An early comparison of nano to microplastic mass in a remote catchment's atmospheric deposition

Steve Allen, Dušan Materić, Deonie Allen, Anna Macdonald, Rupert Holzinger, G. Le Roux, Vernon Phoenix

An early comparison of nano to microplastic mass in a remote catchment's atmospheric deposition

Steve Allen[1,3,4]*, Dušan Materić[2], Deonie Allen[3,4], Anna MacDonald[3], Rupert Holzinger[2], Gael Le Roux[4], Vernon R Phoenix [3]

[1]Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada

[2]Utrecht University, Institute for Marine and Atmospheric research Utrecht (IMAU), Utrecht, The Netherlands

[3]Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland

[4]Laboratoire écologie fonctionnelle et environnement, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse, France. 3

*Corresponding author (st504087@dal.ca)

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Steve Allen, Dušan Materić: Conceptualization, Resources, Methodology, Data curation, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Deonie Allen:** Resources, Methodology, Data curation, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Anna MacDonald:** Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Vernon R Phoenix, Gael Le Roux, Rupert Holzinger:** Resources, Writing – review & editing.

An early comparison of nano to microplastic mass in a remote catchment's atmospheric deposition

Abstract

The existence of nano sized plastic (NP) has been discussed heavily in recent years, however physical proof from environmental samples and direct comparisons to characterized microplastics is limited. Here we compare microplastic (MP) particles and counts (>10µm) to NP particle (<0.45µm) mass concentrations from deposition at a remote field site in the French Pyrenees (elevation 1425 m a.g.l.). Using Thermal Desorption – Proton Transfer Reaction – Mass Spectrometry (TD-PTR-MS) analysis, the data shows that NP is present in atmospheric deposition in quantities up to $2.0x10^5$ nanograms m^{-2} day^{-1}, comparable to that of the >10µm microplastic (up to $1.1\ x10^5$ nanograms m^{-2} day^{-1}). This comparison indicates the quantity of NP and MP may be similar in this atmospheric deposition, however the estimated particle count for NP is understandably multiple orders of magnitude greater compared to MP. Backward trajectory modelling was used to consider the transport of these MP and NP particles. This highlighted the extended spatial influence of NP and its propensity to remain elevated over a 7-day period.

Keywords: aerosol pollutants, transport processes, microplastics, nanoplastics, TD-PTR-MS

Introduction

The issues surrounding plastic pollution are currently receiving multidisciplinary attention, with its discovery in all environmental matrices and in some of the most remote locations (for example, the Arctic, Antarctic, Alps and Ecuadorian Andes)(S. Allen et al., 2021; Ambrosini et al., 2019; Bergmann et al., 2019; Brahney et al., 2020; Cabrera et al., 2020; Huntington et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2021; Materic et al., 2022). While research has focused on finding, quantifying and assessing the environmental impact of microplastics (MP, 1µm-5mm plastic particles), there is a growing interest in nanoplastic occurrence in the environment.

Nanoplastics have been describes as plastic particles smaller than 1 µm and also confusingly as particles smaller than100 nm. The definition of nano has meaning when applied to materials below 100 nm if that material behaves differently to its larger counterparts(Joachim, 2005). This is the level at which many materials start to exhibit Brownian motion(Feynman, 1963) as it bounces off molecules it is in suspension with. As both diffuse and ballistic Brownian motion are known to occur in particles up to 2.5 µm (Silica) in air, the term nano encompasses the small particle sizes in this study (T. Li & Raizen, 2013). Whist it is acknowledged that 100 nm is a practical limit for the safety regulations of industry, it is widely accepted among the plastic pollution research community that sub-micron synthetic polymer material should be described as nanoplastic (NP are particles <1µm) (Frias & Nash, 2019; Gigault et al., 2021). This simpler definition being easier for policy makers and the general public to understand without having to further explain the definition. With this in mind, the definition of NP used in this study is 1 nm-1µm.

Nanoplastic particles form an important element in the global plastic cycle and plastic pollution impact (D. Allen et al., 2022; Mitrano et al., 2021). NP occur as primary (designed as nano sized plastic particles) or secondary (larger particles degraded to nano size) and have been found in the marine waters (Gonçalves & Bebianno, 2021; Piccardo et al., 2020), soil (Wahl et

al., 2021), air (Materić et al., 2021) and biota (Ferreira et al., 2019). NP can be more easily taken up (ingested, inhaled or adsorbed) by biota due their small size (Banerjee & Shelver, 2021), entering the ecosystem. Due to the small size and often jagged shape, secondary NP (and small MP) can pass through or impact on epithelial membranes and early studies suggest there may be a link between changed function, immune compromission and cytotoxicity (Bergmann et al., 2015; Deng et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020; B. Li et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; H. Yang et al., 2020). As a result, NP could potentially influence the cellular to organism functionality, a concern to both environmental and human health (Banerjee & Shelver, 2021; Rubio et al., 2020; Wright & Kelly, 2017; Yee et al., 2021). Given this risk, understanding the extend of MP and NP pollution is crucial. The ratio of MP to NP is still generally hypothesised, with limited data to directly compare MP to NP within individual samples. Formative studies indicate notable atmospheric NP mass (in snow and dry atmospheric deposition) 42 (+32/-25) kg km^{-2} $year^{-1}$ (Materić et al., 2021) and 13.2-52.3 ng ml^{-1} (in ice)(Materic et al., 2022).

