEMT was found at peak
20	concentrations of approximately 12 ng/L, (Figure 1), DBT could be detected
21	above the LOD in some samples with a maximum value of 9.88 ng/L (Figure 2)
22	and we could only determine a concentration above LOD for BP in one sample,
23	namely August $8^{ m th}$ with 1.52 ng/L. However, BMDBM, and MBBT were not
24	detected.

1 Concerning the surface water, many studies detail different concentrations of UV 2 filters, but of the five UV filters in this study, most data are available for the two 3 least hydrophobic compounds, BP3 and to a small extent, BMDBM (see review 4 article (Sánchez-Quiles and Tovar-Sánchez 2015)). The highest concentration of 5 BP3 in the Villeneuve Lake surface water was found in September and was close 6 to 3 ng/L (Figure 1a and Figure 2a). BP3 has previously been detected in lakes 7 with maximum values of 125 ng/L (Poiger et al. 2004), 35 ng/L (Balmer et al. 8 2005) and 40 ng/L (Rodil et al. 2009); thus, the maximum values we report here 9 are not exceedingly high. BP3 concentrations in Banyuls Bay, which did not 10 surpass LOD (Figure 1D and 2A), were also low compared with concentrations 11 found in previous studies. For example, concentrations of BP3 in (filtered) 12 seawater samples from recreational areas were as high as 241.9 ng/L in Mallorca 13 (Tovar-Sanchez et al. 2013) and an extreme value of 1,390,000 ng/L has been 14 reported in the US Virgin Islands (Downs et al. 2016). These varying values can 15 be partly explained because BP3 is more commonly used in the US due to the 16 limited number of filters that are allowed, and the use of BP3 is perhaps more 17 limited in Europe due to regulations (European Union 2009).

18

The peak value of BMDBM in the Villeneuve Lake surface water was
approximately 14.5 ng/L, whereas BMDBM was not detected in Banyuls Bay.
Regarding BMDBM concentrations in lakes, there are only a few studies that can
be used for comparison, and they report varying concentrations, from below
detection level (Poiger et al. 2004) to a very high concentration of over 2000
ng/L (Rodil et al. 2009). For the coastal marine environment, BMDBM was
detected in relatively high concentrations in beaches in Gran Canaria, with a

1	median value of 59.4 ng/L (Sánchez Rodríguez et al. 2015), and the maximum
2	concentration of 321 ng/L was found in coastal water samples from South
3	Carolina (Bratkovics and Sapozhnikova 2011).

5 Notably, we found BEMT at significant concentrations in the lake and Banyuls 6 Bay surface waters, with maximum concentrations of 13.8 and 18 ng/L, 7 respectively, see figure 2a. Further, DBT was detected at the height of summer, 8 albeit at concentrations very close to the calculated LOD. To our knowledge, this 9 is the first report of detection of this UV filter in the water phase in the 10 environment. This finding is notable considering the extremely low predicted 11 and experimentally determined water solubility values of this compound. 12 Indeed, this compound should be practically insoluble in the water phase (Table 13 1). However, we propose that, similar to PAHs, hydrophobic UV filters are in the 14 water-accommodated fraction presumably associated with suspended particles. 15

16 *3.2.2 SML*

17 The concentrations of some of the UV filters in the SML in Villeneuve Lake 18 showed a clear trend during the summer months, with a peak in July-August 19 (Figure 1B). Furthermore, the SML contained higher concentrations of the UV 20 filters than the surface water (note the difference in scale between Figure 1 A 21 and B and Figure 2 A and B). The peak average concentrations of BEMT and 22 BMDBM were 4281 and 531 ng/L, respectively. However, the variability was 23 very high at these sampling points. Additionally, July and August samplings in the 24 lake were both performed when many swimmers were present, and we observed 25 an "oily layer" on the water during these peak sampling times. We know of no

1 other reports on the SML in lakes.

