

Neglected impacts of plant protection products on invertebrate aquatic biodiversity: a focus on eco-evolutionary processes

Marie-Agnès Coutellec, Arnaud Chaumot, Elliott Sucré

▶ To cite this version:

Marie-Agnès Coutellec, Arnaud Chaumot, Elliott Sucré. Neglected impacts of plant protection products on invertebrate aquatic biodiversity: a focus on eco-evolutionary processes. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, In press, 10.1007/s11356-024-32767-3. hal-04501458

HAL Id: hal-04501458 https://hal.science/hal-04501458v1

Submitted on 12 Mar 2024

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.

Copyright

Environmental Science and Pollution Research

Neglected impacts of plant protection products on invertebrate aquatic biodiversity: a focus on eco-evolutionary processes
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	ESPR-D-23-12493R1	
Full Title:	Neglected impacts of plant protection products on invertebrate aquatic biodiversity: a focus on eco-evolutionary processes	
Article Type:	Review Article	
Corresponding Author:	Marie-Agnes Coutellec INRAE Rennes, FRANCE	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	INRAE	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Marie-Agnes Coutellec	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Marie-Agnes Coutellec	
	Arnaud Chaumot, PhD	
	Elliott Sucré, PhD	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	OFB (ECOPHYTO)	Not applicable
Abstract:	The application of plant protection products (PPPs) may have delayed and long-term non-intentional impacts on aquatic invertebrates inhabiting agricultural landscapes. Such effects may induce population responses based on developmental and transgenerational plasticity, selection of genetic resistance, as well as increased extirpation risks associated with random genetic drift. While the current knowledge on such effects of PPPs is still scarce in non-target aquatic invertebrate species, evidences are accumulating that support the need for consideration of evolutionary components of the population response to PPPs in standard procedures of risk assessment. This mini-review, as part of a contribution to the collective scientific assessment on PPP impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services performed in the period 2020-2022, presents a brief survey of the current results published on the subject, mainly in freshwater crustaceans, and proposes some research avenues and strategies that we feel relevant to fill this gap.	

Neglected impacts of plant protection products on invertebrate 2 1 aquatic biodiversity: a focus on eco-evolutionary processes

<u>*</u>

4 Marie-Agnès Coutellec¹ 5 Arnaud Chaumot² 6 Elliott Sucré³⁴ 7 8 9 1. DECOD (Ecosystem Dynamics and Sustainability), INRAE, L'Institut Agro, IFREMER 35042 10 11 Rennes, France 12 2. INRAE, UR RiverLy, Laboratoire d'écotoxicologie, F69625 Villeurbanne, France 13 3. MARBEC (MARine Biodiversity, Exploitation and Conservation), Université de Montpellier, 14 CNRS, Ifremer, IRD, 34000 Montpellier, France 15 4. Université de Mayotte, 97660 Dembeni, Mayotte, France 16 17 corresponding author: marie-agnes.coutellec@inrae.fr 18 19 Keywords: phytopharmaceuticals, ecotoxicology, evolutionary toxicology, aquatic invertebrates 20 **Abstract** 21 22 The application of plant protection products (PPPs) may have delayed and long-term non-intentional 23 impacts on aquatic invertebrates inhabiting agricultural landscapes. Such effects may induce 24 population responses based on developmental and transgenerational plasticity, selection of genetic 25 resistance, as well as increased extirpation risks associated with random genetic drift. While the current knowledge on such effects of PPPs is still scarce in non-target aquatic invertebrate species, 26 27 evidences are accumulating that support the need for consideration of evolutionary components of the 28 population response to PPPs in standard procedures of risk assessment. This mini-review, as part of a 29 contribution to the collective scientific assessment on PPP impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem 30 services performed in the period 2020-2022, presents a brief survey of the current results published on 31 the subject, mainly in freshwater crustaceans, and proposes some research avenues and strategies that 32 we feel relevant to fill this gap. 33 34 35