Nano sized plastics (NP, 1 nm-1µm) have been difficult to assess in environmental matrices due to their small size (published and functional limitations of spectroscopy are approximately µRaman-1µm and FTIR-10µm) (Xu et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2021) and environmental concentrations (for example, Py-GCMS limit of quantification for is µg's rather than ng)(Akoueson et al., 2021; Okoffo et al., 2020). The vast majority of studies assessing NP have thus far have been theoretical or laboratory based, providing a limited understanding of the possible quantities in the environment. However, recent research from Materić et al. (Materic et al., 2022; Materić et al., 2020, 2021) illustrates the effective use of Thermal Desorption – Proton Transfer Reaction – Mass Spectrometry (TD-PTR-MS) for environmental NP analysis. The use of this new method has paved the way for analysis of the elusive nanoplastics in environmental samples.

Materials and Methods

Atmospheric deposition samples were collected from the remote mountain location of Bernadouze, a long-term monitoring station in the central Pyrenees, France (42° 48′ 14.6″ N, 1° 25′ 06.8″ E, 1,425 m above mean sea level). Standard total atmospheric deposition collectors were used over the course of 5 months, November to March 2018, to collect monthly cumulative wet and dry deposition (sample time steps were constrained by access due to snow closure of the access road) (Sample durations: November – 12 days, December – 19 days, January – 34 days, February – 41 days, March – 34 days). Samples were collected as total atmospheric deposition (wet + dry deposition) using a Palmex Rain Sampler (sampling area of 0.014 m^2, open diameter of 135 mm) and a NILU Particle Fallout Collector (sampling area of 0.03 m^2, open diameter of 22 mm). Atmospheric deposition collectors were open for the full sampling period and acted as duplicate sample sets. Multiple field full process blanks were collected on site during this sampling period (November – March 2018). Sample collectors were rinsed thoroughly on site (3 times, approximately 250ml) with MilliQ water and the sample was decanted into sterilised glass containers (including the equivalent field blanks) and transported back to the laboratory where they were stored in a temperature controlled, dark, fridge (4 degrees) until sample preparation and analysis (S. Allen et al., 2019).

Samples were pre-filtered through a 0.45µm pore 47mm diameter polytetrafluoroethylene (PFTE) filters that had been pre-flushed using filtered MilliQ water (250ml MilliQ flush)(Materić et al., 2020). The filtrate was placed in sterilised 25ml glass vial for TD-PTR-MS analysis (vials prepared by heating to 400˚C overnight, sterilised containers were wrapped in sterilised aluminium foil after heading to minimise external contamination). No sample pre-treatment was undertaken. The remaining material on the PTFE filter was then flushed with H_2O_2 (30% w/w) into covered, sterilised borosilicate glass test tubes in a dry heat block at 50˚C to

complete organic digestion(S. Allen et al., 2019). After organic material was adequately removed the sample was filtered onto pre-flushed PTFE filters to remove residual H_2O_2 and liquid and then flushed into sterilised glass density separation tubes with $ZnCl_2$ (1.6 g ml^{-1} density) and agitated to aid MP separation from mineral and residual organic material(S. Allen et al., 2019). Settled material was removed from the bottom of the density separation tubes and the remaining upper liquid plus microplastic material was filtered onto 25mm diameter aluminium oxide (Whatman Anodisc) filters for µRaman analysis.

The samples were analysed for MP by µRaman spectroscopy (785nm laser, 1200 l/mm grating, scanning 200-2000cl-1 with 15s acquisition time and 10 accumulations) and Nile Red fluorescence to quantitatively characterise the atmospheric deposition of MP at this site for this monitoring period (S. Allen et al., 2019). Raman spectra analysis was undertaken using open source Spectragryph software and available databases(Menges, 2018; Munno et al., 2020; Primpke et al., 2020). The limits of quantification for µRaman analysis for these samples was set to 10µm.

NP analysis was completed as a blind test by Thermal Desorption – Proton Transfer Reaction – Mass Spectrometry followed protocols previously developed by Materic et al. (2020)(Materić et al., 2020) herein briefly described. TD-PTR-MS is a destructive analytical method, similar to Py-GCMS, but can be used for nanoplastic analysis in line with microplastic assessment. Filtered (<0.45µm) samples were well mixed (shaken but not vortexed to ensure sample particle integrity) to ensure homogeneity throughout the sample, then sub-sampled into three 0.5ml replicates that were individually analysed by TD-PTR-MS (PTR-MS model PTR8000, IONICON Analitik, Austria) directly via sterilised glass vials (10ml) (Materić et al., 2020). Field blanks were analysed in the same way and used to blank correct all results. Process blanks were carried out using MilliQ water and underwent the same procedures and durations as the samples and quantities subtracted from final results (see supplementary information). The TD-PTR-MS analysis of NP was undertaken using the fingerprinting algorithms created and published in Materic et al. (Materic et al., 2022; Materić et al., 2020, 2021).

