

Mining the sequential patterns of water quality preceding the biological status of waterbodies

Corinne Grac, Xavier Dolques, Agnes Braud, Michele Tremolieres,

Jean-Nicolas Beisel, Florence Le Ber

▶ To cite this version:

Corinne Grac, Xavier Dolques, Agnes Braud, Michele Tremolieres, Jean-Nicolas Beisel, et al.. Mining the sequential patterns of water quality preceding the biological status of waterbodies. Ecological Indicators, 2021, 130, 10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.108070. hal-03325504

HAL Id: hal-03325504 https://hal.science/hal-03325504

Submitted on 22 Aug 2023

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 TITLE: Mining the sequential patterns of water quality preceding the biological status of waterbodies

3

- 4 Authors:
- 5 Corinne Grac^{a,b}, Xavier Dolques , Agnès Braud^c, Michèle Trémolières^b, Jean-Nicolas
- 6 Beisel^{a,b}, Florence Le Ber^{c,d}

- 8 ^a ENGEES, LIVE UMR 7362, F-67000 Strasbourg, France
- 9 <u>corinne.grac@engees.unistra.fr</u>
- ¹⁰ ^b Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, LIVE UMR 7362, F-67000 Strasbourg, France
- ^c Université de Strasbourg, ICube UMR 7357, F-67400 Illkirch-Graffenstaden, France
- ¹² ^d ENGEES, ICube, UMR 7357, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

1 TITLE: Mining the sequential patterns of water quality preceding the 2 biological status of waterbodies

3

4 Abstract

5

We have implemented a specific data mining process to explore the relationship 6 between biological indices and physico-chemical pressures in rivers. Data were 7 collected in the framework of the French National monitoring network set up to 8 assess the ecological status of rivers under the European Water Framework Directive 9 (WFD). Chemical parameters and biological indices were collected regularly from 10 1.781 locations in metropolitan France from 2007 to 2013. The sequential pattern 11 12 mining process generates closed partially ordered patterns representing a succession of physico-chemical events that precede a given biological index in a 13 given status, validated using a subset of data. This paper focuses on the patterns 14 and their occurrence. We showed that biological statuses depend on these temporal 15 successions of alterations and not only on the last alterations. The physico-chemical 16 statuses of water bodies usually appeared to be higher than their biological statuses, 17 suggesting synergism between toxicants and/or an additive impact of other stressors 18 related to hydromorphology or hydrology. Patterns found in the highest biological 19 status for the biological indices based on macroinvertebrates, diatoms, macrophytes 20 or fish, were characterised by the constancy of a high physico-chemical status over 21 time. By contrast, before indices based on macroinvertebrates and macrophytes, two 22 types of patterns were observed for bad biological status: (1) a chronic multi-pressure 23 pattern, in which pressure categories such as nitrates, pesticides and other organic 24 hydrocarbons, in moderate, poor or bad status, repeated themselves several times 25 over time, or (2) a single occurrence of a degraded pressure category, such as one 26

moderate nitrogen, excluding nitrate, or one poor oxidizable organic matter, among other pressure categories in good status. Extracting such patterns is a promising solution both to disentangle the effects of the different stressors on water quality, and to identify the key temporal sequences among them in a context of multi-stress conditions, which is a challenge currently facing the WFD.

32 Keywords

33

Rivers, water quality, biological status, data mining, temporal patterns, physicochemical status.

36

37

38

39 Introduction

40

In rivers and streams, several human activities produce a combination of pressures. 41 These pressures alter the abiotic components of the ecosystem, affect the biological 42 43 communities and hence their ecological status. The European Water Framework Directive (WFD) (European Council, 2000) requires the achievement of a good 44 ecological status for the conservation or restoration of aquatic ecosystems, in the 45 short (2021) and medium term (2027). Currently there is the urge to have access to 46 biological tools that not only able to assess this status but also to disentangle and 47 identify the different pressures in order to propose the appropriate restoration actions 48 to achieve good ecological status (Feld et al., 2016a; Reyjol et al., 2014). 49

50 The assessment of aquatic ecosystems relies on monitoring, which generates large 51 volumes of heterogeneous data from multiple sources (Hering et al., 2010) at 52 different temporal scales. Data mining methods are able to analyze large datasets

and may be a good alternative to traditional statistical methods (Giraudel and Lek, 53 2001). These methods can produce readable results, thereby facilitating interactions 54 between data miners and experts (Džeroski et al., 1997). Two categories of data 55 mining methods exist: supervised and unsupervised methods. Supervised methods 56 require a learning dataset to build a specific model adapted to a given issue, 57 including variables and expected results. When the model is built, it has to be tested 58 on a second dataset. After this validation stage, it can be applied to a third dataset to 59 predict results expected in similar conditions. Unsupervised methods do not require a 60 learning dataset and make it possible to explore and identify unexpected rules in a 61 dataset. 62

Several authors (Larras et al., 2017; Mondy and Usseglio-Polatera, 2013; Villeneuve 63 et al., 2015) have already used water quality data to test the potential ability of 64 supervised data mining methods to identify key anthropic pressures using different 65 biological organisms. A large set of supervised learning techniques includies some 66 artificial neural networks (D'heygere et al., 2006; Dakou et al., 2006; Everaert et al., 67 2016; Tsai et al., 2016) and decision trees (Džeroski, 2001; Feld et al., 2016b; Larras 68 et al., 2017; Mondy and Usseglio-Polatera, 2013; Villeneuve et al., 2015). Methods 69 such as Markov random fields or Bayesian networks could be used to take into 70 account spatial and temporal dependencies (Adriaenssens et al., 2004; Forio et al., 71 2016; Fytilis and Rizzo, 2013; Landuyt et al., 2016; Van Looy et al., 2015). However, 72 these off-the-shelf tools still need to be adapted to the nature of the available data as 73 well as to the specific problem at hand. To check biological responses with respect to 74 physico-chemical variables is necessary in order to discover relevant knowledge 75 (Marzin et al., 2012; Oberdorff and Hughes, 1992) but remains still difficult to 76 interpret. Temporal aspects are insufficiently taking into account. Most studies used 77

multiple physico-chemical variables measured on the same date or just before the 78 79 biological measurement while responses of biological compartment to alterations are dynamic. An acute toxic pollution can alter durably biodiversity as observed in the 80 Rhine after the Sandoz accident (Van Urk et al., 1993). Then the restoration of the 81 former aquatic populations can require several months (Schulz and Liess, 1999). 82 Biodiversity could also be altered progressively and durably by non-toxic alteration. 83 such as nutrients (Pringle, 1990). The aim of this study is to take into account the 84 successive values of physico-chemical parameters of water and to analyze their 85 impact on biological populations, and the ecological status of waterbodies at a given 86 date. 87

88

(Agrawal and Srikant, 1995)(Agrawal and Srikant, 1994)(Ren et al., 2009)(Sallaberry
et al., 2011)(George and Binu, 2012)(Fabrègue et al., 2013)

91

92 In the present study, we used a tool generating temporal patterns with the aim of exploring the relationship between biological indices in different statuses and the 93 succession of physico-chemical events which precede them. Indices based on four 94 biological groups: diatoms, macrophytes, macroinvertebrates and fish were taken int 95 account. Our guestions were: 1) do patterns allow us to disentangle and identify the 96 pressure categories implicated in a degraded status? 2) are pressure categories 97 found in patterns specific to a biological group? 3) is there a correspondence 98 between physico-chemical and biological statutes? 99

100

1. Materials and methods

1011.1The dataset used

Available data were collected in 1,781 sampling sites (Fig. 1) in the framework of the 103 French network created to assess the ecological status of waterbodies, management 104



unit, according to the WFD. 105

106

107

108

Fig. 1: Location of the 1,781 French sampling sites for the national ecological assessment of rivers

109

Fieldwork was undertaken by regional environmental agencies on the French 110 national river network between 2007 and 2013. Table 1 lists the volume of the data we 111 used. The 23,071,909 physico-chemical results concerned 1,201 parameters. Among 112 them, 2% were major parameters (parameters with concentrations in milligram per 113 liter, e.g. pH, nitrogen) and 98% were minor parameters, including micro-pollutants 114 (parameters with concentrations in microgram per liter, e.g. copper, atrazine). 115 analyzes of the major elements were conducted 12 times a year and analyzes of 116 minor elements four or six times a year. The completeness of the physico-chemical 117 data varied consideraly over the study period, ranging from 100% to 1%. Above, we 118

used the physico-chemical results which were the most complete: they represented 119 1,146,544 results and concerned 189 parameters (completeness ranged between 120 98% and 33% for polychloro-biphenyls, PCB). The 24,593 biological results 121 concerned four biological groups and five French standardised biological indices 122 (identified below by their French acronym): macroinvertebrates (33% of results) with 123 IBGN (AFNOR, 2004) and I2M2 (AFNOR, 2016a, 2010), diatoms (35%) with IBD 124 (AFNOR, 2016b), fishes (23%) with IPR (AFNOR, 2011), macrophytes (10%) with 125 IBMR, (AFNOR, 2003). Calculation of I2M2 is detailed in Mondy et al. (2012). IBGN, 126 the former French macroinvertebrate index is expected be replaced by I2M2, but at 127 present, the both are still calculated. The frequency of biological sampling was once 128 a year for macroinvertebrates and diatoms, once every two years for fishes and 129 macrophytes. The overall biological results were 69% complete. 130

131

132

Table 1: Volume of data used

Type of data	Number
Sampling site	1,781
Water sampling for physical chemical	122,765
analyzes	
Biological sampling	26,072
Physical chemical parameters	1,201
Physical chemical results	23,071,909
Biological groups	5
Biological index results	24,593

133

134 We created a database specifically for these data.

135

136 **1.2 Data preprocessing**

We discretized chemical and biological data using the five levels represented by colors, which symbolize the different statuses of the WFD; i.e. blue: high, green: good, yellow: moderate, orange: poor, and red: bad.

For the physico-chemical data, we used two sets of thresholds: the first was created 141 in France before the application of the WFD, hereafter referred to as SEQ (MEDD 142 and AE, 2003) and a second one upon application of the WFD, hereafter called the 143 WFD guide (MEEM, 2012). We performed physico-chemical discretization following 144 a three-step process for a given date: (1) by grouping parameters in the pressure 145 categories listed in Table 2 for SEQ and in Table 3 for the WFD guide; (2) by 146 147 discretizing of each parameter in a pressure category according to the corresponding thresholds; (3) by attributing the final level of each category keeping the worst level of 148 parameters considered, based on the one out, all out principle. With SEQ, we used 149 192 physico-chemical parameters and with the WFD guide, 58 parameters. The 150 thresholds of the two sets are listed in appendix 1 (for SEQ) and appendix 2 (for the 151 WFD guide). 152

153 Table 2: List of physico-chemical pressure categories, their acronyms based on SEQ

154

(MEDD and AE, 2003) and the number of associated parameters

N°	Acronym	Pressure categories	N° of
			parameters
1	MOOX	Oxidizable organic matter (e.g. O ₂ , DBO)	7
2	AZOT	Nitrogen excluding nitrate	3
3	NITR	Nitrate	1
4	PHOS	Phosphorous	2
5	EPRV	Effect of eutrophication	2
6	PAES	Suspended matter	2
7	TEMP	Temperature	1
8	ACID	Acidification parameters	2
9	MINE	Mineralisation	8
10	MPMI	Heavy metals	10
11	PEST	Pesticides	74
12	HAP	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons	15
13	PCB	Polychloro-biphenyls	8
14	MPOR	Other organic hydrocarbons	57

155

- 156 Table **3** : List of physico-chemical pressure categories, their acronyms based on the
- 157
- WFD guide (MEEM, 2012) and the number of associated parameters

N°	Acronym	Pressure categories	N° of parameters
1	TEMP	Temperature	1
2	ACID	Acidification parameters	1
3	BILO2	Oxygen balance	4
4	NUTRI	Nutrients	5
5	POSPE	Specific pollutants	9
6	SDP	Priority substances and priority hazardous substances	38

158

For each biological index, the thresholds from MEEM (2012) were applied. In most cases, about two-thirds of the results correspond to the status required by the WFD guide in class 1, high status, or in class 2, good status and one third of degraded quality (Class 3, moderate status; class 4: poor status; class 5: bad status) except for IPR (52% in classes 1 and 2 and 48% in classes 3, 4 and 5).

- 164
- 165

1.3 A pattern extracting tool named "PRESTOR"

167

To explore data resulting from monitoring the quality status of rivers, sequential 168 pattern mining, an unsupervised data mining tool able to treat large volumes of 169 data and to account for the temporal aspect of events has been used. This 170 method first introduced by Agrawal and Srikant (1995) is a temporal extension of 171 association rules (Agrawal and Srikant, 1994). It was then developed for and used 172 in engineering software (Ren et al., 2009), medicine (Sallaberry et al., 2011), or 173 marketing (George and Binu, 2012). Sequential pattern mining allows to reveal 174 frequent temporal regularities (called sequential patterns) in a sequence 175 database, each pattern being associated to the set of sequences that contain it. 176 Unfortunately, the number of extracted patterns can be high and they provide 177 redundant information, making their interpretation difficult. In order to reduce this 178 formation redundancy and to limit the number of patterns and hence the volume 179 of the result, Fabrègue et al. (2013) proposed to use closed partially ordered 180 patterns (CPO-patterns). Actually, a CPO-pattern is a summary of a set of 181 sequential patterns shared by a set of sequences (Casas-Garriga, 2005). CPO-182 patterns can be used in all kinds of sequential databases and have three main 183 advantages: (1) they provide more detailed information on order among elements; 184 (2) they are depicted by a directed acyclic graph, which is easy to understand; (3) 185 they summarize sequential pattern sets. 186

187 188

189 PRESTOR (temporal PRESsure categories patterns extracTOR) is a tool 190 designed for the analysis of a big temporal database. It was implemented in C++

allowing the best computing performances (along with intel TBB for parallel programming and BOOST and QT to handle different kinds of interfaces). PRESTOR is a command line software, most of the configuration is done in a "config.ini" file. It can fetch data directly from the database or from well-formatted files. Several configuration options are provided (described below) to select specific data subsets. The result consists in pictures and a few files providing different kinds of statistical values to help understanding the results.

198

Frequent Closed Partially Ordered Patterns The main algorithm at the core of
 PRESTOR generates frequent closed partially ordered patterns (CPO-patterns) as
 proposed by Fabrègue et al. (2013).

A sequential pattern is a succession of physico-chemical events that can be checked by the samples preceding a biological status assessment at a sampling site on one or more occasions. Formally, it is a sequence of itemsets. An item is a value to be recognised and an itemset is a set of values assessed at the same point in time (values from the same sample).

For example, having at the same time a *high* value for the alteration *PHOS* (noted *High PHOS*) and a bad value for the alteration *MPOR* (noted *Bad MPOR*) is an itemset we denote (*High PHOS*, *Bad MPOR*). <(*High TEMP*),(*High PHOS*, *Bad MPOR*)> is then a sequential pattern checked at all stations where the itemset (*High TEMP*) is found before the itemset (*High PHOS*, *Bad MPOR*).

Station	Date	Value
1	2/6/2015	Bad PHOS
1	31/5/2015	High IBGN
1	29/5/2015	High PHOS
1	29/5/2015	Bad MPOR
1	28/05/2015	Moderate AZOT
1	27/5/2015	Poor MINE
1	27/5/2015	High TEMP
2	28/6/2015	High IBGN
2	27/6/2015	High TEMP
2	27/6/2015	High PHOS
2	27/6/2015	Bad MPOR
2	26/6/2015	Moderate AZOT
3	30/4/2015	High IBGN
3	28/4/2015	Bad MPOR
3	27/4/2015	High PHOS
3	27/4/2015	High TEMP
3	26/4/2015	Moderate AZOT
3	18/3/2014	Good TEMP

Table 4: Toy database presenting the history of 3 sampling sites

213

Let us consider thetoy database shown in Table 4, presenting the history of 3 stations. In this paper, we focus on the biological indices (e.g. IBGN) we want to characterize using the preceding samples. To this end, we build sequences of itemsets from this database following two simple rules: the sequence must end on a biological sample, called the generating context, and the duration in months between the first and the last samples is bounded by a value (here 6 months) defined by the operator. Three sequences were extracted:

-S1: <(High TEMP, Poor MINE),(Moderate AZOT),(Bad MPOR, High PHOS),(High

222 IBGN)>

-S2: <(Moderate AZOT),(Bad MPOR, High PHOS, High TEMP),(High IBGN)>

-S3: <(Moderate AZOT),(High TEMP, High PHOS),(Bad MPOR),(High IBGN)>

The sample collected at station 1 on 2/6/2015 was not included in a sequence as it did not precede a biological sample. The sample collected at station 3 on 18/3/2014 was not included in a sequence even though it did precede a biological sample because it was too old with respect to the time-length threshold chosen in this toyexample..

In the sequence database, only sequence S1 confirmed the sequential pattern
<(*High TEMP*),(*High PHOS*, *Bad MPOR*)> (it was said that {S1} supported the
pattern), even though other itemsets exist between (*High TEMP*) and (*High PHOS*, *Bad MPOR*).

Here we consider the order of events, this is why sequences S2 and S3 did not confirm the sequential pattern. On S2 *High TEMP* occurred at the same time as *High PHOS* and *Bad MPOR* whereas to confirm the pattern, it would need to occur before. On S3, the problem was that *High PHOS* and *Bad MPOR* did not occur at the same time.

