

### Dimethomorph degradation in vineyards examined by isomeric and isotopic fractionation

Jérémy Masbou, Sylvain Payraudeau, Benoit Guyot, Gwenaël Imfeld

### ► To cite this version:

Jérémy Masbou, Sylvain Payraudeau, Benoit Guyot, Gwenaël Imfeld. Dimethomorph degradation in vineyards examined by isomeric and isotopic fractionation. Chemosphere, 2023, 313, pp.137341. 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.137341. hal-03872967

### HAL Id: hal-03872967 https://hal.science/hal-03872967v1

Submitted on 26 Nov 2022

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

1	Dimethomorph degradation in vineyards
2	examined by isomeric and isotopic fractionation
3	
4	Jérémy Masbou <sup>1</sup> , Sylvain Payraudeau <sup>1</sup> , Benoit Guyot <sup>1</sup> , Gwenaël Imfeld <sup>1,</sup> *
5	
6	<sup>1</sup> Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, ENGEES, ITES UMR7063, F-67084 Strasbourg, France.
7	
8	RECEIVED DATE
9	* Corresponding author:
10	Gwenaël Imfeld, Ph.D.
11	Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, ENGEES, ITES UMR7063, F-67084 Strasbourg, France.
12	E-mail: imfeld@unistra.fr
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Manuscript for Chemosphere
19	

### 20 Abstract

21 Knowledge of the degradation extent and pathways of fungicides in the environment is 22 scarce. Fungicides may have isomers with distinct fungal-control efficiency, toxicity and fate 23 in the environment, requiring specific approaches to follow up the degradation of individual 24 isomers. Here we examined the degradation of the widely used fungicide dimethomorph (DIM) in a vineyard catchment using the signatures of carbon stable isotopes ( $\delta^{13}$ C) and E/Z 25 26 isomer fractionation (IF(Z)). In a microcosm laboratory experiment, DIM degradation halflife in soil was 20  $\pm$  3 days, and was associated with significant isomeric ( $\Delta$ IF(Z) = +30%) 27 and isotopic ( $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C up to 7 ‰) fractionation. This corresponds to an isomer enrichment factor 28 of  $\varepsilon_{IR} = -54 \pm 6\%$ , suggesting isomer selectivity and similar carbon stable isotopic 29 fractionation values of  $\varepsilon_{\text{DIM-(Z)}} = -1.6 \pm 0.2$  ‰ and  $\varepsilon_{\text{DIM-(E)}} = -1.5 \pm 0.2$  ‰. Isomeric and 30 31 isotopic fractionation values were used to estimate DIM degradation in topsoil and transport in a vineyard catchment over two wine-growing seasons. DIM concentrations following DIM 32 application were up to 3  $\mu$ g.g<sup>-1</sup> in topsoil and 29  $\mu$ g.L<sup>-1</sup> in runoff water at the catchment 33 outlet. Accordingly, the IF(Z) and  $\delta^{13}$ C values of DIM in soil were similar to those observed 34 in DIM commercial formulations. The gradual enrichments in DIM-(Z) and <sup>13</sup>C of the 35 residual DIM in soil indicated DIM biodegradation over time. DIM biodegradation estimated 36 37 based on E/Z isomer and carbon stable isotope ratios in topsoil and runoff water ranged from 0% after DIM application up to 100% at the end of the wine-growing season. DIM 38 39 biodegradation was overestimated compared to conventional approaches relying on DIM 40 mass balance, field concentrations and half-lives. Altogether, our study highlights the 41 usefulness of combining carbon isotopes, E/Z isomers and classical approaches to estimate fungicide degradation at the catchment scale, and uncovers difficulties in using laboratory-42 derived values in field studies. 43

- 44 KEYWORDS: Dimethomorph, isotopes, isomers, CSIA, ISIA, vineyard, pesticides
- 45 HIGHLIGHTS:
- Degradation estimates of dimethomorph (DIM), a widely used fungicide in vineyards
- DIM half-life of  $20 \pm 3$  days in vineyard topsoil
- 48 DIM isomer selectivity ( $\epsilon_{IR} = -54 \pm 6\%$ ) during biodegradation
- 49 Carbon isotopic fractionation (εc) similar for DIM-(E) and DIM-(Z) biodegradation
- Stable isotopes and isomers to estimate DIM degradation at the catchment scale
- 51

### 52 TOC-ART:



53

55

# 56 **1.Introduction**

57 The proportion of modern pesticide formumations with active ingredients containing 58 several isomers has gradually increased over the last decade (Jeschke, 2018). Stereoisomers 59 are molecules with the same molecular formula and constitution, but differing in the three-60 dimensional orientations of their atoms in space. The great majority of manufactured 61 stereoisomeric pesticides are mixture of stereoisomers, although the bioactivity is primarily 62 associated with only one stereoisomer (Kurihara et al., 1997). Individual stereoisomers, however, may differ in pest-control efficiency (Garrison, 2006), toxicity (Huang et al., 2012; 63 64 Xie et al., 2018; Zhai et al., 2019), and fate (Buser et al., 2000; Gámiz et al., 2016; Hegeman and Laane, 2002). Within stereoisomers, diastereisomers (e.g., (E)/(Z)) are molecules which 65 66 are neither superimposable nor the image of each other in a mirror. In environmental studies, 67 stereochemistry is often neglected, while isomers are considered as a unique molecular entity. Stereoisomer-specific studies are thus crucial to assess the risks associated with 68 69 stereoisomeric pesticides (Basheer, 2018; de Albuquerque et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2005; Petrie 70 et al., 2015).

71 The widely used fungicide dimethomorph (4-[3-(4-chlorophenyl)-3-(3-4-dimethox-72 yphenyl) acryloyl] morpholine) (DIM) contains a double bond and consists of the 73 stereoisomers DIM-(E) and DIM-(Z). The frequent detection of DIM in vineyard soils, waters 74 and grapes mirrors regular DIM applications and moderate DIM degradation in soil (half-life 75 T<sub>1/2</sub> range: 41-96 days in aerobic soils (EFSA, 2006)), posing a risk for surrounding living 76 organisms (Imfeld et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2012; Shabeer et al., 2015). DIM was selected in 77 this study as a model stereoisomeric pesticide because (i) it is used worldwide and in several 78 crops to control plant diseases, such as mildew and root rot, (ii) the fungicidal activity stems from the (Z)-isomer of DIM (PPDBwebsite), although commercial formulations are not enriched in the (Z)-isomer, and (iii) knowledge of the degradation of individual DIM stereoisomers and the direction of stereoselective degradation of DIM is scarce.

82 Among degradative and nondegradative processes contributing to pesticide dissipation 83 in the environment, DIM biodegradation may be isomer-selective (Huang et al., 2012; Li et 84 al., 2012; Masbou et al., 2018b). DIM biodegradation with preferential use of the E-85 stereoisomer has been reported (Jia and Zhu, 2015; Suryawanshi et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2020), supporting the use of isomeric ratios as a DIM biodegradation proxy. In stereoisomeric 86 87 pollutants, one isomer may degrade faster than the other due to preferential microbial uptake 88 or enzyme activity, stemming from different geometrical recognitions of the isomer molecules 89 (Jammer et al., 2014). Hence, gradual changes in the isomeric fractions (IF) or ratios (IR) 90 from the initial isomeric signature may help evaluate degradation in the field (Jin and Rolle, 91 2016; Williams et al., 2003). However, this approach may be limited for DIM due to its 92 sensitivity to isomerization mechanisms (i.e., interconversion of (E) and (Z) isomers, (Avetta 93 et al., 2014)) and the isomer-selective dependence of DIM degradation on specific soil 94 properties, such as organic matter and pH (Li et al., 2013; Yang and Ji, 2015).