All samples and field blanks were transported to the laboratory where sample preparation occurred in a clean and access-controlled space. Cotton clothing and lab coats were worn to minimise sample contamination and laboratory surfaces were cleaned and covered with non-plastic material (sterilised aluminium foil). Field blanks were processed following the same procedures (full process blanks) (S. Allen et al., 2019) and counts subtracted from the final results (counts in supplementary).

Results and Discussion

MP and NP quantitative characterisation

The µRaman analysed MP particle counts and polymer types and the TD-PTR-MS analysed NP mass and polymer types were compared by calculating the respective mass and particle counts for each sample (see Supplementary Information and data for additional details). MP results were converted from polymer type and particle count to mass relative to their particle size following, with results presented relative to particle size (Figure 1c) and to all MP in each sample (>10µm) (Figure 1a). Similarly, the NP mass relative to polymer type (<0.45µm) were converted to particle counts (assuming a spherical conservative particle size of 0.45µm) to enable direct comparison to the MP particle counts (Figure 1b, c).

The total deposited MP >10µm mass ranged between 44 $x10^3$ - 109 $x10^3$ ng m^{-2} day^{-1} with an overall average for the monitoring period of 87 $x10^3$ ng m^{-2} day^{-1}. Comparably, total NP <0.45µm mass ranged from below detection to 203 $x10^3$ ng m^{-2} day^{-1}, with an average NP mass for the monitoring period of 50 $x10^3$ ng m^{-2} day^{-1}. The mass of MP >10µm and NP

<0.45µm deposited at this location for this period is comparable (average results and range are within an order of magnitude) and are in agreement with the simulated NP fibre and MP release experiment findings of T. Yang et al., 2021. The NP mass results (18 (+55/-17) kg km^{-2} year^{-1}) are also comparable to previously published results, 42 (+32/-25) kg km^{-2} year^{-1} (Materić et al., 2021).

Particle counts for MP >10µm were several orders of magnitude lower than that calculated for NP <0.45µm, as would be expected for comparable mass results for these different particle size ranges. MP particle counts ranged from 297- 462 particles m^{-2} day^{1} (average of 365 particles m^{-2} day^{1}) whereas NP estimated particle counts (adopting the conservative particle size of 0.45µm) ranged from below detection to 43 x10^{8} particles m^{-2} day^{1} (11x10^{8} particles m^{-2} day^{1}). This agrees with the increasing particle count relative to decreased particle size found in both microplastic and nanoplastic studies(Bianco & Passananti, 2020). This suggests that while comparable mass of MP and NP occur in the atmospheric deposition at this site, a far greater number of NP particles are being deposited compared to MP.



Figure 1. Comparison of NP and MP mass (a), number (b), and the relative number of particles across samples considering both the analysed MP and NP results (c).

To ensure comparability, five of the more frequent polymer types were specifically analysed (polystyrene-PS, polyethylene-PE, polypropylene-PP, polyvinyl chloride-PVC and polyethylene terephthalate-PET). Multiple plastic polymer types were found in each sample at both MP and NP particle size range (Figure 2a). With the exception of the February NP sample where results were below detection limits, all samples contained PVC as both MP and NP. Similarly, PET was found in all NP samples (excl. Feb) but was absent in the MP samples for November and March. Conversely, PE and PP were found in the MP samples for January, but reported below the limits of detection for NP in the same samples.

The overall (cumulative) mass of each plastic type for MP and NP is comparative (Figure 2b), with greater NP quantities of PVC, PET and PP compared to MP. When compared as a proportion of the total mass of MP or NP, this differentiation in polymer composition is more easily visualised, with PS, and PE predominantly occurring as MP, PP occurring in moderate proportions in both MP and NP particle size ranges, and PVC and PET occurring predominantly in NP.



Figure 2. Types of plastic found in the MP atmospheric deposition and NP deposition. Figure 2(a) presents the mass of each polymer type within each sample relative to the two particle size groups (NP <0.45µm or MP<10µm), (b) the mass of each polymer type over the total monitoring period relative to the particle size (NP <0.45µm or MP<10µm), (c) the percentage of polymer relative to the total MP (or NP) mass. Further information is provided in the Supplementary information.

* denotes the <0.45µm mass of plastic in the January sample after the detection limit is lowered from 80% to 30% accuracy. At 80% both January and February present <0.45µm plastic masses below the detection limit (<10ng/ml). When the accuracy of

plastic identification is loosened from an 80% correlation to a 30% correlation (of spectral peaks) then PP, PET and PVC can be identified and quantified in the <0.45µm samples for January.

There does not appear to be a direct link between MP and NP polymer type occurrence in this limited dataset, and it is suggested this may be because of the long-distance transport and distal source of MP and NP. The deposited MP and NP may have been transported an extensive distance (100's km) and due to their different particle characteristics may have come from different sources and travelled different distances due to the relative remote location of the sample collection site, and therefore may not be directly related.