For a set of sequences, several sequential patterns may be valid e.g. <(*Moderate AZOT*)(*High* PHOS),(*High* IBGN)>; <(*Moderate* AZOT)(*Bad* MPOR),(*High* IBGN)>;
<(*High* TEMP),(*High* IBGN)>; <(*High* PHOS),(*High* IBGN)>; <(*Moderate* AZOT),(*High IBGN*)>; <(*Bad* MPOR),(*High* IBGN)>; <(*High* IBGN)>; <(*Moderate* AZOT)(*High PHOS*)>; <(*Moderate* AZOT)(*Bad* MPOR)>; <(*High* TEMP)>; <(*High* PHOS)>;
<(*Moderate* AZOT)); <(*Bad* MPOR)>; <>were all valid sequential patterns confirmed
by sequences S1, S2 and S3.

However, some patterns may be redundant as the information they convey is already contained in other patterns. For example, the information in $\langle (High PHOS), (High IBGN) \rangle$ is already conveyed by the pattern $\langle (Moderate AZOT)(High PHOS), (High IBGN) \rangle$. Hence, there is always a smallest set of sequential patterns conveying all the information regarding a set of sequences. A sequential pattern from this set is called a closed sequential pattern. A sequential pattern is closed with respect to a set of sequences if no other pattern conveys the same information, e.g. { $\langle (High PHOS), (High PHOS),$

TEMP),(*High IBGN*)>,<(*Moderate AZOT*)(*High PHOS*),(*High IBGN*)>,<(*Moderate AZOT*)(*Bad MPOR*),(*High IBGN*)>} is the set of closed sequential patterns for sequences S1, S2 and S3; which means that it contains the same information as the set of all sequential patterns presented earlier.

257 Closed sequential pattern sets are relevant because they represent the smallest and 258 most complete description possible of a set of sequences with sequential patterns.

In order to facilitate the reading of closed sequential pattern sets, Fabrègue et al. (2013) summarized them in a single structure named closed partially ordered patterns (CPO-patterns). A CPO-pattern is a directed acyclic graph in which each path is a sequential pattern. It is built in such a way that the number of nodes is minimized.

264

265

266

267



The algorithm extracts the CPO-patterns (Fig. 2) only for a specific biological index in a specific status, here *High IBGN*, which is the generating context. Hence we did not display the generating context of the pattern but this is important information for the evaluation. The CPO-pattern obtained is interpreted as follows: for each sequence which confirms it, *High IBGN* is preceded by *High TEMP* and by *Moderate AZOT* followed by *High PHOS* and *Bad MPOR* in any order. All the paths in the graph are checked by referring to all the supporting sequences.

Implementing the method proposed by Fabrègue et al. (2013), PRESTOR extracts all 275 the frequent CPO-patterns for a given sequence database. The frequency of a 276 pattern is the ratio of the size of its support to the size of the sequence database. In 277 some extracts, CPO-patterns extracted in several contexts may be identical. Each 278 has a generating context, e.g. High IBGN, High IBMR. For this set of identical CPO-279 patterns, the context of the CPO-pattern with the highest frequency is called the 280 dominant context. The frequency of a pattern in its dominant context is denoted by 281 282 f_{max}.

Hereafter, we refer to CPO-patterns simply as patterns.

284

285 Choice of parameters (region, time, reference thresholds, etc.)

The operator can modify several parameters to obtain different kinds of results. A 286 filter can be applied to limit the analysis to a subset of the database restricted to a 287 given region or a period of time. It is also possible to choose between the two quality 288 reference norms for discretizing the physico-chemical values (SEQ or the WFD 289 guide). The operator has to define a frequency threshold below which the patterns 290 are not extracted. The algorithm itself can also be parameterized to consider different 291 time lengths (in months) for the input sequences. One can also limit the values 292 considered to remove irrelevant values. One example of an irrelevant value is High 293 *TEMP* because it appears in more than 90% of the sequences in the database. This 294 generates a significant number of parasite nodes which provide no information. Note 295 that only the *High TEMP* is filtered but *Bad TEMP* is kept as such because this lowest 296

297 general value may provide some information. The choices of these parameters for an298 extraction specify its configuration.

299

300 4. Metrics for the evaluation of patterns

301

In addition to the frequency (f), we propose three metrics of interest on patterns to describe the results: 1) their complexity (C) (Equation 1), 2) their scarcity (S) (Equation 2), 3) their emergence (E) (Equation 3).

305

The complexity (C) of a pattern P indicates its relative size compared to the biggest pattern found in a given extraction. Its value range is 20-12: it is zero when the pattern P is empty and 1 when pattern P is the biggest one.

- 309
- 310

- Equation 1 C = n / N
- where n is the number of items in pattern P; N is number of items found in the biggestpattern in the chosen extraction.
- 313
- 314

Scarcity (S) conveys the level of specificity of pattern P in its generating context. Its value range is [0-1]: it is zero when pattern P is found in all 25 contexts (5 biological indices in five statuses) and 1 when pattern P is found only in one context.

318

- 319 Equation 2 S = (1 n')/24
- 320 where n' is number of repetitions of the pattern in other extraction contexts.

322	The emergence (E) of pattern P, in a given extraction, is calculated only if the generating
323	context is dominant: then its frequency is $f=f_{max}$ as defined before; we denote by $f_{(max-1)}$
324	the next highest frequency of the pattern in the others contexts. The bigger E is, the
325	more specific P is for its targeted biological value. Its value range is $[1-\infty[$.
326	
327	Equation 3 $E = f_{max}/f_{(max-1)}$
328	
329	2. Results
330	
331	In our conditions (Computer INTEL COR 17-4790 3.6 Go and 16 Go RAM), extractions
332	take from few seconds to few minutes, depending on the size of the sequence dataset
333	and the configuration parameters. The number of patterns increases with an increase in
334	time-length and with a decrease in the minimum frequency or in the number of
335	sampling sites, but without constant correlations. The number of patterns obtained
336	using the WFD thresholds guide is always higher than with SEQ thresholds in the same
337	configuration.
338	

2.1 Batch of patterns in a specific configuration

340

The results were obtained with the following configuration: [area: France, period: 2007-2013, table of thresholds: SEQ, time-length: 24 months, minimum frequency: 0.6]. We first eliminated 4 pressure categories for which a single status dominates over 80%: TEMP, ACID and EPRV in high status and HAP in moderate status, to avoid patterns with repetitive and no discriminating items.

A first batch of patterns was generated for a minimal frequency of 0.96. As 90% of the patterns obtained contained only five pressure categories in a single status, high or good (good PAES, high MINE, good MOOX, good AZOT and good PHOS), hence masking the impact of other parameters, we also eliminated these pressure categories in these statuses from the dataset. A second batch of patterns was generated without these pressure categories, for a minimum frequency of 0.6.

352

The distribution of the alteration categories in the different statuses foundin the 353 patterns differed from that in the dataset. The distribution of pressure categories for 354 major parameters, was comparable: (8-9%: from 90,681 results for NITR to 102,006 355 results for TEMP compared to the total number of physico-chemical results: 1,146,544), 356 while nitrogen was dominant in the patterns (30% = 953/3, 124). The micro-pollutants 357 were less abundant in the dataset (from 3% -count: 36,158- for PCB to 6% -count: 358 66,523- for PEST). Conversely PEST was abundant in the patterns (29%). The 359 distribution of sequences per index varied from 2,416 (8%) for IBMR to 8,404 (26%) for 360 IBD, while 67 (8% of) patterns had I2M2 as context and 433 (i.e. 53%) had IBMR as 361 362 context.





Fig. 3: Overall distribution of the pressure categories in the 809 patterns obtained for 365 the configuration [area: France, period: 2007-2013, table of thresholds: SEQ, time-366 length: 24 months, minimum frequency: 0.6] for each biological index and ranked 367 according to the top down percentage of appearance in patterns (Pressure categories: 368 NITR nitrates-; PEST - pesticides -; MPOR - other organic hydrocarbons-; PHOS -369 phosphorous -; MOOX – oxidizable organic matter -; ACID – acidification parameters –; 370 371 PAES – suspended matter; MINE– mineralistion; MPMI – heavy metals; AZOT – nitrogen excluding nitrate). 372

Five main pressure categories were found in the 809 patterns (Fig. 3–All indices), in decreasing order: nitrate (NITR) in good and moderate statuses ((present in 30% of total patterns); pesticides (PEST) only in poor and bad statuses (present in 29% of patterns), phosphorous (PHOS) and oxidizable organic matter (MOOX), with 9.0 % in all

patterns) mainly in the moderate status (present in 9% of patterns). It should be 378 recalled that MOOX with good status was removed before the extraction because of its 379 dominance. We observed the same distribution of four pressure categories for IBMR, but 380 phosphorous (PHOS) disappearing and suspended matter (PAES) coming. Two main 381 pressure categories were associated with the IBD index: phosphorous (PHOS) and 382 acidification parameters (ACID) (,. By studying patterns on the IBD index in detail, we 383 observed that PHOS was mainly in high status and ACID only in good status – PHOS in 384 good status and ACID in high status were removed before the extraction because of their 385 dominance. The other organic hydrocarbons (MPOR was found in moderate status 386 mainly in the IBGN index and in poor status in the IBMR and IPR indices. Heavy metals 387 (MPMI)was found only in the IBGN index in poor status while PEST was the main 388 pressure which impacts I2M2, the second index based on macroinvertebrates as IBGN. 389 Nitrogen excluding nitrate (AZOT) () was found only in the I2M2 index in moderate 390 status. The first pressure categories NITR, PEST, MPOR and MOOX representing at least 391 392 45% of the total distribution were the same in the IBMR, IPR and IBGN index but not in the same order of importance. PHOS, NITR and ACID were the main pressures in IBD, 393 394 PEST, NITR and PHOS in I2M2.

395

2.2 Characteristic patterns of IBGN and IBMR indices

397

A total of 85 characteristic patterns were obtained for IBGN (Fig. 4), (respectively 10, 6, 10, 18 and 46 in biological statuses high, good, moderate, poor and bad) and 433 patterns for IBMR (respectively 16, 12, 14, 88 and 303 in biological statuses high, good, moderate, poor and bad).



404 Fig. 4 : Repartition by status classes of the patterns extracted for the two French
405 biological indices IBGN and IBMR obtained with the configuration: [area: France, period:
406 2007-2013, table of thresholds: SEQ, time-length: 24 months, minimum frequency: 0.6]

407

The largest number of patterns was obtained in the bad status context, which had the fewest sequences: 54% of patterns in the context "bad IBGN" versus less than 1% of sequences, and 70% of patterns in the context "bad IBMR" versus 1% of sequences. This was not the case for all the indices. For instance, we obtained 27% of patterns in the context "high IBD" versus 63% of sequences. That is why we chose to study the two indices IBGN and IBMR in more detail.

In patterns, the nitrate pressure (NITR) appeared in only two statuses: good and 414 moderate, even when the two biological indices were in poor or bad statuses. The 415 pesticide pressure (PEST) appeared only in two statuses: poor and bad, even when the 416 two biological indices were in high, good or moderate statuses. The other organic 417 hydrocarbon pressure (MPOR) appeared only in two statuses: moderate and poor 418 respectively when IBGN was in poor or bad biological status and when IBMR was in bad 419 biological status. The phosphorous pressure (PHOS) appeared most frequently in high 420 421 status which corresponds to high and good statuses in the two biological indices, the 422 oxidizable organic matter pressure (MOOX) in moderate status when the two biological423 indices were in moderate, poor and more particularly in bad statuses.

Patterns were selected and analyzed per context according to the following criteria: 1)
highest frequency (f), 2) highest emergence (E), 3) highest complexity (C), 4) highest
scarcity and 5) item diversity. Table 5 lists the first five patterns for each context except
for bad IBMR, for which we included six patterns in order to have the pressure category
AZOT at least once.

429

430Table 5: Selection of five first patterns generated for all the contexts of the French

431 biological indices IBGN and IBMR according to their frequency (f), emergence (E),

432 complexity (C) and scarcity (S) and the result (f x C x S +E); The dominant context is the

433 context in which the pattern is the most frequent; the last row indicates the items in

434 each pattern; configuration: [area: France, period: 2007-2013, table of thresholds: SEQ,

time-length: 24 months, minimum frequency: 0.6]; in bold: first pattern with no micro-

436

pollutants.

Pattern	Generating Context	Dominant Context	f	E	С	S	f X C X S + E	Items
229	high IBGN	high IBD	0.609		0.150	0.800	0.073	3 high PHOS
228	high IBGN	high IBMR	0.604		0.150	0.640	0.058	3 poor PEST
221	high IBGN	high IPR	0.660		0.050	0.600	0.020	1 high MOOX
223	high IBGN	bad IBMR	0.619		0.050	0.160	0.005	1 bad PEST
220	high IBGN	bad IBMR	0.651		0.050	0.080	0.003	1 good NITR
307	good IBGN	bad IBMR	0.637		0.100	0.360	0.023	2 good NITR
303	good IBGN	high IBD	0.636		0.050	0.560	0.018	1 high PHOS
308	good IBGN	bad IBMR	0.624		0.100	0.240	0.015	2 bad PEST
305	good IBGN	bad IBMR	0.719		0.050	0.080	0.003	1 good NITR
304	good IBGN	bad IPR	0.738		0.050	0.000	0.000	1 good ACID

240	moderate IBGN	bad IBMR	0.629		0.200	0.640	0.080	4 poor PEST
239	moderate IBGN	bad IBMR	0.671		0.150	0.480	0.048	3 bad PEST
236	moderate IBGN	poor IBMR	0.633		0.100	0.560	0.035	2 moderate NITR
237	moderate IBGN	bad IBMR	0.605		0.100	0.360	0.023	2 good NITR
232	moderate IBGN	bad IBGN	0.675		0.050	0.440	0.015	1 moderate MOOX
254	poor IBGN	high IBMR	0.617		0.150	0.640	0.059	3 poor PEST
251	poor IBGN	poor IBMR	0.613		0.100	0.960	0.059	2 moderate MPOR
253	poor IBGN	bad I2M2	0.613		0.100	0.560	0.034	2 moderate NITR
242	poor IBGN	bad IBMR	0.613		0.050	0.920	0.028	1 moderate AZOT
244	poor IBGN	high IBMR	0.637		0.050	0.760	0.024	1 moderate PHOS
300	bad IBGN	bad IBGN	0.600	2.100	0.400	0.960	2.330	5 moderate MPOR, 1 moderate NITR, 1 moderate MOOX
266	bad IBGN	bad IBGN	0.600	1.719	0.250	0.960	1.863	4 poor MPMI & 1 moderate NITR
270	bad IBGN	bad IBGN	0.600	1.260	0.200	0.960	1.375	3 poor PEST & 1 moderate MOOX
289	bad IBGN	bad IBGN	0.600	1.273	0.100	0.960	1.331	1 poor MOOX & 1 moderate NITR
259	bad IBGN	bad IBGN	0.667	1.215	0.150	0.960	1.311	3 bad PEST
324	high IBMR	high IBMR	0.637	1.058	0.200	0.880	1.170	4 poor PEST
325	high IBMR	high IBD	0.612		0.200	0.880	0.108	4 high PHOS
323	high IBMR	bad IBMR	0.602		0.150	0.760	0.069	3 good NITR
316	high IBMR	high IPR	0.619		0.100	0.880	0.054	2 high MOOX
320	high IBMR	bad IBMR	0.604		0.100	0.240	0.015	4 bad PEST
745	good IBMR	high IBMR	0.625		0.150	0.640	0.060	3 poor PEST
746	good IBMR	bad IBMR	0.621		0.150	0.480	0.045	3 bad PEST

738	good IBMR	high IPR	0.667		0.050	0.600	0.020	1high MOOX
739	good IBMR	high IBD	0.643		0.050	0.560	0.018	1 high PHOS
735	good IBMR	bad IBMR	0.613		0.050	0.440	0.014	1 moderate MOOX
340	moderate IBMR	bad IBMR	0.6478		0.200	0.640	0.083	4 bad PEST
338	moderate IBMR	poor IBMR	0.608		0.150	0.800	0.073	3 moderate NITR
334	moderate IBMR	bad IBMR	0.637		0.100	0.480	0.031	3 poor PEST
335	moderate IBMR	high IBMR	0.659		0.100	0.360	0.024	2 good NITR
328	moderate IBMR	bad IBMR	0.704		0.050	0.440	0.016	1 moderate MOOX
410	poor IBMR	poor IBMR	0.604	1.228	0.300	0.960	1.402	4 bad PEST, 2 moderate NITR
363	poor IBMR	poor IBMR	0.6923	1.119	0.150	0.960	1.219	2 moderate NITR, 1 moderate MOOX
360	poor IBMR	poor IBMR	0.625		0.150	0.760	0.071	3 good NITR
421	poor IBMR	poor IBMR	0.604		0.100	0.960	0.058	1 moderate NITR, 1 moderate PAES
419	poor IBMR	poor IBMR	0.604		0.100	0.920	0.056	1 moderate NITR, 1 good ACID
623	bad IBMR	bad IBMR	0.619	4.647	0.500	0.960	4.944	2 bad PEST, 4 good NITR, 2 moderate MOOX, 2 moderate PAES
689	bad IBMR	bad IBMR	0.619	3.714	0.950	0.960	4.279	9 bad PEST, 4 good NITR, 3 moderate MOOX, 3 poor MPOR
564	bad IBMR	bad IBMR	0.619	3.714	0.350	0.960	3.922	3 good NITR, 1 moderate MOOX, 3 moderate PAES
674	bad IBMR	bad IBMR	0.619	3.200	0.600	0.960	3.557	3 bad PEST, 4 good NITR, 2 moderate NITR, 3 poor MPOR
494	bad IBMR	bad IBMR	0.619	2.758	0.500	0.960	3.055	5 good NITR, 4 moderate MOOX, 1 good MINE

								1 moderate AZOT, 1
	bad	bad						good MINE, 3 good
442	IBMR	IBMR	0.61905	2.207	0.250	0.960	2.356	NITR

Among the 50 selected patterns, 14 were emerging patterns (they have a E value, the 438 highest values were for bad IBMR) and they belong to only four contexts: IBMR in high, 439 poor and bad statuses and IBGN in bad status. There were eight situations where the 440 generating context is the dominant context, the four previously cited and four more 441 contexts based on other indices than IBGN and IBMR (high IBD, high IPR, bad I2M2 and 442 bad IPR, not shown in the table). The other generating contexts, based on IBGN and 443 IBMR indices, were never dominant for any given pattern. Only the patterns of four 444 generating contexts had a complexity higher than 0.25 (in this configuration, the biggest 445 pattern had 20 items and C=0.25 corresponded to a pattern with five items): the 446 patterns for IBMR in high, poor and bad statuses and IBGN in bad status. Patterns for 447 only four contexts had a scarcity less than 0.76 (in this configuration, S=0.76 was 448 obtained for a pattern found in more than six contexts): the patterns for IBMR and for 449 IBGN in good and moderate statuses. 450

In each context, we performed detailed analysis of the first pattern according to theselected classification, and the first one with macro-pollutants.