2

3	The SML in Banyuls Bay contained consistently over 10 ng/L of BEMT, with a
4	peak average concentration on June 28 at 101.2 ng/L (Figure 1e). The
5	concentrations of the other UV filters were below detection level for most of the
6	samples. The concentrations of BP3 remained below LOD, which is very low
7	compared with previous values in Mallorca which exceeded 100 ng/L in many
8	cases (Tovar-Sanchez et al. 2013). The variations reported between sites and
9	over the season can be explained by variations in the environmental conditions
10	and because the SML can only be established when the wind speed is below 5
11	m/s (Romano and Garabetian, 1996).
12	
13	3.2.3 Sediment
14	The dynamics of UV filters in the sediment were very different from those we
15	observed for the surface water and SML. Notably, we detected several of the UV
16	filters in significant amounts in April, before the bathing season. In particular, in
17	Lake Villeneuve BEMT, MBBT and DBT were found at average concentrations of
18	48.2, 47.8 and 22 ng/g (dw) sediment, respectively. Further, DBT and BEMT
19	concentrations in Lake Villeneuve sediments increased during the summer
20	season, and the highest detected average values were 628.8 and 87 ng/g (dw),
21	respectively, at the end of September. MBBT, BP-3 and DBM concentrations were
22	more or less stable and slightly decreased at the last sample point in October
23	(Figure 1c).
24	

24

25 The results regarding the concentrations of UV filters in the Banyuls Bay

1 sediment were unexpected because the concentrations of many of the UV filters 2 were actually higher in the beginning of May than those at the last time points 3 (Figure 1f). This was the case for all UV filters except BEMT. BP3 was the only UV 4 filter to follow a dynamic during the summer season with a maximum average 5 peak of 49.4 ng/L in July, and this value is relatively high compared with that of 6 other studies. Baron et al. (2013) found low concentrations of BP3 (max 2.96 7 ng/g) in estuary samples, and Tsui et al. (2015) found a maximum concentration 8 of 39.8 ng/g. Indeed, the low concentrations of BP3 found in sediments from 9 highly industrialized areas (Peng et al. 2017) suggest BP3 partitions less into the 10 sediment phase or is degraded. One reason for these differences could be that the 11 source of UV filters to sediments in Banyuls Bay is direct, through the swimmers 12 at the beach, whereas the marine sediments from China described by Tsui et al. 13 (2015) are affected by industrial and municipal discharge sources. BMDBM is 14 also reported previously in marine sediments at concentrations up to 64.4 ng/g 15 (Tsui et al. 2015), but we were only able to detect BMDBM above our LOD in two 16 samples from lake sediment, presumably due to the low recovery rate of this 17 molecule in the extraction process. It is also worth noting that the sediments 18 from both sites contained a relatively low percentage of organic carbon (Table 19 S2). The median organic carbon percentage of Banyuls Bay sediments was 0.032 20 % and 0.011 % for sediments from Lake Villeneuve, and samples from both these 21 contained more than 95% sand (particles > $63 \mu m$).

22

There are only a few studies that have examined the concentrations of UV filters
in the sediments of lakes. One comparative study found both BP3 and BMDBM in
several German lakes also at several time points during the year (Kaiser et al.

1 2012). These authors detected BP3 at a maximum concentration of 3.6 ng/g and 2 BMDBM at 62.2 ng/g, which are within the same order of magnitude of 3 concentrations we found in Villeneuve Lake for BP3. However, they observed 4 more of a seasonal dynamic with a sharp increase in the peak summer season, 5 whereas our results showed a more steady concentration of these compounds in 6 the summer season (Figure 1c). This same study Kaiser et al. (2012) found 7 octocrylene (OC) concentrations up to 652 ng/g in some lake sediments, and we 8 found maximum detectable concentrations for DBT, BEMT and MBBT (629, 88 9 and 57 ng/g, respectively). Furthermore, we found a higher concentration of the 10 UV filters in the sediment in the lake than that in the bay sediment (Figure 1c), 11 except for BP3.