95 In this context, combining isomer analysis and compound-specific stable isotope 96 analysis (CSIA) in the so-called isomer-selective isotope analysis (ISIA or ESIA for 97 enantiomer-specific cases) may help to identify sources and transformations of pesticide 98 isomers in the environment (Badea and Danet, 2015; Maier et al., 2013). Similar to isomers, 99 pesticide molecules with light and heavy stable isotopes are degraded at slightly different 100 rates, which results in a kinetic isotope effect (Hoefs, 1997). Pesticide CSIA can be used to 101 evaluate the *in situ* biodegradation of pesticides and has been applied in various experimental 102 settings (Cui et al., 2021; Drouin et al., 2021; Droz et al., 2021; Masbou et al., 2018a; Melsbach et al., 2020; Meyer et al., 2009; Pérez-Rodríguez et al., 2021; Torrentó et al., 2021) 103

104 and in modelling studies (Lutz et al., 2017). However, field studies involving the pesticide 105 CSIA (Alvarez-Zaldívar et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2018) remain limited thus far, mainly due to 106 conceptual and analytical limits. ESIA has been developed for several chiral compounds (e.g., 107 polar herbicides, HHCB, phenoxyalkanoic methyl herbicides, anilide fungicides and PCBs) 108 (Jammer et al., 2014; Maier et al., 2013; Masbou et al., 2018b; Milosevic et al., 2013; Tang et 109 al., 2017; Wang et al., 2013). In contrast, ISIA is currently limited to hexachlorocyclohexane 110 (HCH) isomers (Badea et al., 2011; Bashir et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2014). Here we 111 hypothesised that the application of DIM-ISIA may help to evaluate the contribution of DIM 112 biodegradation to the overall DIM dissipation in the field, where both degradative and 113 nondegradative processes co-occur.

The purpose of this study was thus to examine the degradation and transport of DIM isomers at the scale of a small (42.7 ha) vineyard catchment (Rouffach, France) using isotopic and isomeric signatures. ISIA and isomeric ratios measurements were developed for DIM isomers and applied to both laboratory microcosm experiments and field samples to evaluate (i) the degradation of DIM isomers in vineyard topsoil and runoff water, and (ii) the applicability of isomeric and isotopic approaches to estimate the contribution of degradation to the overall DIM dissipation at the catchment scale.

### 121 **2. Materials and methods**

### 122 **2.1.** Chemicals and solution preparation

DIM standard (PESTANAL, purity: >97%), metolachlor-d11 (analytical grade purity, >97%), solvents (dichloromethane DCM, acetonitrile ACN, ethyl acetate EtOAc; HPLC grade purity, >99.9%) and sulfate magnesium (MgSO<sub>4</sub>, ReagentPlus®  $\geq$ 99.5%) were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich. Primary secondary amide (PSA)-bonded silica was 127 purchased from Supelco. For further calibration standard preparation and reproducibility 128 check, a stock solution of DIM at 1 g.L<sup>-1</sup> was prepared in dichloromethane (DCM) and stored 129 at -18 °C until analysis. In the absence of DIM(E) or DIM(Z) standards, all measurements and 130 experiments were carried out using available DIM standard from Sigma-Aldrich (IF(Z) = 0.61 131  $\pm$  0.01, n=10).

132 **2.2.** *Study site* 

133 The 42.7 ha Hohrain vineyard catchment is located in the Alsatian foothills (47°57'9 134 N, 07°17'3 E) and is representative of northern vineyards (Duplay et al., 2014; Imfeld et al., 135 2020) (Figure S1). The catchment has a mean slope of 15% and is mainly occupied by 136 vineyards (59%, 25.3 ha), forests and pasture (29%), grass strips and ditches (7%), and roads 137 and paths (5%). The soil is a calcareous clay loam developed on a loess basement with a bulk density of 1.4 g cm<sup>-3</sup>. The main soil types are Cambisol (Hypereutric Clayic) and Haplic 138 139 Cambisol (Calcaric Siltic) (Duplay et al., 2014). Vineyard plots are permanently covered by 140 grass every second inter row to limit soil erosion, and grass-free interrows are ploughed down 141 to a 5 cm depth to enhance water infiltration.

Rainfall-runoff events generate intermittent discharge at the outlet of the catchment, driven by Hortonian overland flow. Vineyard plots contribute to discharge when rainfall intensity overcomes saturated hydraulic conductivity (Tournebize et al., 2012). Grass strips with a 2 to 3 m width at the plot edges limit overland flow on plots (Lefrancq et al., 2014).

146

### 2.3. Pesticide applications and sampling

147 The dose and frequency of pesticide applications were obtained from surveys 148 addressed to wine producers of the catchment in 2015 and 2016. Answers from producers 149 covered 75% and 74% of the total vineyard area in 2015 and 2016, respectively. The dose and 150 timing of applications were extrapolated for the non-surveyed area to calculate the seasonal pesticide applications. The amount of DIM applications in the vineyard catchment estimated by surveys of the farmers was 119 g in 2015 and 5406 g in 2016 (Dose: 2 to 6 kg.ha<sup>-1</sup>) (Imfeld et al., 2020). The high mildew pressure in 2016 associated with unfavourable wet and warm climatic conditions in early summer explained the significant difference in applied amounts between the two years. DIM was applied on June 19<sup>th</sup> in 2015 and between June 20<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> in 2016.

157 The sampling procedure is detailed in Table S1. Briefly, topsoil samples (0-1 cm) 158 were collected weekly from March to October 2015 and 2016 across four transects across the 159 catchment (Figure S1) (Imfeld et al., 2020). Topsoil samples were also collected every 7 to 30 160 days in two adjacent and representative vineyard plots, 1486 m<sup>2</sup> each, namely, P1 and P2 161 (locations on Figure S1). Composite topsoil samples (1 kg) consisted of mixed topsoil 162 subsamples collected every 10 m across the transects in the catchment and every 2 m across 5 163 interrows for each plot. Topsoil samples were transported in coolers and stored at -18 °C until 164 DIM extraction.

165 Runoff samples were collected at the catchment and plot outlets (Imfeld et al., 2020). Briefly, automatic runoff measurement and water sampling were carried out from March 26<sup>th</sup> 166 to October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015, and from March 30<sup>th</sup> to October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Water depth was measured 167 168 at the catchment outlet using a bubbler flow module (Hydrologic) combined with a Venturi 169 channel to monitor discharge runoff, with an uncertainty of  $\pm 8\%$ . Flow proportional samples 170 (100 ml every 6 L) of runoff water were collected during each runoff event using a 4010 171 Hydrologic automatic refrigerated sampler. Runoff water was collected in a 24-bottle sampler 172 with precleaned glass bottles.

173 Runoff water from the plots was collected in a gutter located downstream of each plot.
174 The gutters were covered to limit photolysis and contamination during the passage of
175 agricultural machinery. Water flow at the outlet of the plots was monitored continuously

using an ultrasonic height sensor (ISMA) connected to a flowmeter and combined with an exponential section Venturi channel (ISMA). Runoff water samples were collected in proportion to the flow rate at each flowing event (100 mL every 3 L) using a flow-controlled refrigerated automatic sampler (ISCO). Samples were combined weekly into a composite sample. Water samples were refrigerated during sampling and placed on ice during transport to the laboratory to limit pesticide degradation. Water samples were immediately filtered using a 0.45 µm glass filter membrane and frozen (-18 °C) until extraction and DIM analysis.

183

### 2.4. DIM biodegradation experiment in microcosms

184 Topsoil (0-5 cm) from the vineyard plots (Table S3 for soil physicochemical characteristics) was collected and pooled on August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015, to evaluate isomer and isotope 185 186 fractionation during aerobic DIM biodegradation. The DIM concentration in topsoil before 187 DIM spiking was below the LOD. The soil microcosms consisted of 30 mL glass vials. To 188 maintain aerobic conditions while limiting water loss and avoiding contamination, a 0.2 µm 189 syringe filter (Rotilabo®, Carl Roth®, France) was mounted on a syringe tip stuck through 190 the vial cap (see experimental setup in the SI, Figure S5). Approximately 15 g of soil was 191 incubated, and deionized water was added to reach a volumetric water content of 20% of soil. The soil was spiked with an environmentally relevant concentration of 10  $\mu$ g.g<sup>-1</sup> DIM. Abiotic 192 193 control experiments were prepared similarly to sterilized soils (autoclaved three times at 12-194 hour intervals). Ten separate experiments and 10 abiotic controls were incubated at  $20 \pm 1$  °C 195 and collected using a sacrificial approach at Days 1, 10, 25, 50 and 100 (duplicate 196 measurements at each sampling date).