The first pattern for high IBGN (pattern 229, Fig. 5) and the second for high IBMR (pattern 325, Fig. 6) showed that the pressure PHOS remained stable in high status, during respectively three and four successive measurements. Pattern 738 (Fig. 6), obtained for the generating context high IBMR, was the only one with another pressure category in high status, i.e. one item with high MOOX. The stability of pressure PEST in poor or bad statuses, measured successively three times (for example patterns 228 for high IBGN and 254 for poor IBGN in Table 5 and Fig. 5) or four times (for example pattern

340 for moderate IBMR in Fig. 6), was not discriminating with respect to a specific 460 context. It appeared in high to bas biological context. The pressure category "good 461 NITR" did not appear to be discriminating; as whatever the context, it appeared: once in 462 high and good IBGN (patterns 220 and 305, Table 5), twice in good, moderate IBGN 463 (patterns 307, Fig. 5 and pattern 237, Table 5) and moderate IBMR (pattern 334, Table 5), 464 three times in moderate IBGN and poor IBMR (patterns 323 and 360, Table 5). Moderate 465 NITR appeared more specifically in poor and bad contexts of both indices (patterns 236, 466 253, Table 5, and 338, Table 5 and Fig. 6). Pattern 289 (Fig. 5) was specific to bad IBGN 467 (E= 1.273 and S=0.960): meant that only one poor MOOX was measured before or after 468 one moderate NITR. Pattern 300 (Fig. 5) was also specific to bad IBGN (E= 2.100 and 469 S=0.960): meant that pollution with moderate MPOR measured five times remained 470 471 stable, and two moderate NITR and one moderate MOOX were measured after or before 472 one these measurements. In pattern 442 (Fig. 6), only one measurement of moderate AZOT between one good MINE and three good NITR were observed before a bad IBMR. 473 474 Pressure MPMI (heavy metals) appeared only in bad IBGN contexts, e.g. in pattern 266 (Fig. 5) composed of four poor MPMI and one moderate NITR. In the bad IBMR context, 475 476 patterns 623 and 564 (Fig. 6) represented multi-stress conditions: moderate MOOX, and moderate PAES for the first, with added bad PEST for the second. 477







Fig. 6: Eleven major patterns extracted from the five contexts of IBMR in the
configuration: [area: France, period: 2007-2013, table of thresholds: SEQ, time-length:
24 months, minimum frequency: 0.6] (Pressure categories: PHOS – phosphorous - ; PEST
– pesticides -; MOOX – oxidizable organic matter -; MPOR – other organic hydrocarbons-

493	; NITR nitrates-; PAES – suspended matter; ACID – acidification parameters –;MINE–
494	mineralistion; AZOT – nitrogen excluding nitrate).
495	
496	

3. Discussion

497 498

499 A promising tool to reveal temporal sequences preceding a biological status

Fabrègue et al. (2014) were the first to show the promising potential of patterns to 500 describe sequential data concerning quality in river ecosystems. We continued this work 501 using a bigger dataset (here 1,146,544 physico-chemical data and 24,593 biological 502 data) and by multiplying the possible configurations. The PRESTOR tool we created was 503 specifically applied to extract patterns based on different criteria (time-length, minimum 504 frequency, etc.) directly from hydro-ecosystem databases. Whereas extraction is stable 505 and rapid, many tests have to be conducted to tune the parameters, and, like in 506 multivariate analysis, the dominant pressure categories had to be removed in order to 507 analyze all the data in detail using a top-down approach. As shown by Serrano Balderas 508 et al. (2017), selecting features for data reduction is an essential data preprocessing 509 technique to ensure the final results are valid. 510

511

To proceed from a potentially useful to an operational method using PRESTOR, we proposed a double process before and after extraction to control the number of patterns extracted and to identify the most relevant ones. Analysing of the 809 patterns we extracted is irrelevant for an expert. Some are nested in others, for example, a pattern of three successive "poor PESTs" included in another one of four successive "poor PESTs" (Fig. 6). After extraction, the three metrics (complexity (C), scarcity (S) and emergence (E)) help selecting the most relevant patterns among hundreds or even thousand ones.

519

520 The process generated more patterns for the smaller sub-datasets. This bias is shared by521 other methods as well as by data mining and statistical methods, which is why the pre

and post-processing are recommended particularly for environmental data mining 522 (Gibert et al., 2008). Here, there can be many patterns in a given context for different 523 reasons: 1) few sequences were available: in our case, IBMR represented 8% of 524 sequences and extracted 53% of patterns, because the threshold of minimum frequency 525 is easily reached; 2) data covered all the range of values: dataset for IBMR were more 526 heterogeneous than those for IBD, which represented the maximum number of 527 sequences (27%) and extracted only 18% of patterns; 3) data were numerous but 528 homogeneous, as were data for high IBD in the dataset. This problem was amplified by 529 unbalanced data distribution. The advantage of this dataset is that it is the complete set 530 of French data from a survey network covering six years, but we nevertheless had to 531 deal with the real distribution of these data: more major parameters than minor 532 pollutants, a different number of sequences available for each index and fewer 533 534 sequences for bad ecological status.

535 Selecting the same number of the most relevant patterns for all biological indices and 536 statuses with a given status, thanks to the three metrics, limited this bias. Before 537 focusing on the most relevant patterns, to be sure the method is efficient, we studied the 538 complete batch of patterns extracted for a time-length of two years.

539

540 Feedback on the pressure categories analyzed and the quality of data

541 Six types of pressure categories have been identified: the first one resulted from the 542 analysis of the original data and the five others from the analysis of the extracted 543 patterns.

The first type concerned several pressure categories considered to remain stable in a single status throughout the French territory, i.e. temperature (TEMP), acidification parameters (ACID) and effect of eutrophication (EPRV) in high status and polycyclic

aromatic hydrocarbons (HAP) in moderate status. For temperature, in the SEQ (op. cit) 547 or in the WFD guide (op.cit.), the quality class is defined by higher temperatures and the 548 temperature difference between high and good class thresholds is 1.5 °C. This difference 549 may correspond to the 1.4 °C to 1.7 °C increase observed by Durance and Ormerod 550 (2007) in streams in Wales between 1981 and 2005 or to the forecasts of 1-9 °C 551 announced by Webb (1996) for 2050. But the mechanisms which control freshwater 552 temperature behavior in the context of global climate change are complex, in particular 553 because temperature increases have been observed in winter while summer 554 temperatures have remained relatively stable (Webb et al., 2008). This could explain 555 why, in the French dataset, temperatures remained stable in high status, and underlines 556 the need to change the way we define this pressure category. In Europe and North 557 America, acidification of freshwater decreased throughout the 1980s and 1990s thanks 558 to the reduction of atmospheric emissions of sulphur dioxide (Stoddard et al., 1999). 559 Therefore, pressure due to acidification is now localized rather than widespread, which 560 is probably why it is difficult to observe this pressure in a study conducted at national 561 scale. The quality class for the effect of eutrophication (EPRV), in the SEQ (op. cit), is 562 563 generally defined for water combining basic pH and oversaturated in oxygen. In our dataset, this pressure category was mainly in high quality based on this definition, which 564 is why it was not included in the analysis of patterns. Again, HAP are ubiquitous 565 contaminants to a moderate degree in our study area, as also shown by Motelay-Massei 566 et al. (2004) in the soils of the Seine River Basin. 567

The five following type of pressure categories are selected according to the patternsextracted from the complete dataset with a time length of two years.

570 The second type pressure categories was measured in different statuses but considered 571 as dominant in only one status. There were macro-pollutants in high or good quality statuses: mineralisation (MINE) in high status, suspended matter (MES), oxidisable
organic matter (MOOX), nitrogen excluding nitrate (AZOT) and phosphorus matter
(PHOS) in good status. They were removed from the pattern extractions, but they can be
considered as regularly measured in each site.

The third type includes pressure categories that were absent or rare in the patterns. 576 Polychloro-biphenyls (PCB) did not appear in any patterns. This pressure category was 577 the one with the lowest number of measurements in the dataset (completeness rate: 578 33% versus at least or more than 50% for the other micro-pollutants). Teil et al. (2004) 579 estimated that the pressure exerted by PCB in the Seine River Basin to be beyond the 580 global national estimation of industrial inputs, but we did not observe it at the national 581 scale. Pressure categories ACID and MINE in other classes than the high one accounted 582 for less than 4% of all appearances of pressures. 583

584 The fourth type represents pressure categories that were dominant in patternsbut poorly discriminant, regardless of the biological status: pesticides (PEST) was only 585 586 found in poor or bad statuses in the patterns we extracted. This pressure category was the one in which the number of measurements of micro-pollutants was the highest in 587 588 the dataset (completeness rate: 61%). According to the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment Programme (2005), pesticides are one of the major stressors in freshwater 589 ecosystems. The patterns extracted revealed the spatial and temporal dominance of this 590 pressure category in the French dataset. After nitrates, it was the second most dominant 591 category in all the patterns extracted, but was found in all biological statuses from high 592 to bad. There was no graduation either in status or in the number of appearances in the 593 patterns extracted for the IBGN index. Conversely, there was a small gradation in status 594 and in the number of appearance in patterns extracted for the IBMR index: poor PEST 595 596 appeared only in patterns extracted for high to moderate IBMR, whereas patterns

extracted for poor and bad IBMR contained only bad PEST. The proportion of herbicides (45%) versus insecticides (31%) in the parameters included in PEST in SEQ (op.cit.) could partly explain the small graduation observed in patterns extracted for IBMR. Even if macroinvertebrates are known to be the most sensitive groups to pesticides in freshwater communities (Schäfer et al., 2012), we observed different responses of the two indices we tested; IBGN sensitivity was higher than that of I2M2 (Mondy et al., 2012).

The fifth type grouped distinguishing pressure categories for a given biological status in 604 all biological indices: nitrates (NITR) in good and moderate status, phosphorus (PHOS) 605 in high and moderate status, oxidizable organic matter (MOOX) in high, moderate and 606 poor status, and other organic hydrocarbons (MPOR) in moderate and poor status. Like 607 608 in recent studies dealing with the effects of multiple stressors on freshwater 609 biodiversity, we found nutrients among the parameters that have the most impact (Lemm and Feld, 2017; Stendera et al., 2012) along with organic matter (Comte et al., 610 611 2010; Villeneuve et al., 2015). We are the first to underline the importance of other 612 organic hydrocarbons (MPOR) in patterns especially for IBGN, IPR and IBMR contexts.

The sixth type is heavy metals (MPMI) in poor status. This pressure category is specific to patterns extracted for IBGN index in bad status. It was missing in patterns associated to I2M2 the other French index based on macroinvertebrates whereas Mondy et al. (2012) found a better correlation between this stressor and I2M2 than IBGN.

617

618 A specific biological response to a specific pressure category?

Except for heavy metals (MPMI), none of the pressure categories was specific to one
biological index in the patterns extracted from the French dataset we used. Many
authors who used large national indices and several biological indices reported that all

biological groups responded firstly to macro-pollutants in general (Dahm et al., 2013; 622 Marzin et al., 2012), particularly to organic matter and nutrients (Villeneuve et al., 623 2015). Haury et al. (2006) showed that the IBMR was sensitive to trophic disruption but 624 also to heavy organic pollution. Nutrients did not appear to be specific to patterns 625 extracted for IBMR or IBD indices. However high and good IBMRs (generating contexts) 626 were associated with High PHOS and MOOX or good NITR. PHOS was also the dominant 627 pressure category for patterns extracted for IBD index (dominant context). 628 Nevertheless, excess nutrients are known to have indirect effects on aquatic organisms, 629 especially on macroinvertebrates (Dolédec et al., 2006; Lemm and Feld, 2017). The 630 pressure acidification (ACID) was well represented (18%) in the patterns extracted for 631 the IBD index, whereas Larras et al. (2017) found a weak correlation between this 632 pressure and diatoms, but their approach using life history traits differs substantially 633 from our approach. Fishes are known to have lower responses to physico-chemical 634 pressures (Dahm et al., 2013; Marzin et al., 2012; Villeneuve et al., 2015). Indeed, the 635 patterns extracted for IPR contained the lowest number of pressures (6/10). Few 636 authors who used large datasets tested biological responses to all micro-pollutant 637 638 categories, except Larras et al. (2017) and Mondy and Usseglio-Polatera (2013) respectively for diatoms and macroinvertebrates using the same French dataset. These 639 authors found good biological responses for pesticides but poor responses for polycyclic 640 aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH), heavy metals (MPMI) and other organic hydrocarbons 641 (MPOR), whereas the last pressure category was widely represented in the patterns we 642 extracted in our study. 643

644

645 Gap between physico-chemical statuses and biological statuses

In the differentiating pressure categories, physico-chemical statuses were often better 646 distinguished than the biological statuses in the patterns. Oberdorff and Hughes (1992) 647 648 already observed a gap between the precursor of the IPR index and SEQ results in the Seine catchment. Except for suspended matter (PAES) and pesticides (PEST) found in 649 bad status in some patterns, the worst status found for other pressure categories was 650 poor status. Defining class boundaries is a critical step in the design of methods of 651 assessment (Birk et al., 2012). Using new French thresholds (MEEM, 2012) to discretize 652 physico-chemical data, we obtained less significant results. This can be partly explained 653 by the fact that these pressure categories include more parameters, but also by the 654 change in the boundary between the good and moderate threshold for nitrates in the 655 nutrient pressure category, which increased from 10 mg/L in SEQ (MEDD and AE, 2003) 656 to 50 mg/L in the WFD guide (MEEM, 2012). This is at least the second time that this 657 658 threshold has been revised upwards: 50 years ago, Nisbet and Verneaux (1970) set the boundary for excess nitrates in French freshwater at 3 mg/L. Although good-bad 659 660 thresholds for micro-pollutants were discussed at the European level for the WFD guide, there was no harmonization of the thresholds for macro-pollutants, and the literature 661 662 comparing them in Europe is really poor. Current French thresholds are among the highest in Europe probably because the majority of countries take the mean or the 663 median as the annual value while France takes the 90th percentile. The French good-664 moderate thresholds compared to the European ranges are 1) for NH₄: 0.5 mg/L in the 665 range [0.05-1.6 mg/L] (Claussen et al., 2012), 2) for O₂: 6 mg/l in the range [6-10 mg/L] -666 but the higher values are used by countries specifying different thresholds for different 667 stream typologies (based on size, climate, geology, geographical location), which is not 668 the case in France - (Claussen et al., 2012), 3) for orthophosphates: 0.5 mg/L in the 669 670 range [0.05-1 mg/L] (Arle et al., 2016), 4) for nitrogen adding the French good-moderate

thresholds for Kjeldahl nitrogen, nitrites and nitrates, the boundary is 4.5 mg/L for SEQ
(MEDD and AE, 2003) and 14 mg/L for WFD guide (MEEM, 2012) versus the European
range [0.7-10 mg/L] (Claussen et al., 2012).

674

The stronger reactions of living organisms evidenced by worse states than their physicochemical status, can also be explained by possible synergism between stressors and/or an additive impact of other stressors related to hydromorphology or hydrology. According to Lemm and Feld (2017), combined nutrient and hydromorphological stress can strengthen an individual's reactions to each single stressor for different biological traits.

Extreme ecological status classes are the easiest to define (Birk et al., 2012). This is surely why in the configuration we chose, or in other configurations, intermediate biological statuses i.e. good and moderate, never displayed specific patterns. Conversely, extreme statuses, high and bad, often displayed specific patterns. For the poor status, there were some specific patterns for IBMR, but not for IBGN.

686

687 Characteristic physico-chemical successions for high and bad biological statuses 688

Patterns of high biological status were characterized by consistently high physicochemical status especially for phosphorus (PHOS) measured three or four times and probably in the consistency of the pressure categories we had to remove before the extraction: mineralisation (MINE) in high status, suspended matter (MES), oxidizable organic matter (MOOX), nitrogen excluding nitrate (AZOT).

We found two types of patterns in bad biological status: (1) a chronic multi-pressure one, in which pressure categories such as nitrates, pesticides and other organic

hydrocarbons, in moderate, poor or bad status, repeated themselves several times over
time, or (2) a single occurrence of a degraded pressure category, such as one moderate
nitrogen excluding nitrate, or one poor oxidizable organic matter, among other pressure
categories in good status (respectively pattern 289, Fig. 5 and pattern 442, Fig. 6).