35

36

Introduction

One of the ultimate goals of ecotoxicology is to estimate non-intentional effects of anthropogenic 37 pollution on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, in order to provide decision-makers with tools to 38 39 alleviate such effects and to maintain ecosystem sustainability and services. In the European framework of chemicals regulation (REACH), ecological risk assessment (ERA) targets this 40 41 overarching objective by evaluating new substances upstream from placing them on the market. However, this assessment is most often based on short-term standard toxicity tests centered on the 42 43 organism level (e.g., the great majority of OECD test guidelines) which lack ecological realism, 44 especially regarding the protection goals targeted by the EU (e.g. population level assessment, see 45 WDF for aquatic ecosystems; see Hommen et al. 2010). While the statement of this regulatory hiatus 46 is no news (e.g., Chapman 2002), it has been more recently extended to the evolutionary impact (Van 47 Straalen and Feder 2012; Straub et al. 2020), as a consequence of an ever-growing corpus of 48 evidences reported for the three last decades and which covers the tree of life [see e.g. special issues 49 on genetic and evolutionary toxicology in journals such as Environmental Health Perspectives 50 (Anderson et al. 1994), Ecotoxicology (Coutellec and Barata 2011, 2013) or Evolutionary 51 Applications (Brady et al. 2017a)]. Nowadays, the issue of human-induced evolutionary impact finds a particular echo in the current context of Anthropocene (Earth's most recent geologic period during 52 53 which humanity became the most influential driver of environmental change) and its trail of long term 54 impacts on biodiversity. In the light of earlier findings on the development of resistance to pests 55 targeted by agricultural treatments, the question of the eco-evolutionary effects of chemical 56 contaminants is becoming increasingly important for biodiversity species, particularly in view of the 57 ever-increasing toxic pressure on various components of ecosystem communities caused by the use of agricultural chemical inputs (e.g. Schulz et al 2021). 58 59 60 This mini-review focuses on evolutionary impacts of plant protection products (PPPs) on aquatic 61 invertebrates and was performed as a contribution to the collective scientific assessment to which this special issue is devoted. More precisely, this work was part of a broader analysis of PPP 62 63 ecotoxicological impacts on aquatic invertebrates, including studies addressing effects at organism, 64 population, and community levels (see chapter 10 of the full report, Mamy et al. 2022). The literature encompassed in the present survey covers the period 2000-2020 (with a punctual addition of more 65 recent, complementary studies), and includes both experimental and field approaches, which address 66 microevolutionary and transgenerational changes triggered by PPPs (see Table 1). In terms of 67 biodiversity, these studies typically lie at the level of intraspecies diversity- (genetic diversity within 68 69 and between conspecific populations). Intraspecific diversity is one of the three pillars of biodiversity, 70 upon which population adaptive potential towards environmental change is based (Lande and Shannon

1996). Genetic improvement programs have resorted for decades on the exploitation of genetic diversity (Falconer and Mackay 1996), and the positive relationship between genetic diversity and fitness, which is nicely illustrated by the experimental concept of heterosis (hybrid vigor), is today largely documented in numerous non resource species (DeWoody et al. 2021). Likewise, genetic diversity and extinction risks associated with its reduction are at the heart of conservation programs (Frankham, 2010). The central role played by genetic diversity in the maintain of populations exposed to PPPs has been recently demonstrated in a study on daphnids, showing that genetically more diverse populations are able to persist longer in environments contaminated with copper (Loria et al. 2022). This result takes on particular importance regarding previous works, which have revealed loss of genetic diversity within daphnid populations in agricultural landscapes (Coors et al 2009).

Table 1. Summary information on evolutionary impacts of PPPs to aquatic invertebrates

Organisms	Delayed effects, Phenotypic plasticity	Genetic adaptation (resistance)	Maladaptation, Cost of resistance
gammarids (arthropods)	☐ Tolerance induced by pre-exposure (clothianidin; Siddique et al. 2021)	(resistance)	Increased susceptibility to various PPPs (Schneeweiss et an 2023) Fitness cost and increased susceptibility to thermal stress (Siddique et al. 2020; 2021)
daphnids (arthropods)	☐ Morphological defenses (carbaryl and endosulfan ; Barry 2000)	Evolutionary rescue (copper; Loria et al. 2022) Resistance (carbaryl; Jenssen et al. 2015)	Loss of genetic diversity (various PPPs ; Coors et al. 2009) Increased susceptibility to parasite (Jenssen et al. 2011)
H. azteca (arthropod)	☐ Plasticity of enzymatic systems of detoxification (pyrethroids; Fung et al. 2021)	☐ Selection of point mutations in target proteins (pyrethrinoids, organophosphates and carbamates; Weston et al. 2013; Major et al. 2018) ☐ Gene duplication (chlorpyrifos; Major et al. 2020)	Fitness cost of resistance, lower thermal tolerance, increased sensitivity to additional contaminants (Heim et al. 2018) Reduced thermal tolerance in interaction with increasing salinity conditions (Fulton et al. 2021)
ephemeropteran (insect)		☐ Selection of genes involved in cuticular resistance (Gouin et al. 2019)	
mosquitoes (insects)		☐ Resistance to various insecticides used in vector control, involving target site mutation, increased metabolic capacities, gene overexpression / amplification (see recent review by Liu 2015)	☐ Fitness cost of resistance (chlorpyrifos ; Delnat et al. 2019)
L. stagnalis (mollusc)			Increased random genetic drift induced by PPP cocktails (Coutellec et al. 2013) Increase of susceptibility in inbred lines (diquat; Duval et al. 2016)