197

#### 2.5. Dimethomorph extraction and analysis

198 DIM was extracted from water samples using solid-phase extraction (SPE) and from 199 soil samples using QUECHERS modified extraction procedures, as previously described

200 (Gilevska et al., 2022). DIM isomers were quantified by gas chromatography (Trace 1300, 201 Thermo Fisher Scientific) coupled with a mass spectrometer (ISQTM, Thermo Fisher 202 Scientific) using a Metolachlor-d11 isotope-labelled internal standard. As the DIM standard 203 was not certified in DIM(E) and DIM(Z) isomers, the ratios of peak areas for DIM(E) and 204 DIM(Z) isomers obtained from GC-MS in SIM/Fullscan mode and GC-IRMS were used to 205 characterized the DIM standard. Both GC-MS and GC-IRMS measurements gave similar and 206 reproducible (IF(Z) =  $0.61 \pm 0.1$ ) isomer ratios. Distinct calibrations curves were then 207 obtained to evaluate separately DIM(E) and DIM(Z) concentrations. Extraction recoveries, 208 DL and QL from water and soil samples are provided in Table S2.

DIM isomer separation was sufficient for accurate isotope analysis (isomer resolution, R>2) (Hengel and Shibamoto, 2000). Typical chromatograms (pure standard, water and topsoil samples) are provided in SI (Figure S2). The soil extraction procedure had no significant effect on the Z/E isomer ratios and the carbon isotope composition (SI, Section S-3).

#### 214

### 2.6. Carbon stable isotope analysis of dimethomorph

The carbon isotope compositions of DIM isomers ( $\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)}$  and  $\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(E)}$ ) were 215 216 determined using a GC-C-IRMS system consisting of a gas chromatograph (Trace GC Ultra, 217 Thermo Fisher Scientific) coupled via a GC IsoLink/Conflo IV interface (Thermo Fisher Scientific) to an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (DeltaV Plus, Thermo Fisher Scientific). The 218  $\delta^{13}$ C values were calibrated using a three-point calibration using the international reference 219 220 materials AIEA-600, USGS-40, and USGS-41 ( $\sigma < 0.05 \%$ ) and reported in parts per thousand 221 (‰) against the Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (VPDB) reference standard, according to Equation 222 1:

223 
$$\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(X)} = \left(\frac{({}^{13}C_{DIM-(X)}/{}^{12}C_{DIM-(X)})_{sample}}{({}^{13}C_{CO2}/{}^{12}C_{CO2})_{ref}} - 1\right) \times 1000 \tag{1}$$

#### with X =bulk, (Z) or (E)

225 Details of the DIM-ISIA validation protocol are provided in the SI (Section S-3). 226 Briefly, linearity tests were performed on DIM standards, indicating a minimum injection of 6 ngC for both DIM-(E) and DIM-(Z) for reliable DIM CSIA. The measurement precision of 227  $\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -33.6 \pm 0.7 \% (\pm \sigma, n = 20)$  was similar to that of  $\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(E)} = -33.5 \pm 0.7 \%$  and 228  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{Bulk-DIM}} = -33.5 \pm 0.5$  ‰. The total analytical uncertainty of  $\sigma < 0.7$  ‰ for amplitude >100 229 mV (m/z 44) on each isomer (>6 ngC) was consistent with typical CSIA measurements 230 (Schürner et al., 2016). Long-term  $\delta^{13}$ C values obtained during 3 different GC-C-IRMS 231 232 sessions within 3 months (Figure S4 and Table S2) did not significantly differ from the bulk value ( $\delta^{13}C_{Bulk-DIM} = -33.0 \pm 0.5$  %;  $\pm \sigma$ , n = 3) obtained with an elemental analyser-isotopic 233 234 ratio mass spectrometer (Flash EA IsoLinkTM CN IRMS, Thermo Fisher Scientific). Cross-235 calibration of the DIM Sigma-Aldrich standard confirmed insignificant isotopic fractionation 236 associated with the extraction procedure and DIM-ISIA.

237 Despite the robustness of DIM-ISIA analytical method, several field samples (n = 50) 238 failed the quality check due to either low concentrations, yielding peak amplitude <100 mV, 239 or co-elution. The validated DIM-ISIA measurements (n = 29) were thus limited, leading to a 240 discrepancy between soil and water samples in 2015 and 2016.

#### 241

### 2.7. Isomeric fractionation and carbon isotope calculations

Change in the proportion of each isomer was calculated by isomer fractionation IR(Z)
and IF(Z) isomeric ratio and fractionation respectively, and according to:

244 
$$IR(Z) = \frac{[DIM - (Z)]}{[DIM - (E)]}$$
(2)

245 
$$IF(Z) = \frac{[DIM - (Z)]}{[DIM - (Z)] + [DIM - (E)]}$$
(3)

246 *Rac*-DIM mixture thus displays IR(Z) = 1 and IF(Z) = 0.5, while an enrichment in 247 DIM-(Z) features an IR(Z) > 1 and IF(Z) > 0.5. An isotopic balance calculation enabled determining the isotopic composition of bulk-DIM ( $\delta^{13}C_{bulk-DIM}$ ) from the stable isotope ratios of the individual DIM isomers determined by GC-C-IRMS (Badea et al., 2011):

251 
$$\delta^{13}C_{Bulk-DIM} = IF_{DIM-(Z)} \times \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} + IF_{DIM-(E)} \times \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(E)}$$
(4)

252 The bulk-DIM  $\delta^{13}C_{bulk-DIM}$  of the analytical standard was also determined by GC-253 IRMS analysis as a double-peak integration method and by EA-IRMS, confirming the 254 isotopic balance approach (Table S2). Isotopic fractionation values ( $\varepsilon$ ) for DIM-(E) and DIM-255 (Z) were calculated from the logarithmic linearization using the Rayleigh equation:

256 
$$\ln\left(\frac{\delta^{13}C_x+1}{\delta^{13}C_0+1}\right) = \epsilon \times \ln\left(\frac{C_x}{C_0}\right)$$
(5)

where  $\delta^{13}C_0$  and  $\delta^{13}C_x$  are the measured carbon isotope ratios at the beginning (t = 1 day) and at t = x days from the beginning of the experiment, and  $C_0$  and  $C_x$  are the corresponding concentrations.

The carbon isotopic fractionation value (ε), derived from closed soil degradation experiments
under mixed aerobic conditions, were used to quantify field degradation B(%) (AlvarezZaldívar et al., 2018; Höhener et al., 2022; Hunkeler et al., 2008):

263 
$$B(t,\%) = \left(1 - \left(\frac{\delta^{13}C_t + 1000}{\delta^{13}C_0 + 1000}\right)^{\frac{1000}{\varepsilon}}\right) \times 100 \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the Rayleigh equation allows deriving isomeric enrichment factors  $\varepsilon_{IR}$  from linear regression of:

266 
$$\ln\left(\frac{IR(Z)x}{IR(Z)0}\right) = \varepsilon_{IR} \times \ln\left(\frac{c_x}{c_0}\right)$$
(7)

IR is generally prefered to IF for  $\varepsilon_{IR}$  calculations (Jammer et al., 2014). The carbon isotopic fractionation value ( $\varepsilon_{IR}$ ), derived from closed soil degradation experiments under mixed aerobic conditions, were used to quantify field degradation B(%):

270 
$$B(t, \%) = \left(1 - \left(\frac{IR(Z)_t}{IR(Z)_t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right) \times 100 \quad (8)$$

The error of the isotopic fractionation values and the isomeric enrichment factors was given as the 95% confidence interval (CI) and determined using regression analysis, as described elsewhere (Elsner et al., 2007).