700

Studies of the change effect in pressure categories over time are scarce or limited to 701 general trends in the case of degradation such as the hydraulic management of large 702 rivers (e.g. Fruget et al., 2001; Trémolières, 1994) or more recently in the case of 703 restoration (e.g. Meyer et al., 2013; Staentzel et al., 2017). However databases storing 704 temporal monitoring data on rivers do exist. Most studies used data on each site on each 705 sampling occasion as not accounting for time information to increase the gradient of 706 measurements before timeless treatments, because the methods used were not able to 707 708 incorporate the temporal dimension (D'heygere et al., 2006; Dahm et al., 2013; Larras et al., 2017; Marzin et al., 2012; Mondy and Usseglio-Polatera, 2013; Villeneuve et al., 709 2018). This is why the temporal patterns extracted by PRESTOR are innovative and 710 offer new opportunities to explore data on rivers. Here the life span of the different 711 biological compartment studied were not taken into account. To go further, we will 712 search the specific time length of sequences to consider with respect to biological 713 714 indices to obtain the most relevant patterns. Moreover hydrological and hydromorphological pressures will be added in the dataset to produce richer patterns 715 that will deepen the analysis. 716

717

719 **Conclusion**

Our questions were: 1) do patterns allow us to disentangle and identify the pressure categories implicated in a degraded status? 2) are pressure categories found in patterns specific to a biological group? 3) is there a correspondence between physico-chemical and biological statutes?

Applying a new data mining method for river ecological assessment required iterative 724 collaboration between computer scientists and experts in the domain to (1) adapt the 725 method to a particular question and to the specific format of the data, (2) analyze the 726 complete results and not only those that "matched well" to ensure the methods are 727 efficient, (3) to propose selection criteria for the evaluation of patterns, (4) to select the 728 most important results particularly for data mining methods which have led to 729 exponential increase in results. PRESTOR (temporal PRESsure categories patterns 730 extracTOR) was implemented specifically to extract patterns from a hydro-ecosystem 731 database. The operator chooses several criteria such as the time-length of patterns or 732 their minimum frequency. To check the efficiency of the method, the 809 patterns 733 extracted from data collected all over France with a time-length of 24 months, were 734 analyzed. Three metrics, complexity, scarcity and emergence, were used to select 735 significant patterns according to their ecological status. 736

Water managers need simple and transparent methods. Selected patterns extracted by PRESTOR are easily readable and match managers' needs. They could be used at large scale and as such, considered as a holistic approach, the kind of approach that is urgently needed (Demars et al., 2012; Stendera et al., 2012). In a multi-pressure environment (Reyjol et al., 2014), hydromorphological and physico-chemical pressures should be analyzed together: patterns including various time scales have to build

therefore. In this study, patterns were extracted over a large territory, here France, but
the method can be applied in the same way to a small territory, climatically and
geologically homogeneous, in order to extract more specific patterns. Finally, patterns,
highlighting a sequence of alteration events before an observed biological response, are
a possible solution to disentangle the effects of different pressures.

748

749 Acknowledgments

750

This work was funded by the French National Agency of Biodiversity (research support
agreement n°460, December 23rd, 2014).

753

754 **References**

- Adriaenssens, V., Goethals, P.L.M., Charles, J., De Pauw, N., 2004. Application of Bayesian
- 757 Belief Networks for the prediction of macroinvertebrate taxa in rivers. Ann. Limnol.
- 758 40, 181–191. https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/2004016
- 759 AFNOR, 2016a. Qualité de l'eau: prélèvements des macro-invertébrés aquatiques en
- rivières peu profondes. Norme Française NF T 90-333.
- AFNOR, 2016b. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice Biologique Diatomées (IBD).
 Norme Française NF T90-354.
- AFNOR, 2011. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice poissons rivière (IPR). Norme
 Française NF T90-344.

- AFNOR, 2010. Qualité de l'eau: traitement au laboratoire d'échantillons contenant des
 macro-invertébrés de cours d'eau. Norme Française Expérimentale XP T 90-388.
- 767 AFNOR, 2004. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice Biologique Global Normalisé
 768 (IBGN); Norme Française NF T90-350.
- AFNOR, 2003. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice Biologique Macrophytique en
 Rivière (IBMR). Norme Française NF T90-395.
- Agrawal, R., Srikant, R., 1995. Mining sequential patterns, in: Proceedings of the Eleventh
- International Conference on Data Engineering. IEEE Comput. Soc. Press, pp. 3–14.
- 773 https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.1995.380415
- Agrawal, R., Srikant, R., 1994. Fast algorithms for mining association rules, in: Proc. 20th
 IVLDB Conference.
- Arle, J., Mohaupt, V., Kirst, I., 2016. Monitoring of Surface Waters in Germany under the
- 777 Water Framework Directive A Review of approaches, methods and results.
- 778 Water 8, 217. https://doi.org/10.3390/w8060217
- Birk, S., Bonne, W., Borja, A., Brucet, S., Courrat, A., Poikane, S., Solimini, A., Van De Bund,
- 780 W., Zampoukas, N., Hering, D., 2012. Three hundred ways to assess Europe's surface
- 781 waters: An almost complete overview of biological methods to implement the
- 782 Water Framework Directive. Ecol. Indic. 18, 31–41.
- 783 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.10.009
- 784 Casas-Garriga, G., 2005. Summarizing Sequential Data with Closed Partial Orders, in:
- 785 Proceedings of the 2005 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining. pp. 380–
- 786 391. https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611972757.34

787	Claussen, U., Müller, P., Arle, J., 2012. WFD CIS ECOSTAT WG A Report " Comparison of
788	envi- ronmental quality Objectives , threshold values or water quality targets Set for
789	the demands of the European Water Framework Directive ". Version 1 . Internal
790	report , 2012 .

- Comte, L., Lek, S., de Deckere, E., de Zwart, D., Gevrey, M., 2010. Assessment of stream
 biological responses under multiple-stress conditions. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 17,
 1469–1478. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-010-0333-z
- D'heygere, T., Goethals, P.L.M., De Pauw, N., 2006. Genetic algorithms for optimisation of
- 795 predictive ecosystems models based on decision trees and neural networks. Ecol.

796 Modell. 195, 20–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.11.005

797 Dahm, V., Hering, D., Nemitz, D., Graf, W., Schmidt-Kloiber, A., Leitner, P., Melcher, A.,

Feld, C.K., 2013. Effects of physico-chemistry, land use and hydromorphology on

- three riverine organism groups: A comparative analysis with monitoring data from
- 600 Germany and Austria. Hydrobiologia 704, 389–415.
- 801 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1431-3
- B02 Dakou, E., Goethals, P.L.M., D'heygere, T., Dedecker, A.P., Gabriels, W., De Pauw, N.,

Lazaridou-Dimitriadou, M., 2006. Development of artificial neural network models

804 predicting macroinvertebrate taxa in the river Axios (Northern Greece). Ann.

- Limnol. J. Limnol. 42, 241–250. https://doi.org/Doi 10.1051/Limn/2006025
- 806 Demars, B.O.L., Potts, J.M., Trémolières, M., Thiébaut, G., Goucelin, N., Nordmann, V.,
- 2012. River macrophyte indices: Not the Holy Grail! Freshw. Biol. 57, 1745–1759.

808 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2012.02834.x

B09 Dolédec, S., Phillips, N., Scarsbrook, M., Riley, R.H., Townsend, C.R., 2006. Comparison of

810	structural and functional approaches to determining landuse effects on grassland
811	stream invertebrate communities. J. North Am. Benthol. Soc. 25, 44–60.
812	https://doi.org/10.1899/0887-3593(2006)25[44:COSAFA]2.0.CO;2
813	Durance, I., Ormerod, S.J., 2007. Climate change effects on upland stream
814	macroinvertebrates over a 25-year period. Glob. Chang. Biol. 13, 942–957.
815	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01340.x
816	Džeroski, S., 2001. Applications of symbolic machine learning to ecological modelling.
817	Ecol. Modell. 146, 263–273. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(01)00312-X
818	Džeroski, S., Grbović, J., Walley, W.J., Kompare, B., 1997. Using machine learning
819	techniques in the construction of models. II. Data analysis with rule induction. Ecol.
820	Modell. 95, 95–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(96)00029-4
821	European Council, 2000. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the
822	Council of 23 October 2000 Establishing a Framework for Community Action in the
823	Field of Water Policy. Office for official publications of the European Communities,
824	Brussels., Office for official publications of the European Communities, Brussels.
825	Everaert, G., Bennetsen 🛛, E., Goethals, P.L.M., 2016. An applicability index for reliable
826	and applicable decision trees in water quality modelling. Ecol. Inform. 32, 1–6.
827	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2015.12.004
828	Fabrègue, M., Braud, A., Bringay, S., 2013. OrderSpan: Mining Closed Partially Ordered
829	Patterns, in: Tucker A., Höppner F., Siebes A., Swift S. (Eds) Advances in Intelligent
830	Data Analysis XII. IDA 2013. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol 8207. Springer,
831	Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 186–197.
832	https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41398-8_17

833	Fabrègue,	М.,	Braud, A.,	Bringay,	S.,	Grac,	С.,	Le Ber,	F.,	Levet, D.,	Teisseire,	М.,	, 201	4
-----	-----------	-----	------------	----------	-----	-------	-----	---------	-----	------------	------------	-----	-------	---

B34 Discriminant temporal patterns for linking physico-chemistry and biology in hydro-

ecosystem assessment. Ecol. Inform. 24, 210–221.

836 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.09.003

- Feld, C.K., Birk, S., Eme, D., Gerisch, M., Hering, D., Kernan, M., Maileht, K., Mischke, U., Ott,
- 838 I., Pletterbauer, F., Poikane, S., Salgado, J., Sayer, C.D., Van Wichelen, J., Malard, F.,

839 2016a. Disentangling the effects of land use and geo-climatic factors on diversity in

European freshwater ecosystems. Ecol. Indic. 60, 71–83.

- 841 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.06.024
- Feld, C.K., Segurado, P., Gutiérrez-Cánovas, C., 2016b. Analysing the impact of multiple

stressors in aquatic biomonitoring data: A 'cookbook' with applications in R. Sci.

Total Environ. 573, 1320–1339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.243

845 Forio, M.A.E., Van Echelpoel, W., Dominguez-Granda, L., Mereta, S.T., Ambelu, A., Hoang,

T.H., Boets, P., Goethals, P.L.M., 2016. Analysing the effects of water quality on the

847 occurrence of freshwater macroinvertebrate taxa among tropical river basins from

- different continents. AI Commun. 29, 665–685. https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-
- 849 160712

850 Fruget, J.-F., Centofanti, M., Dessaix, J., Olivier, J.-M., Druart, J.-C., Martinez, P.-J., 2001.

851 Temporal and spatial dynamics in large rivers : example of a long-term monitoring

of the middle Rhone River. Ann. Limnol. - Int. J. Limnol. 37, 237–251.

853 https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/2001021

Fytilis, N., Rizzo, D.M., 2013. Coupling self-organizing maps with a Naïve Bayesian

855 classifier: Stream classification studies using multiple assessment data. Water

856	Resour. Res. 49, 7747–7762. https://doi.org/10.1002/2012WR013422
857	George, A., Binu, D., 2012. DRL-Prefixspan: A novel pattern growth algorithm for
858	discovering downturn, revision and launch (DRL) sequential patterns. Open
859	Comput. Sci. 2, 426–439. https://doi.org/10.2478/s13537-012-0030-8
860	Gibert, K., Izquierdo, J., Holmes, G., Athanasiadis, I., Comas, J., Sanchez-Marre, M., 2008.
861	On the role of pre and post-processing in environmental data mining Volume 3,
862	1937–1958.
863	Giraudel, J.L., Lek, S., 2001. A comparison of self-organizing map algorithm and some
864	conventional statistical methods for ecological community ordination. Ecol. Modell.
865	146, 329–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(01)00324-6
866	Haury, J., Peltre, MC., Trémolières, M., Barbe, J., Thiébaut, G., Bernez, I., Daniel, H.,
867	Chatenet, P., Haan-Archipof, G., Muller, S., Dutartre, A., Laplace-Treyture, C.,
868	Cazaubon, A., Lambert-Servien, E., 2006. A new method to assess water trophy and
869	organic pollution - The Macrophyte Biological Index for Rivers (IBMR): Its
870	application to different types of river and pollution. Hydrobiologia 570, 153–158.
871	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-006-0175-3
872	Hering, D., Borja, A., Carstensen, J., Carvalho, L., Elliott, M., Feld, C.K., Heiskanen, A.S.,
873	Johnson, R.K., Moe, J., Pont, D., Solheim, A.L., de Bund, W. van, 2010. The European
874	Water Framework Directive at the age of 10: A critical review of the achievements
875	with recommendations for the future. Sci. Total Environ. 408, 4007–4019.
876	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.05.031
877	Kristensen, P., 2004. The DPSIR Framework.UNEP Headquarters, on a
878	comprehensive/detailed assessment of the vulnerability of water ressources to

879	environmental change in Africa using basin approach. Nairobi, Kenya.

- 880 Lalande, N., 2013. Impacts multi-échelles de l'occupation du sol sur l'état écologique des
- 881 cours d'eau Elaboration et test d'un cadre d'analyze et de modélisation. Thèse.
- AgroParisTech Montpellier.
- Landuyt, D., Broekx, S., Engelen, G., Uljee, I., Van der Meulen, M., Goethals, P.L.M., 2016.
- 884The importance of uncertainties in scenario analyzes A study on future ecosystem
- service delivery in Flanders. Sci. Total Environ. 553, 504–518.
- 886 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.02.098
- Larras, F., Coulaud, R., Gautreau, E., Billoir, E., Rosebery, J., Usseglio-Polatera, P., 2017.
- Assessing anthropogenic pressures on streams: A random forest approach based on
- benthic diatom communities. Sci. Total Environ. 586, 1101–1112.
- 890 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.096
- Lemm, J.U., Feld, C.K., 2017. Identification and interaction of multiple stressors in central
- European lowland rivers. Sci. Total Environ. 603–604, 148–154.
- 893 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.06.092
- Marzin, A., Archaimbault, V., Belliard, J., Chauvin, C., Delmas, F., Pont, D., 2012. Ecological
- assessment of running waters: Do macrophytes, macroinvertebrates, diatoms and
- fish show similar responses to human pressures? Ecol. Indic. 23, 56–65.
- 897 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.03.010
- MEDD, AE, 2003. Système d'évaluation de la qualité de l'eau des cours d'eau (SEQ-Eau),
- 899 version 2 étude Inter-Agences N°52 réalisée par le Ministère de l'Ecologie et du
- 900 Développement Durable (MEDD) et les Agences de l'Eau (AE), France.

901	MEEM, 2012. Guide technique Evaluation de l'état des eaux de surfaces continentales
902	(Cours d'eau, Canaux, Plans d'eau) édité par le Ministère de l'Environnement de
903	l'Energie et de la Mer, France.
904	Meyer, A., Combroux, I., Schmitt, L., Trémolières, M., 2013. Vegetation dynamics in side-
905	channels reconnected to the Rhine River: what are the main factors controlling
906	communities trajectories after restoration? Hydrobiologia 714, 35–47.
907	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-013-1512-y
908	Millenium Ecosystem Assessment Programm, 2005. Ecosystems and human well-being :
909	synthesis, Island Pre. ed.
910	Mondy, C.P., Usseglio-Polatera, P., 2013. Using conditional tree forests and life history
911	traits to assess specific risks of stream degradation under multiple pressure
912	scenario. Sci. Total Environ. 461–462, 750–760.
913	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.05.072
914	Mondy, C.P., Villeneuve, B., Archaimbault, V., Usseglio-polatera, P., 2012. A new
915	macroinvertebrate-based multimetric index (I 2 M 2) to evaluate ecological quality
916	of French wadeable streams fulfilling the WFD demands : A taxonomical and trait
917	approach. Ecol. Indic. 18, 452–467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.013
918	Motelay-Massei, A., Ollivon, D., Garban, B., Teil, M.J., Blanchard, M., Chevreuil, M., 2004.
919	Distribution and spatial trends of PAHs and PCBs in soils in the Seine River basin,
920	France. Chemosphere 55, 555–565.
921	https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2003.11.054
922	Nisbet, M., Verneaux, J., 1970. Composantes chimiques des eaux courantes: discussion et
923	proposition de classes en tant que bases d'interprétation des analyzes chimiques.
	46

924	Ann. Limonologie 6, 161–190. https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/1970015	
-----	---	--

- 925 Oberdorff, T., Hughes, R.M., 1992. Modification of an Index of Biotic Integrity Based on
- 926 Fish Assemblages to Characterize Rivers of the Seine Basin ,. Hydrobiologia 228,
- 927 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00006200
- 928 Pringle, C.M., 1990. Nutrient spatial heterogeneity: effects on community structure,
- physiognomy, and diversity of stream algae. Ecology 71, 905–920.
- 930 https://doi.org/10.2307/1937362
- 831 Ren, J., Wang, L., Dong, J., Hu, C., Wang, K., 2009. A Novel Sequential Pattern Mining
- Algorithm for the Feature Discovery of Software Fault, in: 2009 International
- 933 Conference on Computational Intelligence and Software Engineering. IEEE, pp. 1–4.
- 934 https://doi.org/10.1109/CISE.2009.5367106
- 935 Reyjol, Y., Argillier, C., Bonne, W., Borja, A., Buijse, A.D., Cardoso, A.C., Daufresne, M.,
- 936 Kernan, M., Ferreira, M.T., Poikane, S., Prat, N., Solheim, A.L., Stroffek, S., Usseglio-
- 937 Polatera, P., Villeneuve, B., van de Bund, W., 2014. Assessing the ecological status in
- 938 the context of the European Water Framework Directive: Where do we go now? Sci.
- 939 Total Environ. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.07.119
- 940 Sallaberry, A., Pecheur, N., Bringay, S., Roche, M., Teisseire, M., 2011. Sequential patterns
- 941 mining and gene sequence visualization to discover novelty from microarray data. J.
- 942 Biomed. Inform. 44, 760–774. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBI.2011.04.002
- 943 Schäfer, R.B., Von Der Ohe, P.C., Rasmussen, J., Kefford, B.J., Beketov, M.A., Schulz, R.,
- Liess, M., 2012. Thresholds for the effects of pesticides on invertebrate communities
- and leaf breakdown in stream ecosystems. Environ. Sci. Technol.
- 946 https://doi.org/10.1021/es2039882

947	Schulz, R., Liess, M., 1999. A field study of the effects of agriculturally derived insecticide
948	input on stream macroinvertebrate dynamics. Aquat. Toxicol. 46, 155–176.
949	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-445X(99)00002-8
950	Serrano Balderas, E.C., Berti-Equille, L., Hernández, M.A.A., Grac, C., 2017. Principled data
951	preprocessing: Application to biological aquatic indicators of water pollution. Proc.
952	- Int. Work. Database Expert Syst. Appl. DEXA 2017-Augus, 52–56.