MP and NP atmospheric transport

Simple, indicative atmospheric back trajectory and air/particle history modelling can provide a valuable insight into where MP and NP may have been transported from, what elevation in the atmosphere they were transported through, and how far they have travelled. To provide a high level comparative overview of MP and NP atmospheric transport for particles deposited at this Pyrenean field site, long time step atmospheric particle transport modelling was undertaken. This modelling was designed to illustrate the difference in atmospheric transport (extent, elevation) between MP and NP and not to be prescriptive or illustrative of individual sample findings in detail.

Controlled environment laboratory examination of the field/laboratory assessed atmospheric settling velocity of MP or NP particles is a new area of research, but early atmospheric modelling has been completed using estimations of MP settling velocities from Stokes Law (S. Allen et al., 2019; Trainic et al., 2020; Wright et al., 2020). Therefore, for the purposes of this discussion, MP settling velocities have been calculated using Stokes Law, to consider the potential atmospheric transport of sampled MP and to compare this to the potential atmospheric transport of newly quantified NP. For simplicity, particles were considered to be cylindrical (acknowledging that fibres or a range of lengths and diameter were found in the MP samples and that NP particle shapes were not defined). For the purposes of this modelling assessment MP particles were defined as 25µm (the predominant size range for the MP particles) and NP as 0.45µm (acknowledging that there will potentially have been greater particle counts for smaller particle sizes in the NP samples). Settling velocities for the 25µm and 0.45µm generic plastic particles were calculated following:

$$V_t = \frac{gd^2(\rho_p - \rho_m)}{18\mu}$$

Where g is acceleration due to gravity (9.8m s^{-2}), ρ_p defines the density of the plastic particle (1g cm^{-3}), ρ_d is the density of the medium (air, 1.27 kg/m^3 at 5 ˚C), and µ is the dynamic viscosity of the medium (air, 1.74 x 10^{-5} kg m^{-1} s^{-1} at 5 ˚C). Settling velocities were estimated as 0.02m/s for 25µm MP spheres and 6.3 x 10^{-6} m s^{-1} for 0.45µm plastic particles. This results in a simplistic atmospheric transport time (from estimated planetary boundary layer upper elevation of 600m a.g.l.) of 8.5 hours for a 25µm MP particle if no dynamic mixing, turbulence or change in atmospheric conditions occurred during transit. For the smaller particles, this duration extends out past one month (>744hrs). The dynamic mixing, atmospheric characteristics, particle removal due to precipitation (scavenging) and dry deposition therefore potentially have a significant influence on the transport and deposition of these <0.45µm particles.

To illustrate the potential influencing area of MP relative to NP, the dynamic HYSPLIT atmospheric transport modelling for the sample particles was completed relative to selected size and settling velocities. Whilst it is clear that the ~ 1 month time step for sampling precludes accurate particle back trajectory analysis for the specific samples, the following analysis was

carried out to attempt to elucidate any difference between micro and nano plastics transport and sources.

HYSPLIT particle dispersion modelling was undertaken using the HYSPLIT concentration module and particle analysis, backwards modelling the trajectory using both wet and dry deposition for a conservative and illustrative release of 1 particle per hour for a 24hr period, with cyclic emission repeated every 24hours for the duration of the sample period. Particles were parameterised as: MP - 25µm (the average MP particle size in the MP dataset), 1g cc^{-1} (Kooi & Koelmans, 2019), settling velocity 0.02m s^{-1}, default wet deposition of in and below cloud wet removal of 8.0E-05 1 s^{-1} (Draxler & Hess, G, 2018; Stein et al., 2015); NP - 0.45µm, 1g cc^{-1} (Kooi & Koelmans, 2019), settling velocity 6.3 x 10^{-6} m s^{-1}, cyclic emission of 1particle/hr for 24 hours repeated every 24hours. The resulting particle plots were created to illustrate the extent of particle transport and the elevation (above ground level) relative to the monitoring period (Figure 3). The atmospheric model was capped to 10,000m a.g.l..

(a)



(b)



Figure 3. MP (a) and NP (b) particle plot for all sample periods with the respective particle elevation above ground level.

The model outputs identify MP to be transported generally at or below 2000m a.g.l., with particles transport from relatively close to the site (<100km, potentially due to resuspension of previously deposited atmospheric MP) to 10,000km away. The spatial distribution for this high level visualisation of MP particle movement suggests particles to have been transported from and passing over Europe, north America, northern Africa and the Atlantic Ocean. Comparatively, NP particles appear to extend over a greater northern hemisphere spatial

distance, extending down the north western (Atlantic) African coast, across China and the north Pacific Ocean and encroaching further into the Atlantic side of the Arctic circle than the modelled MP. NP particles occur through the modelled atmosphere, with notable particles predicted to occur above 2000m a.g.l. compared to very few MP modelled at these higher elevations. NP in general were suggested to travel extended distance (<100km) prior to occurring at the field site, with less occurrence of shorter travel compared to MPs.

The model results were disaggregated to try and identify the spatial 'source' areas for MP and NP to this field site using these very general particle parameters and gross sampling conditions. Modelled particle backward trajectories were followed to identify which particles would be found at 'ground level' (0-10m a.g.l. adopted as the surface and entrainment zone), during the sample period (samples November to March 2018). All particles that fell to or below 10m a.g.l. were spatially plotted to identify indicative possible source locations for MP and NP for this site using this simple overview model.