12

13 3.3 Environmental distribution of UV filters

14 Previous studies assume that hydrophobic UV filters will partition into the 15 sediment phase. Nevertheless, environmental concentrations of MBBT, BEMT 16 and DBT in the different compartments (sediment, water phase and SML) have 17 not been reported. To further explore the distribution of these compounds in the 18 environment, we defined "environmental distribution coefficients ($env K_d$)" for 19 sediment/water and SML/water. For this calculation, we used the median value 20 over the entire season for each UV filter from both the lake and Banyuls Bay 21 (Table 3).

22

We also experimentally determined the distribution sediment/water ratio by performing controlled laboratory experiments for 24 h. The distribution ratio between water and solid phase is determined by: $K_d = C_s/C_w$, where C_s is the

1	concentration (ng/kg) in the solid phase and C_w is the concentration in the water
2	phase (ng/L). Thus, we could easily and directly compare the K_d among the
3	different UV filters. Furthermore, the sorption isotherms were determined after
4	fitting the data to the Freundlich model in which plotting the log C_{s} to log C_{w}
5	should give a linear response, which was the case in our study (Figure S2). The
6	Freundlich model equation is $C_s = K_f \ge C_w^n$, where K_f characterizes the absorption
7	capacity of the solid and n measures the intensity of the absorption (or the
8	nonlinearity). Indeed, we observed some nonlinearity of the sorption kinetics of
9	the UV filters; the lowest concentration (100 ng added or 1 $\mu g/L)$ gave a higher
10	K_d than that of 10 and 100 $\mu g/L$ (Table 3). Thus, the UV filters adsorbed to the
11	sediment in a higher proportion at low concentrations.

13 Clearly, the experimental *K*_d values varied greatly among the different UV filters 14 (Table 3); thus, although many of the UV filters partitioned into the sediment 15 phase, the filters partitioned at different ratios or alternatively at different rates. 16 BEMT strongly distributed into the sediment phase, with the highest K_d value of 17 over 3000, although MBBT and DBT also produced high values, whereas BP3, 18 with the experimental K_d of approximately 10, was expected to distribute into 19 the sediment at a comparatively low rate. We determined a K_d for BMDBM of 20 777, which is substantially different from a previous report (Li et al. 2016) with 21 values from approximately 11 to 45.8 depending on the sediment. These 22 differences could also be due to differences in experimental design; for example, 23 Li and colleagues used only an 8-hour contact time and did not actually measure 24 the amount sorbed to the sediment (Li et al. 2016).

We could not determine the "environmental Kd (*env K_d*)" values for many of the
filters because they were not present above the methodological LOD in the
surface water. For the UV filters that we could determine the sediment/water *"env Kd*", we see that the *"env Kd*" values were in the same order of magnitude as
the experimental ones. Further, from the SML Kd, we can see that many of the
filters are present at higher concentrations in the SML compared to the surface
water.

8

9 Once the UV filters are adsorbed to the sediments, and if no degradation or 10 dilution processes occur, the UV filters can potentially accumulate over time. 11 Data regarding the degradation of UV filters in sediments are scarce. Volpe et al. 12 (2017) found that EH-DPAB degraded after approximately 60 days in aerobic 13 microcosms with marine sediments but found even slower degradation of 4-14 MBC, with a half-life of over a year. Compared to Volpe et al. (2017), Liu et al. 15 (2013) found shorter half-lives of 4-MBC in their experiments, but in a different 16 environment, namely aquifer sediments. Of the UV filters we examined, BP3 17 degrades in aquifer sediments (Liu et al. 2013) within 5-6 days. Li and colleagues 18 followed the potential degradation of BMDBM in sediment microcosms, but 19 whether BMDBM was degraded or adsorbed to the sediment to a greater extent 20 with time was unclear (Li et al. 2016).