953 https://doi.org/10.1109/DEXA.2017.27

- 954 Staentzel, C., Arnaud, F., Combroux, I., Schmitt, L., Trémolières, M., Grac, C., Piégay, H.,
- 955 Barillier, A., Chardon, V., Beisel, J.-N., 2017. How do instream flow increase and

956 gravel augmentation impact biological communities in large rivers: A case study on

the Upper Rhine River. River Res. Appl. https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3237

958 Stendera, S., Adrian, R., Bonada, N., Cañedo-Argüelles, M., Hugueny, B., Januschke, K.,

959 Pletterbauer, F., Hering, D., 2012. Drivers and stressors of freshwater biodiversity

patterns across different ecosystems and scales: a review. Hydrobiologia 696, 1–28.

961 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1183-0

962 Stoddard, J.L., Jeffries, D.S., Lükewille, A., Clair, T.A., Dillon, P.J., Driscoll, C.T., Forsius, M.,

963 Johannessen, M., Kahl, J.S., Kellogg, J.H., Kemp, A., Mannlo, J., Monteith, D.T.,

964 Murdoch, P.S., Patrick, S., Rebsdorl, A., Skjelkvale, B.L., Stainton, M.P., Traaen, T., Van

Dam, H., Webster, K.E., Wleting, J., Wllander, A., 1999. Regional trends in aquatic

recovery from acidification in North America and Europe. Nature 401, 575–578.

967 https://doi.org/10.1038/44114

Teil, M.-J., Blanchard, M., Chevreuil, M., 2004. Atmospheric deposition of organochlorines
(PCBs and pesticides) in northern France. Chemosphere 55, 501–514.

970 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2003.11.064

- 971 Trémolières, M., 1994. Changes in aquatic vegetation in Rhine floodplain streams in
- Alsace in relation to disturbance. J. Veg. Sci. 5, 169–178. https://doi.org/doi:

973 10.2307/3236149

- 974 Tsai, W.-P., Huang, S.-P., Cheng, S.-T., Shao, K.-T., Chang, F.-J., 2016. A data-mining
- 975 framework for exploring the multi-relation between fish species and water quality
- through self-organizing map. Sci. Total Environ. 579, 474–483.
- 977 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.11.071
- 978 Van Looy, K., Piffady, J., Tormos, T., Villeneuve, B., Valette, L., Chandesris, A., Souchon, Y.,
- 979 2015. Unravelling River System Impairments in Stream Networks with an
- 980 Integrated Risk Approach. Environ. Manage. 55, 1343–1353.
- 981 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0477-1
- 982 Van Urk, G., Kerkum, F., Van Leeuwen, C.J., 1993. Insects and insecticides in the Lower
- 983 Rhine. Water Res. 27, 205–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(93)90077-U
- Villeneuve, B., Piffady, J., Valette, L., Souchon, Y., Usseglio-Polatera, P., 2018. Direct and
- 985 indirect effects of multiple stressors on stream invertebrates across watershed,
- 986 reach and site scales: A structural equation modelling better informing on
- 987 hydromorphological impacts. Sci. Total Environ. 612, 660–671.
- 988 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.08.197
- 989 Villeneuve, B., Souchon, Y., Usseglio-Polatera, P., Ferréol, M., Valette, L., 2015. Can we
- 990 predict biological condition of stream ecosystems? A multi-stressors approach
- 991 linking three biological indices to physico-chemistry, hydromorphology and land
- 992 use. Ecol. Indic. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.07.016

993	Webb, B.W., 1996. Trends in stream and river temperature. Hydrol. Process. 10, 205–
994	226. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1085(199602)10:2<205::AID-
995	HYP358>3.0.CO;2-1

996 Webb, B.W., Hannah, D.M., Moore, R.D., Brown, L.E., Nobilis, F., 2008. Recent advances in

997 stream and river temperature research. Hydrol. Process.

998 https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6994

999

1000 AFNOR, 2016a. Qualité de l'eau: prélèvements des macro-invertébrés aquatiques en

1001 rivières peu profondes. Norme Française NF T 90-333.

- AFNOR, 2016b. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice Biologique Diatomées (IBD).
 Norme Française NF T90-354.
- AFNOR, 2011. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice poissons rivière (IPR). Norme
 Française NF T90-344.
- 1006 AFNOR, 2010. Qualité de l'eau: traitement au laboratoire d'échantillons contenant des
- 1007 macro-invertébrés de cours d'eau. Norme Française Expérimentale XP T 90-388.
- 1008 AFNOR, 2004. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice Biologique Global Normalisé
- 1009 (IBGN); Norme Française NF T90-350.
- AFNOR, 2003. Qualité de l'eau: détermination de l'Indice Biologique Macrophytique en
 Rivière (IBMR). Norme Française NF T90-395.
- 1012 Agrawal, R., Srikant, R., 1995. Mining sequential patterns, in: Proceedings of the Eleventh
- 1013 International Conference on Data Engineering. IEEE Comput. Soc. Press, pp. 3–14.
- 1014 https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.1995.380415

- Agrawal, R., Srikant, R., 1994. Fast algorithms for mining association rules, in: Proc. 20th
 IVLDB Conference.
- 1017 Arle, J., Mohaupt, V., Kirst, I., 2016. Monitoring of Surface Waters in Germany under the
- 1018 Water Framework Directive A Review of approaches, methods and results.
- 1019 Water 8, 217. https://doi.org/10.3390/w8060217
- 1020 Birk, S., Bonne, W., Borja, A., Brucet, S., Courrat, A., Poikane, S., Solimini, A., Van De Bund,
- 1021 W., Zampoukas, N., Hering, D., 2012. Three hundred ways to assess Europe's surface
- 1022 waters: An almost complete overview of biological methods to implement the
- 1023 Water Framework Directive. Ecol. Indic. 18, 31–41.
- 1024 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.10.009
- 1025 Casas-Garriga, G. Summarizing sequential data with closed partial orders. In SIAM
 1026 International Conference on Data Mining, SDM, 2005.
- 1027 Claussen, U., Müller, P., Arle, J., 2012. WFD CIS ECOSTAT WG A Report " Comparison of
- 1028 envi- ronmental quality Objectives , threshold values or water quality targets Set for
- the demands of the European Water Framework Directive ". Version 1. Internal
 report, 2012.
- 1031 Comte, L., Lek, S., de Deckere, E., de Zwart, D., Gevrey, M., 2010. Assessment of stream
- 1032 biological responses under multiple-stress conditions. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 17,
- 1033 1469–1478. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-010-0333-z
- 1034 D'heygere, T., Goethals, P.L.M., De Pauw, N., 2006. Genetic algorithms for optimisation of
- 1035 predictive ecosystems models based on decision trees and neural networks. Ecol.
- 1036 Modell. 195, 20–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.11.005

- 1037 Dahm, V., Hering, D., Nemitz, D., Graf, W., Schmidt-Kloiber, A., Leitner, P., Melcher, A.,
- 1038 Feld, C.K., 2013. Effects of physico-chemistry, land use and hydromorphology on
- 1039 three riverine organism groups: A comparative analysis with monitoring data from
- 1040 Germany and Austria. Hydrobiologia 704, 389–415.
- 1041 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1431-3
- 1042 Dakou, E., Goethals, P.L.M., D'heygere, T., Dedecker, A.P., Gabriels, W., De Pauw, N.,
- 1043 Lazaridou-Dimitriadou, M., 2006. Development of artificial neural network models
- 1044 predicting macroinvertebrate taxa in the river Axios (Northern Greece). Ann.
- 1045 Limnol. J. Limnol. 42, 241–250. https://doi.org/Doi 10.1051/Limn/2006025
- 1046 Demars, B.O.L., Potts, J.M., Trémolières, M., Thiébaut, G., Goucelin, N., Nordmann, V.,
- 1047 2012. River macrophyte indices: Not the Holy Grail! Freshw. Biol. 57, 1745–1759.
- 1048 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2012.02834.x
- 1049 Dolédec, S., Phillips, N., Scarsbrook, M., Riley, R.H., Townsend, C.R., 2006. Comparison of
- 1050 structural and functional approaches to determining landuse effects on grassland
- stream invertebrate communities. J. North Am. Benthol. Soc. 25, 44–60.
- 1052 https://doi.org/10.1899/0887-3593(2006)25[44:COSAFA]2.0.CO;2
- 1053 Durance, I., Ormerod, S.J., 2007. Climate change effects on upland stream
- 1054 macroinvertebrates over a 25-year period. Glob. Chang. Biol. 13, 942–957.
- 1055 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01340.x
- 1056 Džeroski, S., 2001. Applications of symbolic machine learning to ecological modelling.
- 1057 Ecol. Modell. 146, 263–273. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(01)00312-X
- 1058 Džeroski, S., Grbović, J., Walley, W.J., Kompare, B., 1997. Using machine learning
- techniques in the construction of models. II. Data analysis with rule induction. Ecol.

1060	Modell. 95, 95–111. https://doi.o	org/10.1016/S0304-3800([96)00029-4
------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

1061 European Council, 2000. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the

- 1062 Council of 23 October 2000 Establishing a Framework for Community Action in the
- 1063 Field of Water Policy. Office for official publications of the European Communities,
- 1064 Brussels., Office for official publications of the European Communities, Brussels.
- 1065 Everaert, G., Bennetsen 🛛, E., Goethals, P.L.M., 2016. An applicability index for reliable
- and applicable decision trees in water quality modelling. Ecol. Inform. 32, 1–6.
- 1067 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2015.12.004
- 1068 Fabrègue, M., Braud, A., Bringay, S., 2013. OrderSpan: Mining Closed Partially Ordered
- 1069 Patterns, in: Tucker A., Höppner F., Siebes A., Swift S. (Eds) Advances in Intelligent
- 1070 Data Analysis XII. IDA 2013. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol 8207. Springer,
- 1071 Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 186–197.
- 1072 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41398-8_17
- 1073 Fabrègue, M., Braud, A., Bringay, S., Grac, C., Le Ber, F., Levet, D., Teisseire, M., 2014.
- 1074 Discriminant temporal patterns for linking physico-chemistry and biology in hydro-
- 1075 ecosystem assessment. Ecol. Inform. 24, 210–221.
- 1076 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.09.003
- 1077 Feld, C.K., Birk, S., Eme, D., Gerisch, M., Hering, D., Kernan, M., Maileht, K., Mischke, U., Ott,
- 1078 I., Pletterbauer, F., Poikane, S., Salgado, J., Sayer, C.D., Van Wichelen, J., Malard, F.,
- 1079 2016a. Disentangling the effects of land use and geo-climatic factors on diversity in
- 1080 European freshwater ecosystems. Ecol. Indic. 60, 71–83.
- 1081 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.06.024
- 1082 Feld, C.K., Segurado, P., Gutiérrez-Cánovas, C., 2016b. Analysing the impact of multiple

1083	stressors in aquatic biomonitoring data: A 'cookbook' with applications in R. Sci.
1084	Total Environ. 573, 1320–1339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.243
1085	Forio, M.A.E., Van Echelpoel, W., Dominguez-Granda, L., Mereta, S.T., Ambelu, A., Hoang,
1086	T.H., Boets, P., Goethals, P.L.M., 2016. Analysing the effects of water quality on the
1087	occurrence of freshwater macroinvertebrate taxa among tropical river basins from
1088	different continents. AI Commun. 29, 665–685. https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-
1089	160712
1090	Fruget, JF., Centofanti, M., Dessaix, J., Olivier, JM., Druart, JC., Martinez, PJ., 2001.
1091	Temporal and spatial dynamics in large rivers : example of a long-term monitoring
1092	of the middle Rhone River. Ann. Limnol Int. J. Limnol. 37, 237–251.
1093	https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/2001021
1094	Fytilis, N., Rizzo, D.M., 2013. Coupling self-organizing maps with a Naïve Bayesian
1095	classifier: Stream classification studies using multiple assessment data. Water
1096	Resour. Res. 49, 7747–7762. https://doi.org/10.1002/2012WR013422
1097	George, A., Binu, D., 2012. DRL-Prefixspan: A novel pattern growth algorithm for
1098	discovering downturn, revision and launch (DRL) sequential patterns. Open
1099	Comput. Sci. 2, 426–439. https://doi.org/10.2478/s13537-012-0030-8
1100	Gibert, K., Izquierdo, J., Holmes, G., Athanasiadis, I., Comas, J., Sanchez-Marre, M., 2008.
1101	On the role of pre and post-processing in environmental data mining Volume 3,
1102	1937–1958.
1103	Giraudel, J.L., Lek, S., 2001. A comparison of self-organizing map algorithm and some
1104	conventional statistical methods for ecological community ordination. Ecol. Modell.

1105 146, 329–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(01)00324-6

1106	Haury, J., Peitre, MC., Tremoneres, M., Barbe, J., Thiedaut, G., Bernez, I., Daniel, H.,
1107	Chatenet, P., Haan-Archipof, G., Muller, S., Dutartre, A., Laplace-Treyture, C.,
1108	Cazaubon, A., Lambert-Servien, E., 2006. A new method to assess water trophy and
1109	organic pollution - The Macrophyte Biological Index for Rivers (IBMR): Its
1110	application to different types of river and pollution. Hydrobiologia 570, 153–158.
1111	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-006-0175-3
1112	Hering, D., Borja, A., Carstensen, J., Carvalho, L., Elliott, M., Feld, C.K., Heiskanen, A.S.,
1113	Johnson, R.K., Moe, J., Pont, D., Solheim, A.L., de Bund, W. van, 2010. The European
1114	Water Framework Directive at the age of 10: A critical review of the achievements
1115	with recommendations for the future. Sci. Total Environ. 408, 4007–4019.
1116	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.05.031
1117	Lemm, J.U., Feld, C.K., 2017. Identification and interaction of multiple stressors in central
1118	European lowland rivers. Sci. Total Environ. 603–604, 148–154.
1119	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.06.092
1120	Marzin, A., Archaimbault, V., Belliard, J., Chauvin, C., Delmas, F., Pont, D., 2012. Ecological
1121	assessment of running waters: Do macrophytes, macroinvertebrates, diatoms and
1122	fish show similar responses to human pressures? Ecol. Indic. 23, 56–65.
1123	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.03.010

.....

TT

ml. 171. .

D. .I. .

I D. . . . 1 II

- 1124 MEDD, AE, 2003. Système d'évaluation de la qualité de l'eau des cours d'eau (SEQ-Eau),
- 1125 version 2 étude Inter-Agences N°52 réalisée par le Ministère de l'Ecologie et du
- 1126 Développement Durable (MEDD) et les Agences de l'Eau (AE), France.
- 1127 MEEM, 2012. Guide technique Evaluation de l'état des eaux de surfaces continentales
- 1128 (Cours d'eau, Canaux, Plans d'eau) édité par le Ministère de l'Environnement de

1129 l'Energie et de la Mer, France.

- 1130 Meyer, A., Combroux, I., Schmitt, L., Trémolières, M., 2013. Vegetation dynamics in side-
- 1131 channels reconnected to the Rhine River: what are the main factors controlling
- 1132 communities trajectories after restoration? Hydrobiologia 714, 35–47.
- 1133 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-013-1512-y
- Millenium Ecosystem Assessment Programm, 2005. Ecosystems and human well-being :
 synthesis, Island Pre. ed.
- 1136 Mondy, C.P., Usseglio-Polatera, P., 2013. Using conditional tree forests and life history
- 1137 traits to assess specific risks of stream degradation under multiple pressure

scenario. Sci. Total Environ. 461–462, 750–760.