Figure 4. Visualisation of particles at or below 10m a.g.l. during the backward trajectory particle modelling.

High quantities of MP were found at or below 10m a.g.l. during the backward trajectory particle modelling, but notably fewer NP were found at this low elevation. The NP are noted to predominantly stay elevated over the modelled duration therefore presenting a lower particle count within the 0-10m a.g.l. 'ground level' illustrated in Figure 4. NP remain elevated for an extended period of time compared to MP, and extend vertically across the entire troposphere (PBL and free troposphere) while MP altitudes are generally lower (<3000m a.g.l.). Both MP and NP backward particle modelling suggests long distance transport, with the majority of particles elevated above ground level close to the sample location (not locally sourced).

If the percentage of particles modelled at an elevation of ground level (≤10m a.g.l.) are counted, the potential spatial source extents can be tentatively identified (Table 1) (for this sample period at this location). The backward particle modelling can identify possible source areas (through analysis of the location where particles are modelled to be at ground level), however, whether there is a plastic pollution source at the modelled location needs further detailed analysis.

Table 1. Potential source areas of MP and NP to this site for the monitored and modelled duration

Microplastic						Nanoplastic		
Location	MP km^{-2}	Potential source*	Location	MP km^{-2}	Potential source*	Location	NP km^{-2}	Potential source*
Spain	0.00602	3%	Germany	0.000142	<1%	Norway	3.34E-06	1%
France	0.005094	3%	Kazakhstan	0.000136	<1%	Afghanistan	3.2E-06	1%
Norway	0.002261	1%	Montenegro	0.000132	<1%	United States	3.04E-06	15%
Andorra	0.001799	<1%	Belarus	8.52E-05	<1%	Kazakhstan	2.73E-06	4%
Canada	0.001395	24%	Mongolia	5.48E-05	<1%	Morocco	2.6E-06	<1%
Portugal	0.001379	<1%	Poland	5.38E-05	<1%	Canada	2.54E-06	18%
Croatia	0.001237	<1%	Kyrgyzstan	4.65E-05	<1%	Mauritania	2.22E-06	1%
Oceans and Seas	0.000120	43%	Hungary	4.53E-05	<1%	Uzbekistan	2.07E-06	<1%
Switzerland	0.000941	<1%	Macedonia	3.64E-05	<1%	Mali	1.88E-06	1%
Iceland	0.000879	<1%	Slovakia	3.35E-05	<1%	Algeria	1.87E-06	2%
Greenland	0.000851	6%	Czech Republic	3.05E-05	<1%	Sweden	1.27E-06	<1%
Finland	0.000806	1%	Belgium	2.57E-05	<1%	Turkey	1.23E-06	<1%
Netherlands	0.000684	<1%	Italy	2.42E-05	<1%	Russia	1.16E-06	15%
Romania	0.000615	<1%	Afghanistan	2.08E-05	<1%	Egypt	1.11E-06	<1%
Denmark	0.000537	<1%	Bulgaria	1.64E-05	<1%	Iran	6.4E-07	<1%
Russia	0.000522	15%	Algeria	1.5E-05	<1%	Greenland	6.05E-07	2%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.000414	<1%	Mauritania	1.33E-05	<1%	Saudi Arabia	5.75E-07	<1%
Faroe Islands	0.000393	<1%	Georgia	1.31E-05	<1%	Zaire	5.27E-07	<1%
Ireland	0.000385	<1%	Lithuania	1.09E-05	<1%	Sudan	4.79E-07	<1%
Estonia	0.00031	<1%	Austria	9.96E-06	<1%	Oceans and Seas	2.44E-07	38%
Moldova	0.0002	<1%	Western Sahara	8.33E-06	<1%	China	1.05E-07	<1%
United Kingdom	<1%	<1%	Tajikistan	6.8E-06	<1%			
Sweden	<1%	<1%	Uzbekistan	6.2E-06	<1%			
United States	<1%	2%	Ukraine	5.44E-06	<1%			
Serbia	<1%	<1%	Turkey	4.93E-06	<1%			
Latvia	<1%	<1%	China	3.47E-06	<1%			
Morocco	<1%	<1%	Mali	2.81E-06	<1%			

* % of total representative MP and NP particles derived from this location

Potential source areas were estimated from model outputs as MP or NP per km^2 and as a percentage of all particles ≤10m a.g.l.. MP or NP per km^2 provide a spatially comparable surface 'emission' rate per designated area (country or ocean areas). The percentage values provide an indicative comparable land mass or ocean specific general contribution to the overall field site during this sample period. While it is acknowledged this is very indicative and not directly representative of the field samples, these results provide a first assessment of the potential gross source areas that may contribute MP and NP to this site.