21

We would expect that in an open environment, hydrodynamic processes would result in a dilution of the UV filters. Thus, an accumulation from year to year or even throughout the season would not be likely in Banyuls Bay. However, we observed a considerably higher concentration of DBT and MBBT in the April samples (beginning of the season) than that at the end of the season in Banyuls
Bay. This means that, surprisingly, UV filters may accumulate from the previous
season. This accumulation most likely occurred because tides in the
Mediterranean are not significant and because the bay is relatively closed. In
future research, the concentrations of UV filters over several years in both
Banyuls Bay and the lake should be monitored to determine whether UV filters
accumulate in the sediments with time.

8

9 4 Conclusions

10 This study showed for the first time the presence of DBT, BEMT and MBBT in 11 environmental matrixes (water, SML and sediment), which is interesting because 12 these compounds, with high predicted log K_{ow} values, are presumed insoluble in 13 water. Indeed, substantial concentrations of these compounds were measured 14 during peak tourist time in the surface water and SML in Villeneuve Lake. 15 However, we hypothesize that lipophilic UV filters are adsorbed to suspended 16 particulate matter and might not be fully solubilized in the water phase. We 17 show, both by sampling efforts in the environment and laboratory experiments, 18 that a large proportion of the hydrophobic UV filters predictably partitioned into 19 the sediment phase. Further, although some of these compounds, such as BP3, degrade relatively quickly in sediment systems, many of the hydrophobic UV 20 21 filters are most likely not easily biodegraded once sequestered in the sediment 22 phase, although this has yet to be confirmed. Thus, future ecotoxicological 23 evaluation of lipophilic UV filters should be performed on benthic marine species 24 as it has already been done in freshwater systems (Kaiser et al. 2012).

1	Overall, our work improves comprehension of the partitioning of three highly
2	water insoluble UV filters (BEMT, MBBT and DBT). The fact that BP3 and other
3	UV filters are found at various trophic levels in the literature suggests that some
4	of these compounds can biomagnify. Further tests are required for a better
5	understanding of their bioaccumulation and the potential toxicological risks to
6	marine organisms, starting with the zoobenthos. Importantly, we must
7	investigate whether the uptake of very lipophilic UV filters by benthic organisms
8	(bioaccumulation) occurs for a full understanding of the potential risk of these
9	compounds to ecosystems.
10	
11	Funding
12	This work was financially supported by the Pierre Fabre Dermo-Cosmetic
13	Laboratories in France.
14	
15	Conflict of interest statement
16	We need to disclose that this work has been financially supported by the Pierre
17	Fabre Laboratories, but this does not influence the results. The company was not
18	involved in the work plan and they wanted to have independent data on the
19	occurrence and concentration of some filters that have never been quantified in
20	the natural environment.
21	
22	Figure Captions
23	Fig. 1 Dynamics of selected UV filters in Villeneuve Lake and Banyuls Bay surface
24	water (a and d), surface microlayer (b and e) and sediment (c and f). The UV
25	filters are BMDBM (open inverse triangles), BP3 (triangles), MBBT (diamonds),

1	BEMT (circles) and DBT (squares). Note that charts b and c have a log scale on
2	the y-axis, but a, d, e and f do not. All points are the average of triplicate sampling
3	points, and the standard error bars are shown
4	
5	Fig. 2 Box and whiskers plot of all values in the water phase (a), SML phase (b)
6	and the sediment (c) for the two different sites. The median is shown by the bold
7	line, the hinges are the 25^{th} and 75^{th} percentiles and the whiskers are roughly the
8	95% confidence intervals; the other points shown are outliers. Note, the axis in
9	panel C is cut
10	
11	
12	References
13	
14	Alonso, M. B., Feo, M. L., Corcellas, C., Gago-Ferrero, P., Bertozzi, C. P., Marigo, J., et
15	al. (2015). Toxic heritage: Maternal transfer of pyrethroid insecticides
16	and sunscreen agents in dolphins from Brazil. Environmental Pollution,
17	207, 391–402.
18	Balmer, M. E., Buser, HR., Müller, M. D., & Poiger, T. (2005). Occurrence of Some
19	Organic UV Filters in Wastewater, in Surface Waters, and in Fish from
20	Swiss Lakes. Environmental Science & Technology, 39(4), 953–962.
21	Barón, E., Gago-Ferrero, P., Gorga, M., Rudolph, I., Mendoza, G., Zapata, A. M., et al.
22	(2013). Occurrence of hydrophobic organic pollutants (BFRs and UV-
23	filtowa) in andimenta from South America, Champanhara (22), 200, 21(
	Inters) in seaments from South America. <i>Chemosphere</i> , 92(3), 309–316.
24	Bratkovics, S., & Sapozhnikova, Y. (2011). Determination of seven commonly