- 1139 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.05.072
- 1140 Mondy, C.P., Villeneuve, B., Archaimbault, V., Usseglio-polatera, P., 2012. A new
- 1141 macroinvertebrate-based multimetric index (I 2 M 2) to evaluate ecological quality
- of French wadeable streams fulfilling the WFD demands : A taxonomical and trait
- 1143 approach. Ecol. Indic. 18, 452–467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.12.013
- 1144 Motelay-Massei, A., Ollivon, D., Garban, B., Teil, M.J., Blanchard, M., Chevreuil, M., 2004.
- 1145 Distribution and spatial trends of PAHs and PCBs in soils in the Seine River basin,
- 1146 France. Chemosphere 55, 555–565.
- 1147 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2003.11.054
- 1148 Nisbet, M., Verneaux, J., 1970. Composantes chimiques des eaux courantes: discussion et
- 1149 proposition de classes en tant que bases d'interprétation des analyzes chimiques.
- 1150 Ann. Limonologie 6, 161–190. https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/1970015

- 1151 Oberdorff, T., Hughes, R.M., 1992. Modification of an Index of Biotic Integrity Based on
- 1152 Fish Assemblages to Characterize Rivers of the Seine Basin ,. Hydrobiologia 228,
- 1153 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00006200
- 1154 Pringle, C.M., 1990. Nutrient spatial heterogeneity: effects on community structure,
- 1155 physiognomy, and diversity of stream algae. Ecology 71, 905–920.
- 1156 https://doi.org/10.2307/1937362
- 1157 Ren, J., Wang, L., Dong, J., Hu, C., Wang, K., 2009. A Novel Sequential Pattern Mining
- Algorithm for the Feature Discovery of Software Fault, in: 2009 International
- 1159 Conference on Computational Intelligence and Software Engineering. IEEE, pp. 1–4.
- 1160 https://doi.org/10.1109/CISE.2009.5367106
- 1161 Reyjol, Y., Argillier, C., Bonne, W., Borja, A., Buijse, A.D., Cardoso, A.C., Daufresne, M.,
- 1162 Kernan, M., Ferreira, M.T., Poikane, S., Prat, N., Solheim, A.L., Stroffek, S., Usseglio-
- 1163 Polatera, P., Villeneuve, B., van de Bund, W., 2014. Assessing the ecological status in
- the context of the European Water Framework Directive: Where do we go now? Sci.
- 1165 Total Environ. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.07.119
- 1166 Sallaberry, A., Pecheur, N., Bringay, S., Roche, M., Teisseire, M., 2011. Sequential patterns
- 1167 mining and gene sequence visualization to discover novelty from microarray data. J.
- Biomed. Inform. 44, 760–774. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBI.2011.04.002
- 1169 Schäfer, R.B., Von Der Ohe, P.C., Rasmussen, J., Kefford, B.J., Beketov, M.A., Schulz, R.,
- 1170 Liess, M., 2012. Thresholds for the effects of pesticides on invertebrate communities
- and leaf breakdown in stream ecosystems. Environ. Sci. Technol.
- 1172 https://doi.org/10.1021/es2039882
- 1173 Schulz, R., Liess, M., 1999. A field study of the effects of agriculturally derived insecticide

- input on stream macroinvertebrate dynamics. Aquat. Toxicol. 46, 155–176.
- 1175 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-445X(99)00002-8
- 1176 Serrano Balderas, E.C., Berti-Equille, L., Hernández, M.A.A., Grac, C., 2017. Principled data
- 1177 preprocessing: Application to biological aquatic indicators of water pollution. Proc.
- Int. Work. Database Expert Syst. Appl. DEXA 2017-Augus, 52–56.
- 1179 https://doi.org/10.1109/DEXA.2017.27
- 1180 Staentzel, C., Arnaud, F., Combroux, I., Schmitt, L., Trémolières, M., Grac, C., Piégay, H.,
- 1181 Barillier, A., Chardon, V., Beisel, J.-N., 2017. How do instream flow increase and
- 1182 gravel augmentation impact biological communities in large rivers: A case study on
- the Upper Rhine River. River Res. Appl. https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3237
- 1184 Stendera, S., Adrian, R., Bonada, N., Cañedo-Argüelles, M., Hugueny, B., Januschke, K.,
- 1185 Pletterbauer, F., Hering, D., 2012. Drivers and stressors of freshwater biodiversity
- 1186 patterns across different ecosystems and scales: a review. Hydrobiologia 696, 1–28.
- 1187 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1183-0
- 1188 Stoddard, J.L., Jeffries, D.S., Lükewille, A., Clair, T.A., Dillon, P.J., Driscoll, C.T., Forsius, M.,
- 1189 Johannessen, M., Kahl, J.S., Kellogg, J.H., Kemp, A., Mannlo, J., Monteith, D.T.,
- 1190 Murdoch, P.S., Patrick, S., Rebsdorl, A., Skjelkvale, B.L., Stainton, M.P., Traaen, T., Van
- 1191 Dam, H., Webster, K.E., Wleting, J., Wllander, A., 1999. Regional trends in aquatic
- recovery from acidification in North America and Europe. Nature 401, 575–578.
- 1193 https://doi.org/10.1038/44114
- 1194 Teil, M.-J., Blanchard, M., Chevreuil, M., 2004. Atmospheric deposition of organochlorines
- 1195 (PCBs and pesticides) in northern France. Chemosphere 55, 501–514.
- 1196 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2003.11.064

1197	Trémolières, M., 1994. Changes in aquatic vegetation in Rhine floodplain streams in
1198	Alsace in relation to disturbance. J. Veg. Sci. 5, 169–178. https://doi.org/doi:
1199	10.2307/3236149

- 1200 Tsai, W.-P., Huang, S.-P., Cheng, S.-T., Shao, K.-T., Chang, F.-J., 2016. A data-mining
- 1201 framework for exploring the multi-relation between fish species and water quality
- 1202 through self-organizing map. Sci. Total Environ. 579, 474–483.
- 1203 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.11.071
- 1204 Van Looy, K., Piffady, J., Tormos, T., Villeneuve, B., Valette, L., Chandesris, A., Souchon, Y.,
- 1205 2015. Unravelling River System Impairments in Stream Networks with an
- 1206 Integrated Risk Approach. Environ. Manage. 55, 1343–1353.
- 1207 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0477-1
- 1208 Van Urk, G., Kerkum, F., Van Leeuwen, C.J., 1993. Insects and insecticides in the Lower
- 1209 Rhine. Water Res. 27, 205–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(93)90077-U
- 1210 Villeneuve, B., Piffady, J., Valette, L., Souchon, Y., Usseglio-Polatera, P., 2018. Direct and
- indirect effects of multiple stressors on stream invertebrates across watershed,
- 1212 reach and site scales: A structural equation modelling better informing on
- 1213 hydromorphological impacts. Sci. Total Environ. 612, 660–671.
- 1214 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.08.197
- 1215 Villeneuve, B., Souchon, Y., Usseglio-Polatera, P., Ferréol, M., Valette, L., 2015. Can we
- 1216 predict biological condition of stream ecosystems? A multi-stressors approach
- 1217 linking three biological indices to physico-chemistry, hydromorphology and land
- 1218 use. Ecol. Indic. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.07.016
- 1219 Webb, B.W., 1996. Trends in stream and river temperature. Hydrol. Process. 10, 205–

- 1220 226. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1085(199602)10:2<205::AID-
- 1221 HYP358>3.0.C0;2-1
- 1222 Webb, B.W., Hannah, D.M., Moore, R.D., Brown, L.E., Nobilis, F., 2008. Recent advances in
- 1223 stream and river temperature research. Hydrol. Process.
- 1224 https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6994

Appendix 1: Set of thresholds used by SEQ (MEDD and AE, 2003) for the physico-chemical parameters classified according to pressure

the physico-chemical parameters classified according to pressure
categories (here the threshold is always excluded from the better class, e.g.:

1229 for nitrates, the threshold between the high and good classes is 2 mg/L,

1230 therefore if $[NO_3^-]=2$ mg/L, pressure category NITR is good)

Part effective Init inghtgood good/moderate moderate/poor poor/bad MOOX (Oxidisable organic matter)	Dorometer	umié	thresholds between the quality statuses							
WOOX (Diaditable organic matter) Uncertain of the second of	Parameter	unit	high/good	good/moderate	moderate/poor	poor/bad				
O_2 mg/L 8 6 4 %sat % 90 70 50 5 BOD mg/L O2 3 6 10 7 CDO mg/L O2 20 30 40 8 C mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0 Trihalomethanes mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0.8 AZOT (Nitrogen excluding nitrates) 1 2 4 1 NK mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 . . NK mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 . . NG: mg/L 0.03 0.2 0.5 . . PHOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 . . PHOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 . . Sat mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 . . .	MOOX (Oxidisable organic	: matter)								
%sat % 90 70 50 5 BOD mg/L 02 3 6 10 7 CDO mg/L 02 20 30 40 6 CDO mg/L 02 20 30 40 6 CDO mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0 NH,' mg/L 0.5 1.5 2.8 0 AZOT (Nitrogen excluding nitrates) mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 0 NK mg/L 0.01 0.5 2 0 0 3 0.5 NO; mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 0 2 0 5 PHOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1	O ₂	mg/L	8	6	4	3				
BOD mg/L 0.2 3 6 10 2 CDO mg/L 0.2 20 30 40 £ CDO mg/L 0.7 1.0 1 1 Trinalomethanes mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0.0 NH ₄ ' mg/L 0.1 0.5 1.5 2.8 AZOT (Nitrogen excluding nitrates)	%sat	%	90	70	50	30				
CDO mg/L 20 30 400 88 C mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0 Trihalomethanes mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0 NH4," mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0 NH4," mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 0 NK mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 0 NO,' mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 0 NO,' mg/L 0.01 0.5 1 0 PLOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 0 PLOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 0 PH M 8 8.5 9 9 0 2 38 52 PH 8 8.5 9 9 5 1 3 CIC (Acidification parameters)	BOD	mg/L O2	3	6	10	25				
C mg/L 5 7 10 1 Trihalomethanes mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0 NH ₄ '' mg/L 0.05 1.5 2.8 0 AZOT (Nitrogen excluding nitrates) mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 0 NK mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 0	CDO	mg/L O2	20	30	40	80				
Trihalomethanes mg/L 0.075 0.1 0.15 0.1 NH _a ' mg/L 0.5 1.5 2.8 NH _a ' mg/L 0.1 0.5 2.8 NH _a ' mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 NK mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NO; mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NO; mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NTR (Nitrate) mg/L 0.01 0.5 1 PHOS (Phosphorous) $PHOS (Phosphorous)$ $PERV$ (Effect of eutrophication) $PRS (Suspended solids)$ Stat % 110 130 150 20 PAES (Suspended solids) T C 24 25.5 27 22 SS mg/L 2 25 38 5 T C 24 25.5 27 22 ACID (Acidification parameters) P 6	С	mg/L	5	7	10	15				
NH,* mg/L 0.5 1.5 2.8 AZOT (Nitrogen excluding nitrates) mg/L 0.1 0.5 2 NH,* mg/L 0.3 0.3 0.5 NO;* mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NO;* mg/L 0.01 0.5 1 NO;* mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 NO;* mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 NO;* mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 PHOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 EPRV (Effect of eutrophication) % 110 130 150 20 %sat % 110 130 150 20 S mg/L 2 25 38 5 S mg/L 2 25 38 5 G 24 25.5 2.7 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) PH	Trihalomethanes	mg/L	0.075	0.1	0.15	0.5				
AZOT (Nitrogen excluding nitrates) nH4,° mg/L 0.1 0.5 Z NK mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NK mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NO;` mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NTR (Nitrate)	NH⊿ ⁺	mg/L	0.5	1.5	2.8	4				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AZOT (Nitrogen excludi	ng nitrates)								
NK mg/L 1 2 4 1 NO_i mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NITR (Ntrate) NO_i mg/L 2 10 25 5 PHOS (Phosphorous) 0.1 0.5 1 PO_i^3 mg/L 0.01 0.5 1 PAGS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 EPRV (Effect of eutrophication) mg/L 2 2.5 38 5 PH 8 8.5 9 9 9 <	NH4 ⁺	ma/L	0.1	0.5	2	5				
NO_i mg/L 0.03 0.3 0.5 NITR (Nitrate) mg/L 2 10 25 5 PLOS (Phosphorous) mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 PO_a 5 mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 PO_a 5 mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 EPRV (Effect of eutrophication) mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 Stat % 110 130 150 20 PAES (Supended solids) S mg/L 2 2.5 3.8 5 T °C 2.4 2.5,5 2.7 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) T 8.8.2 9 9.5 1 PH 6.5 6 5.5 4 MINE (Mineralisation) mg/L 0 60 120 1.8 C $\mu S/cm 2.500 3.000 35.00 400 Ga2+ mg/L 60 1.20 1.90 22 $	NK	mg/L	1	2	4	10				
NTR (Nitrate) No No No No No NO ₃ mg/L 2 10 25 5 PHOS (Phosphorous) P 0.05 0.2 0.5 PCA ³⁺ mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 EPRV (Effect of eutrophication) ************************************	NO ²	ma/L	0.03	0.3	0.5	1				
No3 mg/L 2 10 25 5 PHO3 mg/L 0.1 0.5 1 PO3 mg/L 0.05 0.2 0.5 EPRV (Effect of eutrophication) 8 8.5 9 9 9 Stat % 110 130 150 22 10 25 38 5 PH 8 8.5 9 9 9 9 9 9 PAES (Suspended solids) 21 25 38 5 T °C 24 25,5 27 2 2 38 5 T °C 24 25,5 27 2 2 3 30 5 ACID (Acidification parameters) 8.2 9 9.5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td< td=""><td>NITR (Nitrate)</td><td>1</td><td>0100</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>-</td></td<>	NITR (Nitrate)	1	0100	0.0	0.0	-				
INC Inc< Inc< Inc< Inc< Inc< Inc< Inc< Inc<	NO. ⁻	ma/l	2	10	25	50				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	PHOS (Phosphorous)	Ing/E		10	25					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		ma/l	01	0.5	1	2				
P Ingr 0.03 0.2 0.3 PRV (Effect of eutrophication) 0 0 0 0 %sat % 110 130 150 20 pH 8 8.5 9 9 9 PAES (Suspended solids) S mg/L 2 25 38 5 TEMP (Temperature) - - 2 25 38 5 T °C 24 25,5 27 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) -	P04	mg/L	0.1	0.5		2				
LP I/V (Effect of eutroprination) *** %sat % 110 130 150 22 %sat mg/L 2 25 38 9 9 PAES (Suspended solids) ************************************	F EDD)//Effect of outroph	ling/L	0.05	0.2	0.5	1				
Test To 110 130 150 24 PH 8 8.5 9 9 9 PAES (Suspended solids) SS mg/L 2 25 38 5 TEMP (Temperature) T °C 24 25,5 27 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) 6.6 6 5.5 4 PH 8.2 9 9.5 1 MINE (Mineralisation) C μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Ci mg/L 50 100 150 22 SQ4 ² mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg ²⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F <			110	120	150	200				
PH 8 8.5 9 9 9 SA (Suspended solids) SS mg/L 2 25 38 5 TEMP (Temperature) T °C 24 25,5 27 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) 0° C 24 25,5 27 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) 0° C 24 25,5 27 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) 0° C 24 25,5 27 2 MINE (Mineralisation) 0° C 0° C 9 9.5 1 C μ S/cm 0 60 120 180 C μ S/cm 250 3000 3500 400 Cl mg/L 50 100 150 22 SQ4 ² mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 5C Mg ²⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 <td>%Sat</td> <td>70</td> <td>110</td> <td>130</td> <td>150</td> <td>200</td>	%Sat	70	110	130	150	200				
PAEs (Subpride Solids) mg/L 2 25 38 5 SS mg/L 2 25 38 5 TEMP (Temperature) *C 24 25,5 27 2 ACID (Acidification parameters) ************************************	PH DATO (Oversended estin	1->	8	8.5	9	9.5				
SS mg/L 2 25 38 2 TEMP (Temperature) "C 24 25,5 27 22 ACID (Acidification parameters) 0 6.5 6 5.5 4 pH 8.2 9 9.5 1 MINE (Mineralisation) C μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Cr mg/L 50 100 150 220 SQ $_4^2$ mg/L 60 120 190 25 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 50 Ga ²⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Akalinity °F 0 3 5 4 Hardness °F 0	PAES (Suspended solid	15)		25	20					
Temperature °C 24 25,5 27 22 ACID (Acidification parameters) pH 6.5 6 5.5 4 pH 8.2 9 9.5 1 MINE (Mineralisation) C μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Cir mg/L 50 100 150 220 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 3 5 4 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 5	SS	Img/L	2	25	38	50				
I Image: Constraint of the second secon	TEMP (Temperature)	00		25.5		20				
ACID (Action cation parameters) pH 6.5 6 pH 6.5 6 pH 8.2 9 9.5 1 pH 8.2 9 9.5 1 MINE (Mineralisation) C μ S/cm 0 60 120 C μ S/cm 0 60 100 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 C μ S/cm 20 120 S 100 400 C α α $C^2^2^*$ mg/L 200 225 250 75 $Alkalinity °F 0 0 4 Alkalinity $		<u>°C</u>	24	25,5	27	28				
pH 6.5 6 5.5 4 pH 8.2 9 9.5 1 MINE (Mineralisation) x^{2} 9 9.5 1 C μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Ci mg/L 50 100 150 20 SO ₄ ²⁻ mg/L 60 120 190 25 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg ²⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 4 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) μ g/L 1 35 70 10 As μ g/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 5 Cr	ACID (Acidification para	imeters)		_						
pH 8.2 9 9.5 1 MINE (Mineralisation) K 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 C mg/L 50 100 150 20 Cl mg/L 60 120 190 22 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 33 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 50 Ma ²⁺ mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na* mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 44 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) Ka Ka Ka Ka Ka Ka Sa S	рн		6.5	6	5.5	4.5				
Mixe (mineralisation) μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Ci mg/L 50 100 150 20 SO ₄ ²⁻ mg/L 60 120 190 25 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 33 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 3000 50 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na ⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 4 Hardness °F 0 4 6 6 Hardness °F 0 4 6 6 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 90 12 24 As $\mu g/L$ 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cr $\mu g/L$ 0.009 0.09 0.85 5 Cr $\mu g/L$ 0.36 3.6 36 5	pH MINE (Minaralization)		8.2	y y	9.5	10				
C μ S/cm 0 60 120 18 C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Ci mg/L 50 100 150 20 SO ₄ ²⁻ mg/L 60 120 190 25 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg ²⁺ mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na ⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 100 Hardness °F 0 4 6 120 120 120 MPMI (Heavy metals) °F 0 3 5 100 44 6 Hardness °F 40 70 90 120 120 120 MPMI (Heavy metals) 40 70 90 120 100 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>120</td> <td>400</td>					120	400				
C μ S/cm 2500 3000 3500 400 Ci mg/L 50 100 150 20 SO ₄ ²⁻ mg/L 60 120 190 25 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca ²⁺ mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg ²⁺ mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na ⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 Alkalinity °F 40 58 75 100 Hardness °F 0 4 6 1 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 100 6 5 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cu µg/L		µS/cm	0	60	120	180				
Cl mg/L 50 100 150 20 $SO_4^{2^2}$ mg/L 60 120 190 25 Ca^{2^4} mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca^{2^4} mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg^{2^+} mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na* mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 Alkalinity Hardness °F 0 4 6 4 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) 4 6 6 6 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 70 10 Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 70 10 10 10 10 10 50 Cd µg/L 0.02 0.2 2		µS/cm	2500	3000	3500	4000				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		mg/L	50	100	150	200				
Ca ²⁺ mg/L 0 12 22 3 Ca^{2+} mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg ²⁺ mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na ⁺ mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 3 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 3 Alkalinity °F 0 4 6 4 Hardness °F 0 4 6 4 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 90 12 36 36 5 Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 5 70 10 Cd µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 5 Cu µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 5 Cr µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 5 5 5	SO4-	mg/L	60	120	190	250				
Ca ^{2*} mg/L 160 230 300 50 Mg ²⁺ mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na* mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 300 100 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 300 100 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 300 100 Hardness °F 0 4 6 6 300 100 100 MPMI (Heavy metals) 75 100 4 6 70 90 120 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 90 10	Ca²⁺	mg/L	0	12	22	32				
Mg ^{2*} mg/L 50 75 100 40 Na* mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 6 Alkalinity °F 40 58 75 100 Hardness °F 0 4 6 6 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 90 12 As µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 75 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 55 Cu µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 44 CN' µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 44 Hig µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24	Ca ^{∠*}	mg/L	160	230	300	500				
Na* mg/L 200 225 250 75 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 Alkalinity °F 40 58 75 10 Hardness °F 0 4 6 6 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 90 12 As µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 75 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 55 Cu µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 44 Hg µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24	Mg ^{2⁺}	mg/L	50	75	100	400				
Alkalinity °F 0 3 5 Alkalinity °F 40 58 75 10 Hardness °F 0 4 6 10 Hardness °F 0 4 6 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) * * 10 10 10 As µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 * Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cu µg/L 0.02 0.27 2.7 27 4 CN' µg/L 0.002 0.2 2 24 36 5 5 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 * 1 10 100 5500	Na⁺	mg/L	200	225	250	750				
Alkalinity °F 40 58 75 10 Hardness °F 0 4 6 Hardness °F 0 4 6 MPMI (Heavy metals) 70 90 12 As $\mu g/L$ 1 35 70 10 Cd $\mu g/L$ 0.009 0.09 0.85 5 Cr $\mu g/L$ 0.27 2.7 27 4 CN' $\mu g/L$ 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn $\mu g/L$ 1 10 100 5500 Hg $\mu g/L$ 0.007 0.07 0.7 1	Alkalinity	°F	0	3	5	8				
Hardness °F 0 4 6 Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) χ 1 35 70 10 Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 0 1 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 5 Cu µg/L 0.02 0.27 2.7 24 4 Sn µg/L 0.002 0.2 2 24 4 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 4 4	Alkalinity	°F	40	58	75	100				
Hardness °F 40 70 90 12 MPMI (Heavy metals) As µg/L 1 35 70 10 Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 6 5 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cu µg/L 0.02 0.27 2.7 24 CN' µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 500 Hg µg/L 1 10 100 5500	Hardness	°F	0	4	6	8				
MPMI (Heavy metals) As µg/L 1 35 70 10 Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 0 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cu µg/L 0.27 2.7 27 4 CN' µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 1 10 100 5500 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7 4	Hardness	°F	40	70	90	125				
As µg/L 1 35 70 10 Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85	MPMI (Heavy metals)		-	-						
Cd µg/L 0.009 0.09 0.85 Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cu µg/L 0.27 2.7 27 4 CN' µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 1 10 100 5500 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7	As	µg/L	1	35	70	100				
Cr µg/L 0.36 3.6 36 5 Cu µg/L 0.27 2.7 27 4 CN' µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 1 10 100 5500 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7	Cd	µg/L	0.009	0.09	0.85	3				
Cu µg/L 0.27 2.7 27 4 CN' µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 1 10 100 5500 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7	Cr	µg/L	0.36	3.6	36	50				
CN ⁻ µg/L 0.02 0.2 2 24 Sn µg/L 1 10 100 5500 Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7	Cu	µg/L	0.27	2.7	27	40				
Sn μg/L 1 10 100 5500 Hg μg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7	CN ⁻	µg/L	0.02	0.2	2	240				
Hg µg/L 0.007 0.07 0.7	Sn	µg/L	1	10	100	55000				
	Hg	µg/L	0.007	0.07	0.7	1				
	Ni	µg/L	1.2	12	26	40				
Pb μg/L 1 10 30 5	Pb	µg/L	1	10	30	50				
Zn µg/L 1.4 14 140 33	Zn	µg/L	1.4	14	140	330				
PEST (Pesticides)	PEST (Pesticides)									
2,4-D-ester µg/L 0.00001 0.0001 0.001 0	2,4-D-ester	µg/L	0.00001	0.0001	0.001	0.1				
2,4-D-non-ester µg/L 0.1 0.7 1.4	2,4-D-non-ester	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2				
2,4-MCPA µg/L 0.1 0.7 1.4	2,4-MCPA	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2				