#### 274 **2.9.** Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out using JMP software (SAS Institute, USA) and the function "Data Analysis" from the Add-In "Analysis Tool Pack" of Microsoft Excel®. Isotopic and isomeric fractionation values were calculated from linear regressions of Equation (5) and (7) respectively, and rate constants (or half-lives) were determined using a single firstorder rate model (SFO) from plots of ln (C/C<sub>0</sub>) versus time (see SI for details). Measurements were performed in triplicate and all data are displayed as the mean  $\pm 95\%$  CI unless otherwise specified.

### **3.Results and discussion**

283

#### 3.1. Isomer-selective biodegradation of DIM in soil microcosms

In abiotic microcosm experiments,  $DIM_{tot}$  concentrations in soils did not vary over time (Figure 1), except on Day 100 ( $[DIM]_{t=100}/[DIM]_{t=1} = 0.65$ ) in a single replicate. High DIM half-lives ( $T_{1/2} > 100$  days) in abiotic experiments coincided with insignificant isomer selectivity ( $IF(Z) = 0.61 \pm 0.01$ , n = 10). In contrast,  $T_{1/2} = 19.6 \pm 3.2$  days for DIM in biotic microcosms (Table 1) emphasised the prevailing contribution of DIM biodegradation to its overall dissipation in soil. Degradation of the (E)-isomer of DIM ( $T_{1/2 \text{ (DIM-(E))}} = 13.7 \pm 2.7 \pm 2.7$ days) was faster than that of the (Z)-isomer ( $T_{1/2 \text{ (DIM-(Z))}} = 22.2 \pm 5.2$  days). These half-lives are in the range of those reported in previous field dissipation studies ( $T_{1/2 \text{ (DIM-(Z))}} = 9-86$  days and  $T_{1/2 \text{ (DIM-(E))}} = 11-30$  days) (FAO, 2014). Here, the vineyard soil used to derive  $T_{1/2}$  was frequently treated with GripTop® (commercial formulation containing DIM), which may favour DIM-adapted microbial communities and higher DIM dissipation rates.

295 DIM-(Z) isomer fraction (IF(Z)) increased from 0.61  $\pm$  0.01 up to 0.91  $\pm$  0.01 (n = 2) 296 after 100 days, indicating an enrichment in the DIM-(Z) isomer during biodegradation. The relationship between IF(Z) (or IR(Z)) and the degradation extent was significant ( $r^2 > 0.97$ , p\* 297 298 <0.001, n = 8), yielding an IR enrichment factor ( $\varepsilon_{IR}$ ) = -54 ± 6% (Figure S6, equation 7). 299 Although no  $\varepsilon_{IR}$  for DIM was previously retrieved,  $\varepsilon_{IR}$  for other organic molecules, including 300 enantiomers, typically ranged from -4 to -237% (Esslinger et al., 2011; Jammer et al., 2015; Qiu et al., 2014; Souchier et al., 2016). Altogether, these results highlight significant isomer-301 302 selectivity during DIM biodegradation in soil.

303



305 Figure 1: DIM concentrations (a) and IF(Z) (b) in biotic and abiotic soil experiments.

306

#### 307 **3.2. Isomer-selective isotope analysis of DIM in soil microcosms**

The carbon isotope composition ( $\delta^{13}$ C) of DIM in biotic soil experiments varied from 308  $\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -33.7 \pm 0.3 \text{ (m and } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(E)} = -33.5 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} = -29.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ (m (t = 1 day) to } \delta^{13}C_{DIM-(Z)} =$ 309 0.1 ‰ and  $\delta^{13}C_{DIM-(E)}$  = -26.5 ± 0.5 ‰ (t = 100 days). In contrast, no significant change of the 310  $\delta^{13}$ C of both DIM isomers after 100 days in the abiotic experiment confirmed no or limited 311 DIM biodegradation. Isotopic fractionation values for DIM-(Z) ( $\varepsilon_{\text{DIM-(Z)}} = -1.6 \pm 0.2 \%$ , 312 313 equation 5) and DIM-(E) ( $\varepsilon_{\text{DIM-(E)}} = -1.5 \pm 0.2 \text{ }$ ) in the biotic soil experiments were similar 314 (Table 1 and Figure S6). Since this is the first report for DIM bulk or isomer-selective isotopic 315 fractionation,  $\varepsilon_c$  values cannot be compared. The low isotopic fractionation values for DIM 316 reflect isotope dilution since the DIM molecule contains 21 carbon atoms. The two main 317 metabolites expected from a demethylation pathway are M550F006 (Z67, meta desmethyl 318 dimethomorph) and M550F007 (Z69, para desmethyl dimethomorph) (Avetta et al., 2014; 319 Zhang et al., 2020). However, the DIM degradation pathways in soil could not be confirmed 320 based on DIM degradation products as analytical standards are currently lacking.

321

322 Table 1: DIM biodegradation kinetics and isomeric ( $\varepsilon_{IR}$ ) and isotopic ( $\varepsilon_c$ ) fractionation 323 observed in the laboratory biodegradation experiment with the vineyard soil.

	$T_{1/2} \pm 95\%$ CI	$\epsilon_{IR} \pm 95\%$ CI	$\epsilon_c \pm 95\%$ CI		
	[days]	[%]	[%0]		
DIM-(E)	$13.7\pm2.7$		- 1.6 ± 0.2		
DIM-(Z)	$22.2\pm5.2$	- 54 ± 6	$-1.5 \pm 0.2$		
DIMtot	$19.6\pm3.2$		- 1.5 ± 0.2		

324

325

### 3.3. DIM degradation and runoff transport in the vineyard plots

326 Overall, the DIM concentrations in the soil significantly (p <0.001) differed in 2015 327  $(0.25 \pm 0.12 \ \mu g.g^{-1}; n = 114, \text{ plots and catchment samples})$  and 2016  $(1.61 \pm 0.14 \ \mu g.g^{-1}; n =$ 328 93) and followed a seasonal application pattern. At the plot scale, DIM concentrations ranged from below the DL up to 1.8  $\mu$ g.g<sup>-1</sup> and 10.1  $\mu$ g.g<sup>-1</sup> in the topsoil of the vineyard plots in 2015 and 2016, respectively (Figure 2). The DIM concentrations in the P1 and P2 plots were similar (p >0.05), confirming the reproducibility of the sampling strategy.

332 DIM<sub>tot</sub> concentrations in runoff water from the plots ranged from <LD up to 12 µg.L<sup>-1</sup> 333 and were above the French drinking water limit of 0.1 µg. L<sup>-1</sup> for 31 of the 39 samples. 334 Although EFSA estimates that DIM acute toxicity towards aquatic organisms is low (EFSA, 335 2006), several studies underscored an ecotoxic risk for several living organisms, including 336 soil and water microflora (Avetta et al., 2014; Lunn, 2007) or in mixtures with other 337 substances, such as difenoconazole (Fan et al., 2021) or copper (Megateli et al., 2013).

338 Altogether, isomeric fractionation values of the IF(Z) of DIM in the plot topsoil and 339 runoff water indicated significant DIM degradation. Indeed, the IF(Z) values from 0.5 to 0.8 340 in the vineyard plots in 2015 and 2016 were generally larger than the IF(Z) value of the DIM 341 commercial formulation (GripTop®;  $0.50 \pm 0.02$ ). This highlights that DIM-(Z) was 342 systematically enriched in topsoil and runoff, while DIM-(E) degraded preferentially, in 343 agreement with the results of the soil microcosm experiments. Similar IF(Z) values in topsoil 344 and in runoff water at the plot scale suggest that DIM in runoff stems from a unique DIM pool 345 in soil.