1	chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry. Analytical Methods, 3(12),
2	2943–2950.

3	Díaz-Cruz, M. S., & Barceló, D. (2009). Chemical analysis and ecotoxicological
4	effects of organic UV-absorbing compounds in aquatic ecosystems.
5	Applying combinations of chemical analysis and biological effects to
6	environmental and food samples - II, 28(6), 708–717.
7	Downs, C. A., Kramarsky-Winter, E., Segal, R., Fauth, J., Knutson, S., Bronstein, O.,
8	et al. (2016). Toxicopathological Effects of the Sunscreen UV Filter,
9	Oxybenzone (Benzophenone-3), on Coral Planulae and Cultured Primary
10	Cells and Its Environmental Contamination in Hawaii and the U.S. Virgin
11	Islands. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 70(2),
12	265–288.
13	Emnet, P., Gaw, S., Northcott, G., Storey, B., & Graham, L. (2015). Personal care
14	products and steroid hormones in the Antarctic coastal environment
15	associated with two Antarctic research stations, McMurdo Station and
16	Scott Base. Environmental Research, 136, 331–342.
17	European Union. (2009). Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 of the European
18	parliament and the council of 30 November 2009 on cosmetic products.
19	Official Journal of the European Union.
20	Fent, K., Zenker, A., & Rapp, M. (2010). Widespread occurrence of estrogenic UV-
21	filters in aquatic ecosystems in Switzerland. Environmental Pollution,
22	<i>158</i> (5), 1817–1824.
23	Forth, H. P., Mitchelmore, C. L., Morris, J. M., Lay, C. R., & Lipton, J. (2017).
24	Characterization of dissolved and particulate phases of water
25	accommodated fractions used to conduct aquatic toxicity testing in

1	support of the Deepwater Horizon natural resource damage assessment.
2	Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 36(6), 1460–1472.
3	Gago-Ferrero, P., Alonso, M. B., Bertozzi, C. P., Marigo, J., Barbosa, L., Cremer, M.,
4	et al. (2013). First Determination of UV Filters in Marine Mammals.
5	Octocrylene Levels in Franciscana Dolphins. Environmental Science &
6	Technology, 47(11), 5619–5625.
7	Gago-Ferrero, P., Díaz-Cruz, M. S., & Barceló, D. (2015). UV filters
8	bioaccumulation in fish from Iberian river basins. Science of The Total
9	Environment, 518–519, 518–525.
10	Giokas, D. L., Sakkas, V. A., Albanis, T. A., & Lampropoulou, D. A. (2005).
11	Determination of UV-filter residues in bathing waters by liquid
12	chromatography UV-diode array and gas chromatography–mass
13	spectrometry after micelle mediated extraction-solvent back extraction.
14	Journal of Chromatography A, 1077(1), 19–27.
15	Harvey, G. W., & Burzell, L. A. (1972). A simple microlayer method for small
16	samples. <i>Limnology and Oceanography</i> , 17(1), 156–157.
17	Hassan, H. M., Castillo, A. B., Yigiterhan, O., Elobaid, E. A., Al-Obaidly, A., Al-Ansari,
18	E., & Obbard, J. P. (2018). Baseline concentrations and distributions of
19	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in surface sediments from the Qatar
20	marine environment. <i>Marine Pollution Bulletin</i> , 126, 58–62.
21	Kaiser, D., Wappelhorst, O., Oetken, M., & Oehlmann, J. (2012). Occurrence of
22	widely used organic UV filters in lake and river sediments (Vol. 9).
23	Kaiser, D., Sieratowicz, A., Zielke, H., Oetken, M., Hollert, H., & Oehlmann, J.
24	(2012). Ecotoxicological effect characterisation of widely used organic UV
25	filters. Environmental Pollution, 163, 84–90.