Aclonifen	µg/L	0.007	0.07	0.7	2
Alachlor	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Aldicarb	µg/L	0.005	0.05	0.5	2
Aldrin	µg/L	0.001	0.05	0.2	1
Aminotriazole	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Atrazine	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Atrazine desethyl	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Bentazone	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Bifenox	µg/L	0.007	0.07	0.7	2
Captan	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Carbendazim	µg/L	0.0007	0.007	0.07	2
Carbofuran	µg/L	0.0015	0.015	0.15	2
Chlorfenvinphos	µg/L	0.0003	0.003	0.03	2
Chlorothalonil	µg/L	0.0004	0.004	0.04	2
Chlorotoluron	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Chlorpyriphos-ethyl	µg/L	0.00005	0.0005	0.005	0.05
Cymoxanil	µg/L	0.006	0.06	0.6	2
Cyprodinil	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	2
DDD op'	µg/L	0.0006	0.006	0.06	0.6
DDD pp'	µg/L	0.0006	0.006	0.06	0.6
DDE op'	µg/L	0.03	0.3	1.6	2
DDE pp'	µg/L	0.03	0.3	1.6	2
DDT op'	µg/L	0.0002	0.002	0.02	0.2
DDT pp'	µg/L	0.0002	0.002	0.02	0.2
Deltamethrin	µg/L	0.00002	0.0002	0.002	0.02
Dicamba	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Dichlorprop	µg/L	0.05	0.5	1.2	2
Dieldrin	µg/L	0.0005	0.005	0.05	0.5
Dinoterb	µg/L	0.0003	0.003	0.03	0.3
Diquat	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Diuron	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
DNOC	µg/L	0.07	0.7	1.4	2
Endosulfan	µg/L	0.002	0.02	0.2	0.3
Endrin	µg/L	0.0003	0.003	0.03	0.3
Ethofumesate	µg/L	0.08	0.8	1.4	2
Fenpropidin	µg/L	0.0006	0.006	0.06	2
Fenpropimorph	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Flusilazole	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Folpel	µg/L	0.002	0.02	0.2	2
Fosetyl-aluminium	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Glyphosate	µg/L	0.04	0.4	1.2	2
Imazamethabenz-methyl	μg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
loxynil	µg/L	0.04	0.4	1.2	2
Iprodione	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Isodrin	µg/L	0.0003	0.003	0.03	2
Isoproturon	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Lindane	µg/L	0.001	0.01	0.1	1.1
Linuron	µg/L	0.05	0.5	1.3	2
Mancozeb	µg/L	0.1	1	1.5	2
Maneb	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	2
Methabenzthiazuron	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Methomyl	µg/L	0.03	0.3	1.1	2
Metolachlor	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Norflurazon	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1.2	2
Oxadixyl	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Oxydemeton-methyl	µg/L	0.003	0.03	0.3	2
Paraquat	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2