Figure 2. DIM topsoil concentrations (a) and IF(Z) (b) at the plot and catchment scales. The
periods correspond to vine budding and initial growth before DIM application (March–June),
vine growth following DIM application (July–August) and the end of the season after
harvesting (September–October). Dashed line in Figure 2b) represent the IF(Z) of the applied
formulation.

352

### 3.4.DIM degradation and runoff transport in the vineyard catchment

353 At the catchment scale, the DIM concentrations and IF(Z) in the topsoil were similar to those obtained at the plot scale (Figure 2), confirming the homogeneity of DIM 354 355 applications. DIM concentrations in runoff collected at the catchment outlet were similar in 2015 (3.0 ± 6.2 µg. L<sup>-1</sup>; n = 13) and 2016 (5.0 ± 9.5 µg. L<sup>-1</sup>; n = 15) (Table 2). The DIM mass 356 export at the catchment outlet reached 2.3 g in 2015 and 4.7 g in 2016 (Imfeld et al., 2020). 357 358 The DIM concentrations increased in both topsoil and runoff water following DIM application, with DIM export coefficients reaching 0.7% (Figure 3a and (Imfeld et al., 2020)). 359 The DIM concentrations in topsoil in 2016 reached 2.9 µg.g<sup>-1</sup> (June 22nd), during the main 360 application (June 20th – 23th 2016), and gradually decreased to 1.2  $\mu$ g.g<sup>-1</sup> at the end of the 361 362 sampling campaign (October 5th). Considering a layer of 1 cm of topsoil, this corresponds to 363 DIM masses from 4.3 to 10 kg in the overall catchment topsoil. The DIM masses were similar 364 to the applied masses (5.4 kg in 2016), supporting the idea of DIM storage in topsoil with 365 limited yearly DIM degradation and export by surface runoff.

366 Table 2: DIM concentrations, IF(Z) and  $\delta^{13}C$  values in the vineyard catchment.

Year	Rainfall depth	Outlet runoff volume	Number of runoff events	Matrix	[DIM <sub>tot</sub> ]	IF(Z)	$\delta^{13}C_{DIM\text{-}(Z)}$	$\delta^{13}C_{DIM\text{-}(E)}$
	(mm)	(m <sup>3</sup> )			$(\mu g.g^{-1} \text{ or } \mu g.L^{-1})$		(‰)	(‰)
		Commercia Grip®To	al formulatio op (BASF)	n	90 g.kg <sup>-1*</sup>	$0.50 \pm 0.02$ (n = 6)	$-33.2 \pm 0.7$ (n = 3)	$-33.7 \pm 0.3$ (n = 3)
2015	239	1577	32	Topsoil	$0.11 \pm 0.09$ (n = 15)	$0.63 \pm 0.08$ (n = 15)	n.d.	n.d.

				Runoff	$3.0 \pm 6.2$ (n = 13)	$0.81 \pm 0.15$ (n = 12)	$-32.1 \pm 0.9$ (n = 7)	$-29.2 \pm 1.4$ (n = 6)
2016	310	2027	47	Topsoil	$1.5 \pm 1.1$ (n = 20)	$0.65 \pm 0.10$ (n = 20)	$-30.7 \pm 1.7$ (n = 8)	$-28.6 \pm 2.7$ (n = 8)
2016				Runoff	$5.0 \pm 9.5$ (n = 15)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.72 \pm 0.09 \\ (n=15) \end{array}$	n.d.	n.d.

367 *n.d.: not determined* 

368 \* DIM concentration in the commercial formulation Grip®Top (BASF)

369

The apparent DIM field dissipation of  $128 \pm 60$  days (T<sub>1/2 field</sub>  $\pm 95\%$  CI, n = 13) was 370 higher than the half-life of DIM ( $T_{1/2 \text{ lab}} = 19.6 \pm 3.2 \text{ d}$ ) in laboratory experiments (Figure S7). 371 372 This indicates that DIM biodegradation was slower in the field than under laboratory-373 controlled conditions. Overall, IF(Z) values reflected DIM applications, with IF(Z) in runoff 374 decreasing after DIM applications. IF(Z) > 0.9 in runoff in early 2015 indicated degradation in 375 soil of the residual DIM from the previous DIM application in 2014. IF(Z) decreased to  $\Box 0.5$ 376 following the application of the Griptop® formulation (IF(Z) =  $0.50 \pm 0.02$ , Table 2), and 377 gradually increased up to 0.8-1 over time. In contrast, IF(Z) did not change much (IF(Z) =378  $0.63 \pm 0.08$ ) in topsoil across the 2015 season and was globally lower than in runoff water 379  $(IF(Z) = 0.81 \pm 0.15 \text{ Table 2}).$ 

380 IF(Z) variations in topsoil and runoff water were consistent with DIM biodegradation 381 estimates (Figure 3). IF(Z) in 2016 ranged from 0.6 to 0.8 in runoff, whereas it decreased after DIM applications (June 20<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup>) and gradually increased from 0.5 to 0.8 in topsoil (Figure 382 3b). Accordingly, estimates of biodegradation extent (B(%)) derived from  $\varepsilon_{IR}$  values obtained 383 384 in laboratory experiments (equation 8) were significantly higher in the runoff water (B(%) = 385  $82 \pm 8\%$ ) than in the topsoil (B(%) = 58 ± 10%) in 2015 and 2016 (Figure 3b). Overall, this 386 suggests a preferential export of the degraded fraction of DIM from the topsoil into the runoff water. This supports the idea that DIM sorption (Koc =  $300 - 600 \text{ L.kg}^{-1}$ , (Boesten and 387 Matser, 2017)) may reduce the DIM bioavailability, and thus DIM degradation, in topsoil. 388



Figure 3: Total DIM concentration (DIM<sub>tot</sub>) (a), DIM isomeric fractionation (IF(Z)) (b), and DIM isomer specific isotope composition for carbon ( $\delta^{13}$ C) compared to  $\delta^{13}$ C of the commercial formulation (c) in transect topsoils (filled symbols) and outlet runoff waters (empty symbols). DIM biodegradation (B(%)) were estimated as described in the Materials and Methods section (equation 5 and 6).

# **3.5.** DIM isomer-specific isotopic fractionation in vineyard catchment topsoil and runoff

400 DIM ISIA was carried out in runoff (2015) and topsoil (2016) samples with sufficient DIM concentrations (Figure 3c). In 2015, the initial  $\delta^{13}C$  values of DIM in runoff ( $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(Z)}}$ 401  $= -30.7 \pm 1.2$  ‰ and  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(E)}} = -27.9 \pm 1.2$  ‰, june 18<sup>th</sup>) decreased ( $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(Z)}} = -33.3 \pm$ 402 1.9 ‰  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(E)}} = -31.0 \pm 2.2$  ‰, july 23<sup>rd</sup>) after DIM application, and were close to  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM}}$ 403 value of the DIM commercial formulation (GripTop®;  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(Z)}} = -33.2 \pm 0.7$ ;  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(E)}} =$ 404 -33.7 ± 0.3, Table 2). However, the  $\delta^{13}$ C values gradually increased ( $\delta^{13}$ C<sub>DIM-(Z)</sub> = -31.2 ± 0.5 405 %;  $\delta^{13}C_{\text{DIM-(E)}} = -28.03 \pm 0.5$  %) at the end of the season (Figure 3c). This gradual 406 enrichment in <sup>13</sup>C of the remaining DIM fraction exported during runoff indicates DIM 407 408 biodegradation in the vineyard soil, as previously observed with S-metolachlor in a crop 409 catchment (Alvarez-Zaldívar et al., 2018).