1	Langford, K. H., Reid, M. J., Fjeld, E., Øxnevad, S., & Thomas, K. V. (2015).							
2	Environmental occurrence and risk of organic UV filters and stabilizers in							
3	multiple matrices in Norway. <i>Environment International, 80</i> , 1–7.							
4	Li, S., Lu, G., Xie, Z., Ding, J., Liu, J., & Li, Y. (2016). Sorption and degradation of							
5	selected organic UV filters (BM-DBM, 4-MBC, and OD-PABA) in laboratory							
6	water-sediment systems. Environmental Science and Pollution Research,							
7	<i>23</i> (10), 9679–9689.							
8	Liu, YS., Ying, GG., Shareef, A., & Kookana, R. S. (2013). Degradation of Six							
9	Selected Ultraviolet Filters in Aquifer Materials Under Various Redox							
10	Conditions. Groundwater Monitoring & Remediation, 33(4), 79–88.							
11	Molins-Delgado, D., Máñez, M., Andreu, A., Hiraldo, F., Eljarrat, E., Barceló, D., &							
12	Díaz-Cruz, M. S. (2017). A Potential New Threat to Wild Life: Presence of							
13	UV Filters in Bird Eggs from a Preserved Area. Environmental Science &							
14	Technology, 51(19), 10983–10990.							
15	Montes-Grajales, D., Fennix-Agudelo, M., & Miranda-Castro, W. (2017).							
16	Occurrence of personal care products as emerging chemicals of concern in							
17	water resources: A review. Science of The Total Environment, 595, 601–							
18	614.							
19	Obernosterer, I., Catala, P., Reinthaler, T., Herndl, G. J., & Lebaron, P. (2005).							
20	Enhanced heterotrophic activity in the surface microlayer of the							
21	Mediterranean Sea. Aquatic Microbial Ecology, 39, 293–302.							
22	Office of the governor — news release — Governor David Ige signs bill making							
23	Hawaii first in the world to ban certain sunscreens. (2018).							
24	https://governor.hawaii.gov/newsroom/latest-news/office-of-the-							
25	governor-news-release-governor-david-ige-signs-bill-making-hawaii-							

1	first-in-the-world-to-ban-certain-sunscreens/.
2	Osterwalder, U., Sohn, M., & Herzog, B. (2014). Global state of sunscreens.
3	Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine, 30(2–3), 62–80.
4	Peng, X., Xiong, S., Ou, W., Wang, Z., Tan, J., Jin, J., et al. (2017). Persistence,
5	temporal and spatial profiles of ultraviolet absorbents and phenolic
6	personal care products in riverine and estuarine sediment of the Pearl
7	River catchment, China. Special Issue on Emerging Contaminants in
8	engineered and natural environment, 323, 139–146.
9	Poiger, T., Buser, HR., Balmer, M. E., Bergqvist, PA., & Müller, M. D. (2004).
10	Occurrence of UV filter compounds from sunscreens in surface waters:
11	regional mass balance in two Swiss lakes. <i>Chemosphere, 55</i> (7), 951–963.
12	Rahlff, J., Ribas-Ribas, M., Brown, S. M., Mustaffa, N. I. H., Renz, J., Peck, M. A., et al.
13	(2018). Blue pigmentation of neustonic copepods benefits exploitation of
14	a prey-rich niche at the air-sea boundary. <i>Scientific Reports, 8</i> (1), 11510.
15	Ramos, S., Homem, V., Alves, A., & Santos, L. (2015). Advances in analytical
16	methods and occurrence of organic UV-filters in the environment — A
17	review. Science of The Total Environment, 526, 278–311.
18	Ramos, S., Homem, V., Alves, A., & Santos, L. (2016). A review of organic UV-filters
19	in wastewater treatment plants. Environment International, 86, 24–44.
20	Rodil, R., Schrader, S., & Moeder, M. (2009). Non-porous membrane-assisted
21	liquid–liquid extraction of UV filter compounds from water samples.
22	Journal of Chromatography A, 1216(24), 4887–4894.
23	Romano, J.C. & Garabetian, F. (1996). Photographic records of sea-surface
24	microlayers as a survey of pollution daily rhythm in coastal waters.
25	Marine Environmental Research, 41, 219–265.