The simplistic model assessment of potential MP and NP source areas suggests continental Europe (France, Spain, Andorra) and Norway to be key possible areas of MP when source is considered relative to area (MP km^{-2}). When considered as a proportion of the total modelled MP potentially transported to the field site during this monitored period, the marine environment (Atlantic Ocean, Mediterranean Ocean) are suggested to be significant contributors to atmospheric MP (43%). NP appears to be transported from a greater distance,

with Norway, south central Asia (Afghanistan), and north America suggested as possible areas of NP contribution. However, when considered by continent or ocean, the marine environment is suggested to a notable contributor to atmospheric NP at this site (38%), similar to MP model outputs (D. Allen et al., 2022; S. Allen et al., 2020). It is noted that a much greater number of NP particles would be expected for ≤10m a.g.l. if the model was extended backward in time (if the backward particle trajectories were run for long enough to follow particle down to lower atmospheric elevations) rather than being constrained to the monitored duration of the field samples. However, for small NP this could be weeks or more and would change for each particle depending on its trajectory and environmental conditions, resulting in a highly complex and extensive dataset that is not considered appropriate for the overview transport modelling intended to support the MP and NP field findings in this study.

Conclusion

This study presents a direct comparison of NP and MP content in atmospheric deposition samples collected in a relatively remote area of the Pyrenees, France. While MP is analysed by particle and NP is analysed by mass, using simple volume to mass calculations a comparison has been made of both mass and particle count for MP and NP for this monitoring period. NP (<0.45µm) were found to present a comparative mass compared to MP in the same sample, and a correspondingly much higher particle count (NP>>MP particles per sample). The MP and NP sample composition varies, with plastic polymer predominance in the MP particle size range not directly reflected in the NP proportion of the sample. This may be due to the atmospheric transport dynamics of the different particle sizes, acknowledging the smaller NP particles fall within the realms of Brownian motion. The long distance transport necessary to create MP and NP at this sample location may also influence the sample composition, suggesting that NP may have been transported from more extensive distances from the site than MP particles. The HYSPLIT back trajectories illustrate the global long range atmospheric transport of nanoplastic and give indications of the possible source areas. Most notably the ocean is illustrated as the source of ~38% of global atmospheric emissions of nanoplastics. This finding suggests that whilst previous work has shown the ocean as a source for MP, it is also clearly the source of a much greater amount of nanoplastic, and as such requires urgent investigation.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare they have no competing interest

Supplementary materials

Supplementary Dataset (xls)

Supplementary Information

References

Akoueson, F., Chbib, C., Monchy, S., Paul-Pont, I., Doyen, P., Dehaut, A., & Duflos, G. (2021). Identification and quantification of plastic additives using pyrolysis-GC/MS: A review. *Science of the Total Environment*, *773*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145073

Allen, D., Allen, S., Jickells, T., Abassi, S., Baker, A., Bergmann, M., Brahney, J., Butler, T., Dusan, M., Eckhart, S., Kanakidou, M., Laj, P., Levermore, J., Li, D., Liss, P., Liu, K., Majowald, N., Masque, P., Mayes, A., … Duce, R. (2022). The Atmospheric Cycle of Microplastics in the Marine Environment. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, *(in review)*.

Allen, S., Allen, D., Baladima, F., Phoenix, V. R., Thomas, J. L., Le Roux, G., & Sonke, J. E. (2021). Evidence of free tropospheric and long-range transport of microplastic at Pic du Midi Observatory. *Nature Communications*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27454-7

Allen, S., Allen, D., Moss, K., Le Roux, G., Phoenix, V. R., & Sonke, J. (2020). Examination of the ocean as a source for atmospheric microplastics. *PLoS ONE*, *15*(5), e0232746. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232746

Allen, S., Allen, D., Phoenix, V. R., Le Roux, G., Duranteza, P., Simonneau, A., Stéphane, B., & Galop, D. (2019). Atmospheric transport and deposition of microplastics in a remote mountain catchment. *Nature Geoscience*, *12*, 339–344. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0335-5

Ambrosini, R., Azzoni, R. S., Pittino, F., Diolaiuti, G., Franzetti, A., & Parolini, M. (2019). First evidence of microplastic contamination in the supraglacial debris of an alpine glacier. *Environmental Pollution*, *253*, 297–301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.07.005

Banerjee, A., & Shelver, W. L. (2021). Micro- and nanoplastic induced cellular toxicity in mammals: A review. *Science of the Total Environment*, *755*, 142518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142518

Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., & Klages, M. (2015). Marine anthropogenic litter. In M. Bergmann, L. Gutow, & M. Klages (Eds.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter* (1st ed.). Springer Open. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3

Bergmann, M., Mützel, S., Primpke, S., Tekman, M. B., Trachsel, J., & Gerdts, G. (2019). White and wonderful? Microplastics prevail in snow from the Alps to the Arctic. *Science Advances*, *5*(8), eaax1157. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax1157

Bianco, A., & Passananti, M. (2020). Atmospheric Micro and Nanoplastics : An Enormous Microscopic Problem. *Sustainability*, *12*, 7327. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187327

Brahney, J., Hallerud, M., Heim, E., Hahnenbergere, M., & Sukumaran, S. (2020). Plastic rain in protected areas of the United States. *Science*, *368*(6496), 1257–1260. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz5819

Cabrera, M., Valencia, B. G., Lucas-Solis, O., Calero, J. L., Maisincho, L., Conicelli, B., Massaine Moulatlet, G., & Capparelli, M. V. (2020). A new method for microplastic sampling and isolation in mountain glaciers: A case study of one antisana glacier, Ecuadorian Andes. *Case Studies in Chemical and Environmental Engineering*, *2*(September), 100051. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cscee.2020.100051