410 The isotopic fractionation values ( $\varepsilon_{\text{DIM-(Z)}} = -1.6 \pm 0.2$  % and  $\varepsilon_{\text{DIM-(E)}} = -1.5 \pm 0.2$  %, 411 Table 1) derived from the soil microcosm experiments were used to estimate DIM 412 biodegradation, following the isotopic approach. Biodegradation estimates using the isotopic 413 approach (equation 6) ranged from 38 to 99% for DIM-(E) and from 0 to 97% for DIM-(Z) in topsoil and runoff water (Figures 3c). Changes in DIM isotope signatures ( $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C up to 6 ‰) 414 415 corresponded to an average biodegradation of 67% for DIM-(E) and 85% for DIM-(Z) in 416 topsoil, whereas biodegradation estimations in runoff average 44% for DIM-(E) and 92% for 417 DIM-(Z) (Figure 3c). Overall, DIM ISIA confirmed the gradual DIM degradation in topsoil 418 following DIM application.

419

#### 3.6. Comparison of DIM degradation estimates in the vineyard catchment

420 Overall, estimates of biodegradation extent B(%) obtained using the isomeric and 421 isotopic approaches in runoff significantly differed (p<0.05), whereas B(%) in topsoil was 422 similar (Figure S8b). This suggests that distinct processes may affect DIM isomeric 423 fractionation in topsoil and runoff. For instance, DIM photolysis in water may lead to the fast 424 (i.e., a few minutes) interconversion of DIM isomers from (E) to (Z) (Avetta et al., 2014; 425 Lunn, 2007). In contrast, DIM sorbed in topsoil would be less prone to photolysis and 426 interconversion of DIM isomers. The interconversion during photolysis of DIM isomers in 427 runoff water may thus affect isomeric ratios since the water residence time in the vineyard catchment ranges from 10 to 30 minutes. However, no isotope fractionation occurred ( $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C 428 429 <1 ‰ after 90% degradation, data not shown) during DIM photolysis in water under solar 430 irradiation (QSUN XE-1 test chamber, Xe arc lamp, and daylight-Q filter with a nominal cut-431 on of 295 nm). Hence, DIM ISIA may lead to more accurate estimates of DIM biodegradation 432 than estimation relying on isomeric ratios since solar irradiation apparently has limited effect on DIM  $\delta^{13}$ C but may affect IF(Z) values. 433

434 Overall, estimates of B(%) or P(%) (proportion of remaining DIM) in topsoil at the 435 catchment scale largely differ depending on the estimation approach (Figure 4). The isotopic 436 and isomeric approaches vielded B(%) > 88% in topsoil, which are close to B(%) estimates 437 obtained using laboratory half-life values ( $T_{1/2} = 19.6$  d). B(%) estimated with isotopic, isomeric and  $T_{1/2}$  approaches from laboratory experiments were correlated (R<sup>2</sup>>0.86, p <0.05) 438 439 (Figure S9). However, estimates with these lab-derived approaches differed from the observed 440  $T_{1/2}$  (field) of 128 days derived from DIM concentrations in the vineyard soil after the DIM application during the 2016 campaign (SI, Section S-5 and Figure S7). Similarly to  $T_{1/2 \text{ (field)}}$ 441 442 approach, the so-called "field concentration" approach relies on comparing concentrations 443 shift in topsoils between t and t0 (first samples after application date; SI, Section S-5).



445 Figure 4: DIM dissipation in the vineyard soil following DIM application (2016) estimated 446 with different approaches. See Section S-5 in the SI for calculations. \*Estimation of 447 dissipation extent (otherwise, biodegradation extent is estimated). Error bars represent the 448 standard deviation of the method estimated via error propagation.

444

449 This dicrepency between approaches suggests that the isotopic and isomeric 450 approaches overestimated B(%) in the field and/or that using the field  $T_{1/2}$  value 451 underestimated B(%). Estimates of DIM dissipation from DIM application onwards using the 452 mass balance approach indicated that B(%) was close to zero (i.e., no DIM biodegradation) to 453 balance DIM applications and stocks in the vineyard topsoil (SI, Section S-5). However, the 454 mass balance results must be considered with caution because of the large uncertainties in 455 such calculations. For instance, the low B(%) derived from this approach may be due to an 456 overestimation of the DIM mass budget in soil (6920  $\pm$  1594 g, 95% CI, n = 15, from June 22<sup>nd</sup> to October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016), which is based on the DIM concentrations in topsoil (i.e., top first 457 458 cm) from transect. In addition, the doses of DIM application (5406 g in 2016, (Imfeld et al., 459 2020)) may have been underestimated when extrapolating the survey results to the entire 460 catchment or due to underreporting of DIM usage by winegrowers.

Overall, the discrepancy among complementary approaches to estimate DIM 461 462 degradation highlights the interest and difficulties to quantify the contribution of pesticide 463 biodegradation to the overall dissipation in the field. Although different approaches yielded 464 similar estimates when examining S-metolachlor dissipation at the catchment scale (Alvarez-465 Zaldívar et al., 2018), different approaches led to distinct estimates of DIM dissipation. 466 Several reasons may explain this difference. First, reference values derived from laboratory 467 experiments (i.e., isotopes, isomers and  $T_{1/2}$  (lab)) may overestimate the dissipation compared 468 to field-derived parameters (i.e., mass balance,  $T_{1/2}$  (field) and the field concentrations). This 469 may reflect the high sensitivity of DIM to degradation conditions, including microbial 470 communities, temperature, humidity, and DIM formulations, differing under laboratory and 471 field conditions. Second, additional degradation/volatilization and unknown processes 472 affecting DIM on the wine leaves may alter the isomeric and stable isotope composition of 473 DIM before it enters into the soil and runoff water. Whil S-metolachlor is applied directly to 474 soil, DIM is applied to leaves, where it is supposed to remain as long as possible to protect 475 plants from fungi after rainfall events. Indeed, the GripTop manufacturer (BASF) states that 476 DIM is safe from leaching once the spray has dried on the treated plant organs, approximately 477 one hour after treatment. Hence, DIM may persist (approximately 12-14 days) on the leaves 478 independent of the occurrence of rainfall. Overall, we hypothesise that the wine leaves may be 479 an important intermediate compartment before DIM reaches the soil. This also advocates 480 considering all compartments where pesticide degradation can occur once applied in the field 481 and carefully comparing field and laboratory degradation estimates.

# 482 **4. Conclusions**

483 Knowledge of the contribution of fungicide degradation to the overall dissipation in 484 agricultural catchments is scarce. In this study, we examined the potential of isomer and 485 stable isotope fractionation to evaluate DIM degradation at the vineyard plot and catchment 486 scales. Despite the large amount of carbon in the DIM molecule, significant carbon isotope fractionation ( $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C  $\Box$ 5 %) occurred during biodegradation in microcosm soil experiments 487 and in the field ( $\Delta \delta^{13}$ C up to 7 ‰). Enrichment in both the (Z)-isomer and in <sup>13</sup>C of DIM 488 489 following DIM application indicated significant DIM degradation in both topsoil and runoff 490 water. Altogether, our results underscored substantial DIM immobilization in the vineyard 491 soil, while a small pool of bioavailable DIM may be degraded and exported by surface runoff 492 waters. Indeed, the isomeric approach, highlighted the preferential export of a highly 493 degraded fraction of DIM in runoff water compared to the DIM stored in the topsoil, with 494 limited (<1%) DIM export by surface runoff.

495 The comparison of the DIM degradation estimates obtained from isomeric and isotopic fractionation with those retrieved from classical approaches, including  $T_{1/2 \text{ (lab)}}$  and 496 497  $T_{1/2 \text{ (field)}}$ , and mass balances, underlined the difficulty to use values derived from laboratory 498 experiments to estimate fungicide degradation in the field. For instance, the use of 499 degradation kinetics and values retrieved from the laboratory experiments (i.e., isotopic, isomeric and  $T_{1/2 \text{ (lab)}}$ ) overestimated the DIM dissipation compared to field estimates relying 500 501 on  $T_{1/2 \text{ (field)}}$ , mass balance, and field concentrations. Since fungicides are primarily applied to 502 plant leaves, the foliar compartment cannot be neglected as a potential site of degradation 503 processes, including photolysis and biodegradation, which may result in significant isomer 504 and/or isotope fractionation. Laboratory experiments targeting fungicide formulation 505 behaviour on leaf surfaces may help in the future to improve estimations of fungicide 506 degradation in vineyards. Overall, this study also emphasised the interest of crossing 507 independent information sources, including application surveys, and applying isotopic and 508 isomeric approaches to estimate fungicide degradation in agricultural catchments.