1	Sánchez Rodríguez, A., Rodrigo Sanz, M., & Betancort Rodríguez, J. R. (2015).								
2	Occurrence of eight UV filters in beaches of Gran Canaria (Canary Islands).								
3	An approach to environmental risk assessment. <i>Chemosphere</i> , 131, 85–90.								
4	Sánchez-Quiles, D., & Tovar-Sánchez, A. (2015). Are sunscreens a new								
5	environmental risk associated with coastal tourism? Environment								
6	International, 83, 158–170.								
7	Sang, Z., & Leung, K. SY. (2016). Environmental occurrence and ecological risk								
8	assessment of organic UV filters in marine organisms from Hong Kong								
9	coastal waters. Science of The Total Environment, 566–567, 489–498.								
10	Shaath, N. A. (2010). Ultraviolet filters. Photochemical & Photobiological Sciences,								
11	9(4), 464–469.								
12	Tovar-Sanchez, A., Sanchez-Quiles, D., Basterretxea, G., Benede, J. L., Chisvert, A.,								
13	Salvador, A., et al. (2013). Sunscreen Products as Emerging Pollutants to								
14	Coastal Waters. <i>Plos One</i> , 8(6), e65451.								
15	Tovar-Sanches, A., Sanchez-Quiles, D., & Rodriguez-Romero, A. (2019). Massive								
16	costal tourism influx the Mediterranean Sea: The environmental risk of								
17	sunscreens. Science of The Total Environment, 656, 316–321.								
18	Tsai, DY., Chen, CL., & Ding, WH. (2014). Optimization of matrix solid-phase								
19	dispersion for the rapid determination of salicylate and benzophenone-								
20	type UV absorbing substances in marketed fish. Food Chemistry, 154, 211–								
21	216.								
22	Tsui, M. M. P., Leung, H. W., Kwan, B. K. Y., Ng, KY., Yamashita, N., Taniyasu, S., et								
23	al. (2015). Occurrence, distribution and ecological risk assessment of								
24	multiple classes of UV filters in marine sediments in Hong Kong and								
25	Japan. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 292, 180–187.								

1	Tsui, M. M. P., Leung, H. W., Lam, P. K. S., & Murphy, M. B. (2014). Seasonal
2	occurrence, removal efficiencies and preliminary risk assessment of
3	multiple classes of organic UV filters in wastewater treatment plants.
4	Water Research, 53, 58–67.
5	Volpe, A., Pagano, M., Mascolo, G., Grenni, P., & Rossetti, S. (2017). Biodegradation
6	of UV-filters in marine sediments. Science of The Total Environment,
7	<i>575</i> (Supplement C), 448–457.
8	Wang, XC., Zhang, YX., & Chen, R. F. (2001). Distribution and Partitioning of
9	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Different Size Fractions in
10	Sediments from Boston Harbor, United States. Marine Pollution Bulletin,
11	42(11), 1139–1149.
12	Wnuk, A., Rzemieniec, J., Lasoń, W., Krzeptowski, W., & Kajta, M. (2018).
13	Apoptosis Induced by the UV Filter Benzophenone-3 in Mouse Neuronal
14	Cells Is Mediated via Attenuation of $\text{Er}\alpha/\text{Ppar}\gamma$ and Stimulation of
15	Erβ/Gpr30 Signaling. <i>Molecular Neurobiology</i> , 55(3), 2362–2383.
16	
17	