Deng, Y., Yan, Z., Shen, R., Wang, M., Huang, Y., Ren, H., Zhang, Y., & Lemos, B. (2020). Microplastics release phthalate esters and cause aggravated adverse effects in the mouse gut. *Environment International*, *143*, 105916.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105916

Draxler, R. R., & Hess, G, D. (2018). *Description of the Hysplit4 modeling system*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255682850_Description_of_the_HYSPLIT_4_modelling_system

Ferreira, I., Venâncio, C., Lopes, I., & Oliveira, M. (2019). Nanoplastics and marine organisms: What has been studied? *Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology*, *67*(November 2018), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2019.01.006

Feynman, R. (1963). *Brownian motion*. Feynman Lectures. https://www.feynmanlectures.caltech.edu/I_41.html

Frias, J. P. G. L., & Nash, R. (2019). Microplastics: Finding a consensus on the definition. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *138*(November 2018), 145–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.11.022

Gigault, J., El Hadri, H., Nguyen, B., Grassl, B., Rowenczyk, L., Tufenkji, N., Feng, S., & Wiesner, M. (2021). Nanoplastics are neither microplastics nor engineered nanoparticles. *Nature Nanotechnology*, *16*(5), 501–507. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-021-00886-4

Gonçalves, J. M., & Bebianno, M. J. (2021). Nanoplastics impact on marine biota: A review. *Environmental Pollution*, *273*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.116426

Huang, J. N., Wen, B., Zhu, J. G., Zhang, Y. S., Gao, J. Z., & Chen, Z. Z. (2020). Exposure to microplastics impairs digestive performance, stimulates immune response and induces microbiota dysbiosis in the gut of juvenile guppy (Poecilia reticulata). *Science of the Total Environment*, *733*, 138929. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138929

Huntington, A., Corcoran, P. L., Jantunen, L., Thaysen, C., Bernstein, S., Stern, G. A., & Rochman, C. M. (2020). A first assessment of microplastics and other anthropogenic particles in Hudson Bay and the surrounding eastern Canadian Arctic waters of Nunavut. *Facets*, *5*(1), 432–454. https://doi.org/10.1139/FACETS-2019-0042

Joachim, C. (2005). To be nano or not to be nano? *Nature Materials*, *4*(2), 107–109. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat1319

Kim, S.-K., Lee, H.-J., Kim, J.-S., Kang, S.-H., Yang, E.-J., Cho, K.-H., Tian, Z., & Andrady, A. (2021). Importance of Seasonal Sea Ice in the Western Arctic Ocean to the Arctic and Global Microplastic Budgets. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.125971

Kooi, M., & Koelmans, A. A. (2019). Simplifying Microplastic via Continuous Probability Distributions for Size, Shape,and Density. *Environmental Science and Technology Letters*, *6*(9), 551–557. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.9b00379

Li, B., Ding, Y., Cheng, X., Sheng, D., Xu, Z., Rong, Q., Wu, Y., Zhao, H., Ji, X., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Polyethylene microplastics affect the distribution of gut microbiota and inflammation development in mice. *Chemosphere*, *244*, 125492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.125492

Li, T., & Raizen, M. G. (2013). Brownian motion at short time scales. *Annalen Der Physik*, *525*(4), 281–295. https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.201200232

Liu, S., Wu, X., Gu, W., Yu, J., & Wu, B. (2020). Influence of the digestive process on intestinal toxicity of polystyrene microplastics as determined by in vitro Caco-2 models. *Chemosphere*, *256*, 127204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127204

Materić, D., Kasper-Giebl, A., Kau, D., Anten, M., Greilinger, M., Ludewig, E., van Sebille, E.,

Röckmann, T., & Holzinger, R. (2020). Micro- and nanoplastics in Alpine snow – a new method for chemical identification and quantification in the nanogram range. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *54*(5), 2353–2359. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b07540

Materic, D., Kjær, H. A., Vallelonga, P., Tison, J.-L., Rockmann, T., & Holzinger, R. (2022). Nanoplastics measurements in Northern and Southern polar ice. *Environmental Research*, *208*, 112741. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.112741

Materić, D., Ludewig, E., Brunner, D., Rochmann, T., & Holzinger, R. (2021). Nanoplastics transport to the remote, high-altitude Alps. *Environmental Pollution*, *288*(117697). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.117697

Menges, F. (2018). *Spectragryph* (v1.2.8). https://www.effemm2.de/spectragryph/index.html

Mitrano, D. M., Wick, P., & Nowack, B. (2021). Placing nanoplastics in the context of global plastic pollution. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-021-00888-2

Munno, K., Frond, H. De, Donnell, B. O., & Rochman, C. M. (2020). Increasing the accessibility for characterizing microplastics : Introducing new application-based and spectral libraries of plastic particles (SLoPP & SLoPP-E). *Analytical Chemistry*, *92*(3), 2443–2451. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.9b03626