### 510 Author contribution statement

Jérémy Masbou: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation;
Methodology; Visualization; Writing – original draft. Sylvain Payraudeau: Formal analysis;
Resources; Software; Validation; Writing – review & editing. Benoit Guyot: Data curation;
Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing – review & editing. Gwenaël Imfeld:
Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Funding acquisition; Methodology;
Project administration; Resources; Supervision; Validation; Visualization; Writing – review &

518

### 519 **Declaration of competing interest**

520 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal 521 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### 522 **Data availability**

523 Data will be made available on request.

### 524 Acknowledgements

525 This research has been funded by the Agence de l'Eau Rhin-Meuse (AERM) and the Conseil 526 Interprofessionnel des Vins d'Alsace (CIVA) in the project PACOV and the French National 527 Research Agency ANR through grant ANR-18-CE04-0004-01, project DECISIVE. The 528 authors thank the Agricultural and Viticulture College of Rouffach (EPLEFPA Les Sillons de 529 Haute Alsace Rouffach), the City of Rouffach and the vine producers of the catchment. The 530 authors wish to acknowledge Eric Pernin and Agnès Herrmann for support in sampling,

analyses and surveys.

# 532 Appendix A. Supplementary data

533 Supplementary data to this article can be found online at

# 534 **References**

- Alvarez-Zaldívar, P., Payraudeau, S., Meite, F., Masbou, J., Imfeld, G., 2018. Pesticide degradation and
   export losses at the catchment scale: In sights from compound-specific isotope analysis
   (CSIA). Water Research, 139: 198-207.
- 538Avetta, P. et al., 2014. Phototransformation pathways of the fungicide dimethomorph ((E,Z) 4-[3-(4-539chlorophenyl)-3-(3,4-dimethoxyphenyl)-1-oxo-2-propenyl]morpholine), relevant to sunlit540surface waters. Science of The Total Environment, 500-501: 351-360.
- 541Badea, S.-L., Danet, A.-F., 2015. Enantioselective stable isotope analysis (ESIA) A new concept to542evaluate the environmental fate of chiral organic contaminants. Science of The Total543Environment, 514: 459-466.
- Badea, S.L. et al., 2011. Development of an enantiomer-specific stable carbon isotope analysis (ESIA)
   method for assessing the fate of α-hexachlorocyclo-hexane in the environment. Rapid
   Communications in Mass Spectrometry, 25(10): 1363-1372.
- 547 Basheer, A.A., 2018. Chemical chiral pollution: impact on the society and science and need of the 548 regulations in the 21st century. Chirality, 30(4): 402-406.
- Bashir, S., Fischer, A., Nijenhuis, I., Richnow, H.-H., 2013. Enantioselective carbon stable isotope
   fractionation of hexachlorocyclohexane during aerobic biodegradation by Sphingobium spp.
   Environmental science & technology, 47(20): 11432-11439.
- 552Boesten, J., Matser, A., 2017. Sorption of pymetrozine and dimethomorph to substrate materials.5531566-7197, Wageningen Environmental Research.
- 554Buser, H.-R., Poiger, T., Müller, M.D., 2000. Changed Enantiomer Composition of Metolachlor in555Surface Water Following the Introduction of the Enantiomerically Enriched Product to the556Market. Environmental Science & Technology, 34(13): 2690-2696.
- 557 Cui, G., Lartey-Young, G., Chen, C., Ma, L., 2021. Photodegradation of pesticides using compound-558 specific isotope analysis (CSIA): a review. RSC Advances, 11(41): 25122-25140.
- de Albuquerque, N.C.P., Carrão, D.B., Habenschus, M.D., de Oliveira, A.R.M., 2018. Metabolism
   studies of chiral pesticides: A critical review. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical
   analysis, 147: 89-109.
- 562Drouin, G. et al., 2021. Direct and indirect photodegradation of atrazine and S-metolachlor in563agriculturally impacted surface water and associated C and N isotope fractionation.564Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 23(11): 1791-1802.
- 565Droz, B. et al., 2021. Phase Transfer and Biodegradation of Pesticides in Water–Sediment Systems566Explored by Compound-Specific Isotope Analysis and Conceptual Modeling. Environmental567Science & Technology, 55(8): 4720-4728.
- 568Duplay, J. et al., 2014. Copper, zinc, lead and cadmium bioavailability and retention in vineyard soils569(Rouffach, France): the impact of cultural practices. Geoderma, 230: 318-328.

- 570 EFSA, 2006. Conclusion regarding the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active 571 substance dimethomorph. EFSA Journal, 4(7): 82r.
- Elsner, M., McKelvie, J., Lacrampe Couloume, G., Sherwood Lollar, B., 2007. Insight into Methyl tert Butyl Ether (MTBE) Stable Isotope Fractionation from Abiotic Reference Experiments.
   Environmental Science & Technology, 41(16): 5693-5700.
- 575 Esslinger, S., Becker, R., Maul, R., Nehls, I., 2011. Hexabromocyclododecane enantiomers:
   576 microsomal degradation and patterns of hydroxylated metabolites. Environmental science &
   577 technology, 45(9): 3938-3944.
- 578 Fan, R. et al., 2021. Combined Developmental Toxicity of the Pesticides Difenoconazole and 579 Dimethomorph on Embryonic Zebrafish. Toxins, 13(12): 854.
- 580 FAO, 2014. Dimetomorph Evaluation Report. 467-605.
- 581Gámiz, B., Facenda, G., Celis, R., 2016. Evidence for the effect of sorption enantioselectivity on the582availability of chiral pesticide enantiomers in soil. Environmental Pollution, 213: 966-973.
- 583 Garrison, A.W., 2006. Probing the enantioselectivity of chiral pesticides. ACS Publications.
- 584 Gilevska, T. et al., 2022. Simple extraction methods for pesticide compound-specific isotope analysis 585 from environmental samples. MethodsX: 101880.
- Hegeman, W.J., Laane, R., 2002. Enantiomeric enrichment of chiral pesticides in the environment.
   Reviews of environmental contamination and toxicology, 173: 85-116.
- Hengel, M.J., Shibamoto, T., 2000. Gas Chromatographic– Mass Spectrometric Method for the
   Analysis of Dimethomorph Fungicide in Dried Hops. Journal of agricultural and food
   chemistry, 48(12): 5824-5828.
- 591 Hoefs, J., 1997. Stable isotope geochemistry.
- Höhener, P. et al., 2022. Multi-elemental compound-specific isotope analysis of pesticides for source
   identification and monitoring of degradation in soil: a review. Environmental Chemistry
   Letters: 1-16.
- Huang, L., Lu, D., Diao, J., Zhou, Z., 2012. Enantioselective toxic effects and biodegradation of benalaxyl in Scenedesmus obliquus. Chemosphere, 87(1): 7-11.
- 597 Hunkeler, D. et al., 2008. A guide for assessing biodegradation and source identification of organic 598 ground water contaminants using compound specific isotope analysis (CSIA). US EPA, Ada.
- 599Imfeld, G. et al., 2020. Do rainfall characteristics affect the export of copper, zinc and synthetic600pesticides in surface runoff from headwater catchments? Science of the Total Environment,601741: 140437.
- Jammer, S., Rizkov, D., Gelman, F., Lev, O., 2015. Quantitative structure–activity relationship
   correlation between molecular structure and the Rayleigh enantiomeric enrichment factor.
   Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 17(8): 1370-1376.
- Jammer, S., Voloshenko, A., Gelman, F., Lev, O., 2014. Chiral and isotope analyses for assessing the
   degradation of organic contaminants in the environment: Rayleigh dependence.
   Environmental science & technology, 48(6): 3310-3318.
- 608Jeschke, P., 2018. Current status of chirality in agrochemicals. Pest management science, 74(11):6092389-2404.
- 610Jia, H.-f., Zhu, Y.-z., 2015. Screening and identification of spirodiclofen-degrading bacteria611Enterobacter sp. QD26-6 for soil under ginger cultivation. Agrochemicals, 54: 327-329.
- Jin, B., Rolle, M., 2016. Joint interpretation of enantiomer and stable isotope fractionation for chiral
   pesticides degradation. Water research, 105: 178-186.
- 614 Kurihara, N. et al., 1997. Pesticides report 37: Chirality in synthetic agrochemicals: Bioactivity and 615 safety consideration (Technical Report). Pure and Applied Chemistry, 69(9): 2007-2026.
- 616 Lefrancq, M. et al., 2014. Fungicides transport in runoff from vineyard plot and catchment:
  617 contribution of non-target areas. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 21(7): 4871618 4882.
- 619Li, J. et al., 2013. Stereoisomeric Isolation and Stereoselective Fate of Insecticide Paichongding in620Flooded Paddy Soils. Environmental Science & Technology, 47(22): 12768-12774.