Abbr.	Chemical names	CAS	Molecular	Log K _{ow}		Water solubility (ng/L)		
			weight		Molecular structure	Experimental ^b		Predicted (tap
			(g/mol)			tap water	sea water	water) ^a
BP3	Benzophenone 3	131-57-7	228.2	3.79	OH O	1.3E+08	8.7E+07	6.9E+07
BMD BM	Butyl methoxydibenzoylmethane	70356-09-1	310.4	4.51		1.9E+07	4.7E+07	1.5E+06
DBT	Diethylhexyl butamido triazone	154702-15-5	765.9	14.06		2E+05	< 2E+05°	1.3E-05
BEMT	bis-ethylhexyloxyphenol methoxyphenyl triazine	187393-00-6	627.8	9.29		3E+05	< 6E+04°	1.5E-10
MBBT	methylene bis- benzotriazolyl tetramethyl butylphenol	103597-45-1	658.8	12.5	N-N OH OH N-N N-N	< 4E+04 ^c	< 1E+05°	4.5E-04

Table 1: UV filters information

^a Predicted by EPI Suite[™] (Ramos et al., 2016) ^b Values obtained by Intertek France ^c The water solubility was less than the quantification limit of the method used by Intertek

1 Table 2. Recoveries and method limits of detection of analysis of BP3, BMDBM,

2 DBT, BEMT and MBBT in seawater and sediment samples.

3

	Water sa	mples	Sediment samples		
Compound	Recovery	LOD	Recovery	LOD	
	(%)	(ng/L)	(%)	(ng/g)	
BP3	67	1.3	47	4.6	
BMDBM	10	2.3	2	6.8	
DBT	71	2.3	75	8.6	
BEMT	80	2.3	60	7.5	
MBBT	47	5.2	80	3.9	

4

5

6 Table 3. Distribution coefficients (L/kg) of UV filters determined experimentally

7 and calculated from environmental samples

8

	Exp.ª			La	ake	Banyuls bay	
	K_d	Kf	R ²	$K_d \operatorname{sed^b}$	$K_d \operatorname{SML^c}$	$K_d \operatorname{sed^b}$	<i>K</i> _d SML ^c
BMDBM	777±150	463	0.9777	N.D.	9.14	N.D.	N.D.
BP3	10±0.8	19.6	0.985	3765	1.23	N.D.	N.D.
MBBT	2212±453	1492	0.9921	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.	N.D.
BEMT	3506±641	3129	0.9837	9939	6.81	3756	2.76
DBT	2829±467	1848	0.9870	N.D.	N.D.	7678	1.26

 $a = K_d$ determined experimentally from an average of triplicate tubes and 2 different concentrations (n=6), $b = K_d$ determined from median concentrations in sediments and median concentrations in the water column with a minimum of 3 samples over LOD, $c = K_d$ determined from median concentrations in the SML and median concentrations in the water column with a minimum of 3 samples over LOD, $n = K_d$ determined from median concentrations in the water column with a minimum of 3 samples over LOD, $n = K_d$ determined from median concentrations in the water column with a minimum of 3 samples over LOD, n = 1 and n = 1.

9

10



Fig. 1 Dynamics of selected UV filters in Villeneuve Lake and Banyuls Bay surface
water (a, d), surface microlayer (b, e), and sediment (c, f). The UV filters are
BMDBM (open inverse triangles), BP3 (triangles), MBBT (diamonds), BEMT
(circles), and DBT (squares). Note that charts b and c have a log scale on the y
axis, but a, d, e, and f do not. All points are the average of triplicate sampling
points, and the standard error bars are shown





Fig. 2 Box and whiskers plot of all values in the water phase (a), SML phase (b), and the sediment (c) for the two different sites. The median is shown by the bold line, the hinges are the 25th and 75th percentiles, and the whiskers are roughly the 95% confidence intervals; the other points shown are outliers. Note that the axis in c is cut

- 7
- 8