Okoffo, E. D., Ribeiro, F., O'Brien, J. W., O'Brien, S., Tscharke, B. J., Gallen, M., Samanipour, S., Mueller, J. F., & Thomas, K. V. (2020). Identification and quantification of selected plastics in biosolids by pressurized liquid extraction combined with double-shot pyrolysis gas chromatography–mass spectrometry. *Science of the Total Environment*, *715*(January), 136924. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136924

Piccardo, M., Renzi, M., & Terlizzi, A. (2020). Nanoplastics in the oceans: Theory, experimental evidence and real world. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *157*(April), 111317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.111317

Primpke, S., Cross, R. K., Mintenig, S. ., Simon, M., Vianello, A., Gerdts, G., & Vollertsen, J. (2020). Toward the Systematic Identification of Microplastics in the Environment: Evaluation of a New Independent Software Tool (siMPle) for Spectroscopic Analysis. *Applied Spectroscopy*, *74*(9), 1127–1138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003702820917760

Rubio, L., Marcos, R., & Hernández, A. (2020). Potential adverse health effects of ingested micro- and nanoplastics on humans. Lessons learned from in vivo and in vitro mammalian models. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health - Part B: Critical Reviews*, *23*(2), 51–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/10937404.2019.1700598

Stein, A. F., Draxler, R. R., Rolph, G. D., Stunder, B. J. B., Cohen, M. D., & Ngan, F. (2015). NOAA's HYSPLIT Atmospheric Transport and Dispersion Modeling System. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *96*(12), 2059–2077. https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00110.1

Trainic, M., Flores, J. M., Pinkas, I., Pedrotti, M. L., Lombard, F., Bourdin, G., Gorsky, G., Boss, E., Rudich, Y., Vardi, A., & Koren, I. (2020). Airborne microplastic particles detected in the remote marine atmosphere. *Communications Earth & Environment*, *1*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-020-00061-y

Wahl, A., Le Juge, C., Davranche, M., El Hadri, H., Grassl, B., Reynaud, S., & Gigault, J. (2021). Nanoplastic occurrence in a soil amended with plastic debris. *Chemosphere*, *262*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127784

Wright, S. L., & Kelly, F. J. (2017). Plastic and Human Health: A Micro Issue? *Environmental*

Science and Technology, *51*(12), 6634–6647. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b00423

Wright, S. L., Ulke, J., Font, A., Chan, K. L. ., & Kelly, F. J. (2020). Atmospheric microplastic deposition in an urban environment and an evaluation of transport. *Environment International*, *136*, 105411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105411

Xu, J. L., Thomas, K. V., Luo, Z., & Gowen, A. A. (2019). FTIR and Raman imaging for microplastics analysis: State of the art, challenges and prospects. *TrAC - Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, *119*, 115629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2019.115629

Yang, H., Lai, H., Huang, J., Sun, L., Mennigen, J. A., Wang, Q., Liu, Y., Jin, Y., & Tu, W. (2020). Polystyrene microplastics decrease F–53B bioaccumulation but induce inflammatory stress in larval zebrafish. *Chemosphere*, *255*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127040

Yang, T., Luo, J., & Nowack, B. (2021). Characterization of Nanoplastics, Fibrils, and Microplastics Released during Washing and Abrasion of Polyester Textiles. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *55*(23), 15873–15881. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04826

Yee, M. S. L., Hii, L. W., Looi, C. K., Lim, W. M., Wong, S. F., Kok, Y. Y., Tan, B. K., Wong, C. Y., & Leong, C. O. (2021). Impact of microplastics and nanoplastics on human health. *Nanomaterials*, *11*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano11020496

Zheng, Y., Li, J., Sun, C., Cao, W., Wang, M., Jiang, F., & Ju, P. (2021). Comparative study of three sampling methods for microplastics analysis in seawater. *Science of the Total Environment*, *765*, 144495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144495

Highlights

- Comparable micro and nanoplastic assessment is vital to advancing source-transport-fate assessments.
- There are effective methods to compare atmospheric micro and nanoplastics
- Comparative analysis suggests order of magnitude greater nanoplastic particles in the atmosphere
- Nanoplastics are transported further and across a greater altitude range
- Tentative global source assessment of atmospheric micro(nano)plastics

Graphical Abstract



Supplementary Information

Supplementary Dataset

Click here to access/download

Supplementary Material

Supplementary dataset_for submission.xlsx

Statement of Novelty

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Ocean Frontiers Institute (OFI) for the support of Steve Allen through the International Postdoctoral Fellowship, the Leverhulme Trust, grant ECF-2019-306, for their support of Deonie Allen and the EPSRC doctoral scholarship provided to Anna MacDonald. The authors acknowledge the support provided to Gael Le Roux by the ANR-20-CE34-0014 Atmo-Plastic project, the Plasticopyr project within the Interreg V-A Spain-France- Andorra programme, the CNRS TRAM Project and ANR-15-CE01-0008, Observatoire Homme- Milieu Pyrénées Haut Vicdessos - LABEX DRIIHM ANR-11-LABX0010. The authors also acknowledge the support from Dutch Research Council (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – NWO) projects: “Nanoplastics: hormone-mimicking and inflammatory responses?” (grant number OCENW.XS2.078) and “Size distribution of nanoplastics in indoor, urban and rural air” (grant number OCENW.XS21.2.042) provided to Dušan Materić.