- Li, X. et al., 2012. Enantioselective degradation of indoxacarb enantiomers in soils. Environ. Chem,31: 1262-1267.
- Liu, C., Wan, K., Huang, J., Wang, Y., Wang, F., 2012. Behavior of mixed formulation of metalaxyl and
   dimethomorph in grape and soil under field conditions. Ecotoxicology and environmental
   safety, 84: 112-116.
- Liu, W., Gan, J., Schlenk, D., Jury, W.A., 2005. Enantioselectivity in environmental safety of current
   chiral insecticides. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102(3): 701-706.
- 628 Lunn, D., 2007. Dimethomorph. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Lutz, S.R. et al., 2017. Pesticide fate on catchment scale: conceptual modelling of stream CSIA data.
   Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 21(10): 5243.
- Maier, M.P., Qiu, S., Elsner, M., 2013. Enantioselective stable isotope analysis (ESIA) of polar
   herbicides. Anal Bioanal Chem, 405(9): 2825-31.
- 633Masbou, J., Drouin, G., Payraudeau, S., Imfeld, G., 2018a. Carbon and nitrogen stable isotope634fractionation during abiotic hydrolysis of pesticides. Chemosphere, 213: 368-376.
- Masbou, J., Meite, F., Guyot, B., Imfeld, G., 2018b. Enantiomer-specific stable carbon isotope analysis
  (ESIA) to evaluate degradation of the chiral fungicide Metalaxyl in soils. Journal of Hazardous
  Materials, 353: 99-107.
- Megateli, S. et al., 2013. Simultaneous effects of two fungicides (copper and dimethomorph) on their
   phytoremediation using Lemna minor. Ecotoxicology, 22(4): 683-692.
- Melsbach, A. et al., 2020. Dual-element isotope analysis of desphenylchloridazon to investigate its
  environmental fate in a systematic field study: a long-term lysimeter experiment.
  Environmental science & technology, 54(7): 3929-3939.
- Meyer, A.H., Penning, H., Elsner, M., 2009. C and N isotope fractionation suggests similar
   mechanisms of microbial atrazine transformation despite involvement of different enzymes
   (AtzA and TrzN). Environmental science & technology, 43(21): 8079-8085.
- 646 Milosevic, N. et al., 2013. Combined isotope and enantiomer analysis to assess the fate of phenoxy 647 acids in a heterogeneous geologic setting at an old landfill. Water research, 47(2): 637-649.
- Pérez-Rodríguez, P., Schmitt, A.-D., Gangloff, S., Masbou, J., Imfeld, G., 2021. Plants affect the
   dissipation and leaching of anilide pesticides in soil mesocosms: Insights from compound specific isotope analysis (CSIA). Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 308: 107257.
- 651Petrie, B., Barden, R., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2015. A review on emerging contaminants in652wastewaters and the environment: current knowledge, understudied areas and653recommendations for future monitoring. Water research, 72: 3-27.
- 654 PPDBwebsite, Pesticides Properties DataBase Dimethomorph.
- 655Qiu, S. et al., 2014. Small 13C/12C Fractionation Contrasts with Large Enantiomer Fractionation in656Aerobic Biodegradation of Phenoxy Acids. Environmental Science & Technology, 48(10):6575501-5511.
- 658Schürner, H.K. et al., 2016. Compound-Specific Stable Isotope Fractionation of Pesticides and659Pharmaceuticals in a Mesoscale Aquifer Model. Environmental science & technology.
- Shabeer, A. et al., 2015. Residue dissipation and processing factor for dimethomorph, famoxadone
   and cymoxanil during raisin preparation. Food chemistry, 170: 180-185.
- Souchier, M., Benali-Raclot, D., Casellas, C., Ingrand, V., Chiron, S., 2016. Enantiomeric fractionation
   as a tool for quantitative assessment of biodegradation: the case of metoprolol. Water
   research, 95: 19-26.
- Suryawanshi, K. et al., 2018. Field evaluation of the bio-efficacy of Bacillus subtilis DR-39 formulation
   for enhancing pesticide degradation in grapes and optimisation of application dose. Indian
   Phytopathology, 71(4): 571-577.
- Tang, B., Luo, X.-J., Zeng, Y.-H., Mai, B.-X., 2017. Tracing the Biotransformation of PCBs and PBDEs in
   Common Carp (Cyprinus carpio) Using Compound-Specific and Enantiomer-Specific Stable
   Carbon Isotope Analysis. Environmental Science & Technology, 51(5): 2705-2713.

- 671Torrentó, C. et al., 2021. Triple-element compound-specific stable isotope analysis (3D-CSIA): Added672value of Cl isotope ratios to assess herbicide degradation. Environmental Science &673Technology, 55(20): 13891-13901.
- 674Tournebize, J., Gregoire, C., Coupe, R., Ackerer, P., 2012. Modelling nitrate transport under row675intercropping system: Vines and grass cover. Journal of hydrology, 440: 14-25.
- Wang, J. et al., 2013. Compound-specific stable carbon isotope analysis of galaxolide enantiomers in
   sediment using gas chromatography/isotope ratio monitoring mass spectrometry. Rapid
   Communications in Mass Spectrometry, 27(15): 1690-1696.
- Williams, G., Harrison, I., Carlick, C., Crowley, O., 2003. Changes in enantiomeric fraction as evidence
  of natural attenuation of mecoprop in a limestone aquifer. Journal of Contaminant
  Hydrology, 64(3-4): 253-267.
- Wu, L. et al., 2018. Carbon and hydrogen isotope analysis of parathion for characterizing its natural
   attenuation by hydrolysis at a contaminated site. Water research, 143: 146-154.
- 684Xie, J. et al., 2018. Activity, toxicity, molecular docking, and environmental effects of three685imidazolinone herbicides enantiomers. Science of the Total Environment, 622: 594-602.
- Yang, Z.-H., Ji, G.-D., 2015. Stereoselective Degradation and Molecular Ecological Mechanism of
   Chiral Pesticides Beta-Cypermethrin in Soils with Different pH Values. Environmental Science
   & Technology, 49(24): 14166-14175.
- Key Schemen 2019. The biological activities of prothioconazole enantiomers and their toxicity
   assessment on aquatic organisms. Chirality, 31(6): 468-475.
- Kang, C. et al., 2020. Rapid degradation of dimethomorph in polluted water and soil by Bacillus
   cereus WL08 immobilized on bamboo charcoal-sodium alginate. Journal of Hazardous
   Materials, 398: 122806.
- 694Zhang, N. et al., 2014. Compound specific stable isotope analysis (CSIA) to characterize695transformation mechanisms of α-hexachlorocyclohexane. Journal of hazardous materials,696280: 750-757.