Parathion methyl µpL 0.002 0.02 0.22 2 Pendimethalin µpL 0.01 0.1 1 2 Prosileraz µpL 0.01 0.1 1 2 Simazine µpL 0.02 0.02 0.2 2 2 Simazine-descthyl µpL 0.01 1 1.5 2 Terburthaline-descthyl µpL 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terburthylaine µpL 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Terburthylaine µpL 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terburthylaine µpL 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terburthylaine µpL 0.02 0.2 1 2 Vinckozin µpL 0.007 0.7 1.60 3 Acenaptifylene µpL 0.0005 0.0005 1.2 E Berzo(phlorentheme µpL 0.0003 0.0003 0.63 E <t< th=""><th>Parathion ethyl</th><th>µg/L</th><th>0.000003</th><th>0.00003</th><th>0.0003</th><th>0.03</th></t<>	Parathion ethyl	µg/L	0.000003	0.00003	0.0003	0.03
PendmethalinµpL0.030.31.12ProchiforanµpL0.010.112PrositoranµpL0.020.020.22Simaine-deschtylµpL0.020.212TebuconzoleµpL0.010.71.42TerburkonµpL0.020.212TerburkynµpL0.030.31.12TerburkynµpL0.020.212TerburkynµpL0.011.31.62TrefarainµpL0.010.71.42VinciozolinµpL0.070.71.62HAP (Boycilic aromatic hytocartons)0.030.030.080.003Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.0030.080.06Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.0030.080.06Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.60.01Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.60.01Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.80.004Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.80.01Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.60.01Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.80.01Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.040.024Benzo(a)phraneµpL0.0030.030.010.01	Parathion methyl	µg/L	0.0002	0.002	0.02	2
ProchlorazµpL0.010.112SimazineµgL0.0020.020.020.22Simazine-desethylµgL0.020.020.21Simazine-desethylµgL0.0111.522TerbumetonµgL0.010.71.42TerbuthylazineµgL0.020.212TerbuthylazineµgL0.030.31.12TerbuthylazineµgL0.020.212TriduralinµgL0.020.212TriduralinµgL0.020.212VinclozolinµgL0.070.71.60AcenaphtyleneµgL0.0070.7160AcenaphtyleneµgL0.00050.0051.2Benzo(a)nthraceneµgL0.00030.0030.08Benzo(b)fluorantheneµgL0.00030.0330.6Benzo(b)fluorantheneµgL0.00060.0061.5Dibenzo(k/fluorantheneµgL0.00010.012ProseneµgL0.00010.0010.012ProseneµgL0.00010.0010.012ProseneµgL0.00010.0010.012ProseneµgL0.00010.0010.012ProseneµgL0.00010.0010.012ProseneµgL0.00010.0010.012	Pendimethalin	µg/L	0.03	0.3	1.1	2
Presulticarib µg/L 0.01 0.1 1 2 Simazine- desethyl µg/L 0.02 0.02 0.2 2 Simazine- desethyl µg/L 0.01 1 1.5 2 Teburston µg/L 0.01 0.7 1.4 2 Terburtyn µg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Trifturalin µg/L 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Trifturalin µg/L 0.01 0.7 1.4 2 HAP (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons)	Prochloraz	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	2
Simazine µg/L 0.002 0.02 0.1 1 2 Simazine-deschy µg/L 0.01 1 1.5 2 Terburneton µg/L 0.01 0.7 1.4 2 Terburtylaine µg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terburtylaine µg/L 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Terburtylaine µg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Triffuratin µg/L 0.04 0.4 2 1 2 Vinclocolin µg/L 0.07 0.7 160 Acenaphytic 2 2 1 2 Acenaphyticne µg/L 0.0005 0.003 0.003 0.08 2 <	Prosulfocarb	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	2
Simaane-desethyl µg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terbuxnarole µg/L 0.1 1 1.5 2 Terburnen µg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terburtyn µg/L 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Trideronn µg/L 0.01 1.3 1.6 2 Trideronn µg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Vinciscolin µg/L 0.07 0.7 1.60 2 Acenapthylene µg/L 0.007 0.7 1.60 3 Acenapthylene µg/L 0.0005 0.0005 1.02 3 Benzolg/hijverne µg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.68 3 Benzolg/hijverne µg/L 0.0003 0.03 0.6 1 5 Dibenzolg/hijverne µg/L 0.0004 0.024 6 6 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 2	Simazine	µg/L	0.002	0.02	0.2	2
Tebuconacole µgL 0.1 1 1.5 2 Terbumeton µgL 0.0 0.7 1.4 2 Terbutrylaine µgL 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terbutryn µgL 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Tridenorph µgL 0.1 1.3 1.6 2 Tridenorph µgL 0.1 0.7 1.4 2 Vinclozelin µgL 0.07 0.7 160 Acenaphtylene µgL 0.044 0.4 99 BenzolgJanthracene µgL 0.001 0.001 0.3 BenzolgJanthracene µgL 0.0003 0.003 0.08 BenzolgJanthracene µgL 0.0003 0.003 0.8 EnzolgJanthracene µgL 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 EnzolgJanthracene µgL 0.0006 0.014 EnzolgJanthracene µgL 0.0024 0.024 6 EnzolgJanthracene µgL 0.0016 0.011 D.11 27	Simazine-desethyl	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Terburnton µgl. 0.1 0.7 1.4 2 Terburtynizine µgl. 0.02 0.2 1 2 Trideronph µgl. 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Trideronph µgl. 0.01 1.3 1.6 2 Vinclocolin µgl. 0.07 0.7 1.4 2 Acenaphtrene µgl. 0.07 0.7 160 2 Acenaphtylene µgl. 0.0005 0.0005 1.2 2 Benzo(shitracene µgl. 0.0003 0.0003 0.08 2 Benzo(shitracene µgl. 0.0003 0.003 0.6 3 2 Benzo(shitracene µgl. 0.0003 0.003 0.03 0.3 77 Indenzity.3-calpyrene µgl. 0.0006 0.0016 0.014 2 Floorantene µgl. 0.001 0.011 0.11 27 Prene µgl. 0.001 0.001 <t< td=""><td>Tebuconazole</td><td>µg/L</td><td>0.1</td><td>1</td><td>1.5</td><td>2</td></t<>	Tebuconazole	µg/L	0.1	1	1.5	2
Terbuthylazine μg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Terbutryn μg/L 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Trideronph μg/L 0.01 1.3 1.6 2 Trifluralin μg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 HAP (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) 0.07 0.7 1.4 2 Acenaphtylene μg/L 0.004 0.4 9 6 Benzo(a)privene μg/L 0.0005 0.0003 0.008 6 Benzo(a)privene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 6 Benzo(a)privene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 6 Benzo(a)priventhene μg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 6 Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene μg/L 0.0001 0.03 77 1 Inderol(1,2,3-cd)pyrene μg/L 0.0001 0.01 2 2 Prene μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2<	Terbumeton	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Terburyn μg/L 0.03 0.3 1.1 2 Tridemorph μg/L 0.1 1.3 1.6 2 Triderain μg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Vinclozolin μg/L 0.07 0.7 1.4 2 Acenaphtene μg/L 0.07 0.7 160 2 Acenaphtylene μg/L 0.005 0.005 1.2 2 Benzolalpyrene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.08 2 Benzolalpyrene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 2 Benzolalpyrene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.8 2 Chrysene μg/L 0.0006 0.006 0.15 2 Dibenzola, hianthracene μg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 2 Prene μg/L 0.0016 0.04 2 2 Prene μg/L 0.001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB (P	Terbuthylazine	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
Tridemorph μg/L 0.1 1.3 1.6 2 Trithuralin μg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Vinclozolin μg/L 0.01 0.7 1.4 2 HAP (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons)	Terbutryn	µg/L	0.03	0.3	1.1	2
Triffuralin μg/L 0.02 0.2 1 2 Vinclozolin μg/L 0.1 0.7 1.4 2 ARP (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) 2 4 Acenaphtylene μg/L 0.07 0.7 160 Acenaphtylene μg/L 0.0005 0.005 1.2 2 Benzo(a)anthracene μg/L 0.00001 0.001 0.3 3 Benzo(filyoranthrene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 3 Benzo(filyoranthrene μg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 3 Elwaranthene μg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 3 Elwaranthene μg/L 0.0016 0.044 6 3 Fluoranthene μg/L 0.011 0.11 27 3 Prene μg/L 0.0016 0.001 0.01 2 Prene μg/L 0.001 0.001 0.01 2 Prene μg/L	Tridemorph	µg/L	0.1	1.3	1.6	2
Vinctorolin ug/L 0.1 0.7 1.4 2 HAP (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons)	Trifluralin	µg/L	0.02	0.2	1	2
HAP (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) Accenaphtene Ug/L 0.07 0.7 160 Accenaphtene Ug/L 0.04 0.4 99 Benzo(a)anthracene Ug/L 0.0005 0.0005 1.2 Benzo(a)pyrene Ug/L 0.0003 0.0003 0.08 Benzo(a)fluoranthene Ug/L 0.0003 0.03 0.6 Benzo(k)fluoranthene Ug/L 0.0003 0.03 0.6 Benzo(k)fluoranthene Ug/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 Fluorene Ug/L 0.00024 0.024 6 Fluorene Ug/L 0.0016 0.04 0.04 Naphtalene Ug/L 0.0011 0.11 27 Pyrene Ug/L 0.0011 0.011 27 Pyrene Ug/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB (Polychono biphenyls) T T 7 7 PCB 28 Ug/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2	Vinclozolin	µg/L	0.1	0.7	1.4	2
Accenaphtene µg/L 0.07 0.7 160 Accenaphtylene µg/L 0.04 0.4 0.9 Benzo(a)pyrene µg/L 0.0005 0.005 1.2 Benzo(a)pyrene µg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.08 Benzo(a)pyrene µg/L 0.0003 0.03 0.6 Benzo(k)fluoranthene µg/L 0.0003 0.03 0.8 Chrysene µg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 Fluorente µg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 Fluorene µg/L 0.033 0.3 77 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene µg/L 0.030 0.01 0.01 Prene µg/L 0.001 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 12 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 13	HAP (Polycyclic aromatic hyd	frocarbons)				
Accenaphtylene µg/L 0.04 0.4 99 Benzo(a)anthracene µg/L 0.0005 0.005 1.2 Benzo(a)privene µg/L 0.00003 0.003 0.6 Benzo(a)privene µg/L 0.0003 0.03 0.6 Benzo(a)privene µg/L 0.0003 0.03 0.6 Benzo(b)Fuoranthene µg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 Chrysene µg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.00016 0.0016 0.014 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.0016 0.011 0.1 Naphtalene µg/L 0.0011 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 13 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130	Acenaphtene	µg/L	0.07	0.7	160	
Benzo(a)anthracene µg/L 0.0005 0.005 1.2 Benzo(a)pyrene µg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.08 Benzo(g)h/iperylene µg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 Benzo(g)h/iperylene µg/L 0.0006 0.003 0.6 Benzo(g)h/iperylene µg/L 0.0006 0.006 1.5 Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.00016 0.0016 0.4 Naphtalene µg/L 0.00024 0.024 6 Phenanthrene µg/L 0.0001 0.011 0.1 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 29 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 20 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01	Acenaphtylene	µg/L	0.04	0.4	99	
Benzo(a)pyrene µg/L 0.00003 0.0003 0.08 Benzo(g), i)perylene µg/L 0.0003 0.06 0.003 0.6 Benzo(k), illouranthene µg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 Benzo(k), illouranthene µg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.001 Chrysene µg/L 0.00024 0.024 6 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.0016 0.014 1 Fluorene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluorene µg/L 0.011 0.11 27 Prene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Prene µg/L 0.001 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 18 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 2 PCB 180 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0	Benzo(a)anthracene	µg/L	0.0005	0.005	1.2	
Benzo(b)fluoranthene μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.3 Benzo(k), i)perylene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 Benzo(k) fluoranthene μg/L 0.0006 0.006 1.5 Dibenzo(k, i) anthracene μg/L 0.0004 0.0006 0.014 Fluoranthene μg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluoranthene μg/L 0.0016 0.011 0.1 Naphtalene μg/L 0.019 1.9 460 Prene μg/L 0.001 0.011 27 Pyrene μg/L 0.001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 </td <td>Benzo(a)pyrene</td> <td>µg/L</td> <td>0.00003</td> <td>0.0003</td> <td>0.08</td> <td></td>	Benzo(a)pyrene	µg/L	0.00003	0.0003	0.08	
Benzo(g,h,l)perylene μg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.6 Benzo(g,h,l)perylene μg/L 0.0006 0.003 0.8 Chrysene μg/L 0.0006 0.0006 0.014 Fluoranthene μg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluoranthene μg/L 0.003 0.3 77 Inden0(1,2,3-cd)pyrene μg/L 0.010 0.0016 0.4 Naphtalene μg/L 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.01 0.01 <t< td=""><td>Benzo(b)fluoranthene</td><td>µg/L</td><td>0.0001</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.3</td><td></td></t<>	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.3	
Benzok/filuoranthene µg/L 0.0003 0.003 0.8 Chrysene µg/L 0.00006 0.0006 1.5 Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluorente µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluorene µg/L 0.0016 0.016 0.4 Naphtalene µg/L 0.0011 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) P FCB 2 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 2 PCB 180 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 2 PCB 180 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 2 PCB 180 µg/L 0.0001 0.01 0.1 2	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	0.0003	0.003	0.6	
Chrysene µg/L 0.0006 0.0006 1.5 Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene µg/L 0.00006 0.00006 0.014 Fluoranthene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluorene µg/L 0.033 0.3 77 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene µg/L 0.019 1.9 460 Naphtalene µg/L 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 µg/L 0.0001 0.01 0.01	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	0.0003	0.003	0.8	
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene µg/L 0.00006 0.0006 0.014 Fluorantene µg/L 0.03 0.3 77 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene µg/L 0.0016 0.0016 0.4 Naphtalene µg/L 0.011 0.11 27 Prenanthrene µg/L 0.0024 0.62 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) Prese µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 118 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 133 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 µg/L <	Chrysene	µg/L	0.0006	0.006	1.5	
Fluoranthene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 Fluorene µg/L 0.03 0.3 77 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene µg/L 0.00016 0.0016 0.4 Naphtalene µg/L 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 52 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 133 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 133 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 µg/L 0.05 5 5	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	µg/L	0.000006	0.00006	0.014	
Fluorene µg/L 0.03 0.3 77 Indenc(1,2,3-cd)pyrene µg/L 0.00016 0.0016 0.4 Naphtalene µg/L 0.011 0.11 27 Phenanthrene µg/L 0.0014 0.011 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0004 0.0024 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) 0.001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 52 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 µg/L 0.001 0.001 0.01 0.1 2 2 12 10 12 3 12 10	Fluoranthene	µg/L	0.0024	0.024	6	
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene µg/L 0.00016 0.0016 0.4 Naphtalene µg/L 0.19 1.9 460 Phenanthrene µg/L 0.001 0.11 27 Pyrene µg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 52 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 118 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 µg/L 0.001 0.	Fluorene	µa/L	0.03	0.3	77	
Naphtalene $\mu g/L$ 0.19 1.9 460 Phenanthrene $\mu g/L$ 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene $\mu g/L$ 0.0024 0.024 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) 0.0024 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 118 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 133 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 20 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum $\mu g/L$ 0.05 5 5 14 1,2-Chloroalkanes $\mu g/L$	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	µg/L	0.00016	0.0016	0.4	
Phenanthrene $\mu g/L$ 0.011 0.11 27 Pyrene $\mu g/L$ 0.0024 0.024 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) 0.001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 28 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 52 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB Coher organic hydrocarbons) 3 10 10 1 Benzene $\mu g/L$ 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 10 1,2-Chioroalkanes $\mu g/L$ 0.001 0.1 6	Naphtalene	µa/L	0.19	1.9	460	
Pyrene μg/L 0.0024 0.024 6 PCB (Polychloro biphenyls)	Phenanthrene	ua/L	0.011	0.11	27	
PCB (Polychloro biphenyls) PCB PCB 28 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 52 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 118 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.05 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 <td< td=""><td>Pyrene</td><td>µg/L</td><td>0.0024</td><td>0.024</td><td>6</td><td></td></td<>	Pyrene	µg/L	0.0024	0.024	6	
PCB 28 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 52 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 101 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 118 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum $\mu g/L$ 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 MPOR (Other organic hydrocarbons) Benzene $\mu g/L$ 0.05 0.5 5 1.4 1,2-Chloroaniline $\mu g/L$ 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline $\mu g/L$ 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene $\mu g/L$ 3	PCB (Polychloro biphenyls)	1.0				
PCB 52 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB 101 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 118 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 130 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB construct Benzene μg/L 0.05 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroaliline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 30 90 150	PCB 28	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
PCB 101 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB 118 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.001 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.05 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 1.2 3 30 90 150 </td <td>PCB 52</td> <td>µg/L</td> <td>0.0001</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>2</td>	PCB 52	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
PCB 118 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB roganic hydrocarbons) Benzene μg/L 0.05 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 3 30 90 150 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 0.2 0.8 <td< td=""><td>PCB 101</td><td>µg/L</td><td>0.0001</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.01</td><td>2</td></td<>	PCB 101	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
PCB 138 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB roganic hydrocarbons) Benzene μg/L 0.05 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 0.2 0.8	PCB 118	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
PCB 153 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB 180 μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCB sum μg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 MPOR (Other organic hydrocarbons) 3 5 7.5 100 Benzene μg/L 0.05 0.5 5 14 1,2-Chloroalkanes μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline μg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline μg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 30 90 150 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene μg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 <td>PCB 138</td> <td>µg/L</td> <td>0.0001</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>2</td>	PCB 138	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
PCB 180 µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 PCBs sum µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 MPOR (Other organic hydrocarbons) Benzene µg/L 0.5 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,2-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2	PCB 153	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
PCBs sum µg/L 0.0001 0.001 0.01 2 MPOR (Other organic hydrocarbons) Benzene µg/L 0.5 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes µg/L 0.05 0.5 5 14 1,2-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 <t< td=""><td>PCB 180</td><td>µg/L</td><td>0.0001</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.01</td><td>2</td></t<>	PCB 180	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
MPOR (Other organic hydrocarbons) Benzene µg/L 0.5 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes µg/L 0.05 0.5 5 14 1,2-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Qrtho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 0 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.0	PCBs sum	µg/L	0.0001	0.001	0.01	2
Benzene µg/L 0.5 5 7.5 10 C10-C13-Chloroalkanes µg/L 0.05 0.5 5 14 1,2-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 0 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.003 0.3 3 6 </td <td>MPOR (Other organic hydroc</td> <td>arbons)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	MPOR (Other organic hydroc	arbons)				
C10-C13-Chloroalkanes µg/L 0.05 0.5 5 14 1,2-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 0rtho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 0 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.003 0.3 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.3 3 <	Benzene	µg/L	0.5	5	7.5	10
1,2-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 0 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.3 3 2 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.003 0.3 3 2 <	C10-C13-Chloroalkanes	µg/L	0.05	0.5	5	14
1,3-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 Chloroform µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 3 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.09 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,2-Chloroaniline	µg/L	0.001	0.01	0.1	6
1,4-Chloroaniline µg/L 0.001 0.01 0.1 6 Chloroform µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.02 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 3 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.09 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,3-Chloroaniline	µg/L	0.001	0.01	0.1	6
Chloroform µg/L 1.2 3 6 10 1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.009 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,4-Chloroaniline	µg/L	0.001	0.01	0.1	6
1,2-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	Chloroform	µg/L	1.2	3	6	10
1,3-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,2-Chloronitrobenzene	µg/L	3	30	90	150
1,4-Chloronitrobenzene µg/L 3 30 90 150 Meta-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,3-Chloronitrobenzene	µg/L	3	30	90	150
Meta-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 3 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,4-Chloronitrobenzene	µg/L	3	30	90	150
Ortho-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 3 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.09 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	Meta-cresol	µg/L	0.2	0.8	1.4	2
Para-cresol µg/L 0.2 0.8 1.4 2 Phtalate DEPH µg/L 0.03 0.3 3 3 Dibutyltin µg/L 0.09 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	Ortho-cresol	µg/L	0.2	0.8	1.4	2
Phtalate DEPH μg/L 0.03 0.3 3 Dibutyltin μg/L 0.09 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline μg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene μg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene μg/L 2 20 200 740	Para-cresol	µg/L	0.2	0.8	1.4	2
Dibutyltin µg/L 0.09 0.9 3 6 3,4-Dichloroaniline µg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	Phtalate DEPH	µg/L	0.03	0.3	3	
3,4-Dichloroaniline μg/L 0.003 0.03 0.3 2 1,2-Dichlorobenzene μg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene μg/L 2 20 200 740	Dibutyltin	µg/L	0.09	0.9	3	6
1,2-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740 1,3-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	3,4-Dichloroaniline	µg/L	0.003	0.03	0.3	2
1,3-Dichlorobenzene µg/L 2 20 200 740	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	2	20	200	740
	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	2	20	200	740

1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	2	20	100	200
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	3	4.5	6	60
1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	50	200	350	500
Dichloromethane	µg/L	6.8	17	28	40
2,3-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	1	4	7	10
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	1	4	7	10
2,5-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	1	4	7	10
2,6-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	1	4	7	10
3,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	1	4	7	10
3,5-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	1	4	7	10
EDTA	µg/L	4	41	410	2000
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	0.0007	0.007	0.02	0.1
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	6
4-para-nonylphenol	µg/L	0.033	0.33	3.3	21
Para-ter-octylphenol	µg/L	0.1	1	10	100
Pentabromodiphenylether	µg/L	0.02	0.2	2.4	
Pentachlorobenzene	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	2
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	0.01	0.1	1	2
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	14	42	70	100
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	5	12	20	200
Tetrachloromethane	µg/L	2	2.3	2.5	20
Toluene	µg/L	10	100	1000	1500
Tributylin compounds	µg/L	0.00004	0.0004	0.004	0.05
Tributylin oxyde	µg/L	0.0002	0.002	0.02	2
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	13	130	250	500
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	1.8	12	20	200
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	0.3	3	25	50
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	0.3	3	25	50
1,3,5-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	0.3	3	25	50
2,3,5-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	0.05	0.5	2.2	4
2,3,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	0.05	0.5	2.2	4
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	0.05	0.5	2.2	4
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	0.05	0.5	2.2	4
3,4,5-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	0.05	0.5	2.2	4
Triphenyltin acetate	µg/L	0.002	0.02	0.2	2
Triphenyltin chloride	µg/L	0.002	0.02	0.2	2
Triphenyltin hydroxyde	µg/L	0.002	0.02	0.2	2
Meta-xylene	µg/L	0.1	1	10	1000
Ortho-xylene	µg/L	0.1	1	10	1000
Bara yulono	ua/L	0.1	1	10	1000

Appendix 2: Set of thresholds used by the WFD guide (MEEM, 2012) for 1238 physico-chemical parameters classified according to pressure 1239 categories (here for TEMP, ACID, BILO2, NUTRI: the threshold is always 1240 excluded from the better class, e.g.: for nitrates, the threshold between the 1241 high and good classes is 10 mg/L, therefore if $(NO_3)^{-1}=10$ mg/L, pressure 1242 category is good; in contrast, for POSPE and SDP the threshold is always 1243 included in the better class, e.g.: for arsenic, the threshold between the high 1244 and bad classes is 4.2µg/L, therefore if [As]=4.2µg/L, pressure category is 1245

1246 *high*)

Baramatar	um it	thresholds between the statuses				
Farameter	unit		good/moderate	moderate/poor	poor/bad	
TEMP (Temperature)						
Т	°C	24	25.5	27	28	
ACID (Acidification parameters)						
pH		6.5	6	5.5	4.5	
pH		8.2	9	9.5	10	
BILO2 (Oxygen balance)						
O ₂	mg/L	8	6	4	3	
%sat	%	90	70	50	30	
BOD	mg/L O2	3	6	10	25	
C	mg/L	5	7	10	15	
NUTRI (Nutrients)						
PO ₄ ^{3.}	mg/L	0.1	0.5	1	2	
P	mg/L	0.05	0.2	0.5	1	
NH4 ⁺	mg/L	0.1	0.5	2	5	
NO ₂ ⁻	mg/L	0.1	0.3	0.5	1	
NO ₃	mg/L	10	50	not yet defined	not yet defined	

Parameter	unit	status thresholds for annual average high/bad	status thresholds for maximum concetrations high/bad	
POSPE (Specific pollutants)				
Δs	lug/l	42		
Cr		3.4		
		1.4		
7n	un/l	7.8		
Chlortoluron	ug/l	5		
Ovadiazon	ug/L	0.75		
Linuron	ug/L	1		
24-D-ester	ug/L	15		
24-MCPA		0.1		
SDP (Priority substances and priority hazardous substanc	es)	0.1		
Alachlor	µg/L	0.3	0.7	
Antracene	ua/L	0.1	∩4	
Atrazine	ug/l	0.6	2	
Benzene	ug/L	10	50	
Brominated dephenylethers	ug/l	0 0005		
Cd	ug/L	0.25	15	
Carbon tetrachlorid	ug/l	12		
C10-C13-Chloroalkanes	ug/l	0.4	14	
Chlorfenvinfos	ug/L	0.1	0.3	
Chlorpyrifos (ethylchlorpyrifos)	ug/l	0.03	0.0	
Cyclodiene pesticides sum	ug/l	0.00	0.1	
Total DDT	ug/L	0.025		
Para-para-DDT	ug/L	0.01		
1 2-Dichloroethane	ug/L	10		
Dichloromethane	ua/l	20		
Diuron	ug/L	0.2	1.8	
Endosulfan	ug/l	0 005	0.01	
Eluoranthene	ug/L	0.01	1	
Hexachlorobenzene	ug/l	0.01	0.05	
Hexachlorobutadiene	ua/l	0.1	0.6	
Hexachlorocyclohexane	ua/L	0.02	0.04	
Isoproturon	ug/l	0.3	1	
Ph	ug/l	7.2		
На	ua/L	0.05	0.07	
Naphtalene	ua/L	2.4		
Ni	ua/L	20		
Nonviphenol	ua/L	0.3	2	
PAH	ua/L		_	
Benzo(a)pyrene	μg/L	0.05	0.1	
Benzo(b)fluoranthene and benzo(k) fluoranthene sum	µg/L	0.03		
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene and Indenol(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	µg/L	0.002		
Simazine	µg/L	1	4	
Tetrachloroethylene	ua/L	10		
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	10		
Tributyletain	µg/L	0.0002	0.0015	
Trichlorobenzenes	µg/L	0.4		
Trichloromethane	µg/L	2.5		
Trifluraline	ua/L	0.03		