Aquatic invertebrates as non-intentional targets of PPPs

85

86

87 88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101102

103

104105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112113

114

115116

117

118

119120

As representative of the main part of animal diversity and biomass, invertebrates do not form a monophyletic group (Lecointre and Le Guyader 2017). Indeed, this grouping covers all metazoan phyla (ctenophora, porifera, placozoa, cnidaria, and all bilaterian sub-phyla). Their biological traits (morphology, body size, development, reproduction, etc.) encompass and underly a great diversity of life histories. In spite of the occurrence of highly conserved pathways, as studied under evolutionary developmental biology and comparative genomics (Carroll et al. 2005; Hall 2012), the heterogeneity and divergence of invertebrates is reflected notably in their molecular equipment and in the way their biological functions are regulated (development, metabolism, homeostasis, reproduction...). In the context of ecotoxicology, such discrepancies translate into heterogeneous sensitivity to chemical components such as PPPs, whose toxic modes of action can be highly specific (e.g., inhibition of enzymes or receptors through the binding to specific sites in a particular taxonomic group). This heterogeneity in physiological functioning across large metazoan lineages (non vertebrates) is puzzling and contributes to the difficulty to assess biological disturbance by xenobiotics such as PPPs when they are released into the environment. Aquatic life is represented by all these phyla, sometimes exclusively (e.g., non-bilaterian metazoans). Therefore, understanding the impact of PPPs on aquatic invertebrates implies that diversity and heterogeneity is to be considered as pervasive and ubiquitous, notably in terms of taxonomic biodiversity (the majority of animal species), complexity (e.g., body plan of a placozoan vs a cephalopod mollusc), life style (sessile, mobile, parasitic forms...), life cycle (fully aquatic or not, including dormancy stages), lifespan, voltinism, semel- vs iteroparity, reproductive mode (scissiparity, parthenogenesis, which can be partial, cyclic, or obligatory, hermaphroditism, separate sexes), dispersal (internal vs external fertilization, phoresis, parasitic cycle...), as well as functional ecology and position in foodwebs. With respect to aquatic environments inhabited by invertebrates, diversity is also pervasive, in terms of salinity (freshwater, brackish, and marine waters), typology (lentic vs lotic systems), connectivity (dendritic hydrographic networks, interconnected marshes, estuaries...), anthropization (from ponds and other artificial water bodies to deep ocean waters), and vulnerability against chemical contamination including PPPs (proximity to treated agricultural zones, multiple modes of transfer). Invertebrates exhibit some propensity in terms of sensitivity to toxicants, which results from (1) phylogenetic proximity between some groups and the organisms targeted by PPPs (e.g., aquatic arthropods and crop insect pests), (2) a central position within biotic interactions, especially foodwebs, which increases their ecological vulnerability to the disturbance of lower trophic levels sensitive to pesticides such as herbicides and fungicides, as well as their role in propagating indirect effects to higher levels such as predators, (3) sensitivity of species which phenology is in line with PPP applications (e.g., seasonal reproduction of univoltine organisms and reprotoxic substances), (4)

relatively short lifespan and increased risk of micro-evolutionary effects induced by PPPs (multi- and transgenerational effects, evolution of resistance, etc.), and (5) high fluctuation in population size and isolation degree, which exacerbates demographic stochasticity and its consequences (Allee effect, random genetic drift), especially in species with low mobility and dispersal, as well as those with a complete aquatic lifecycle in discontinuous and semi-permanent habitats (marshes and ditches in agricultural landscapes).

127

128

129

130

131

132

133134

135

136

137

138

139140

141

142143

144145

121122

123

124

125126

Eco-evolutionary processes altered or induced by PPPs

With respect to evolutionary impacts of environmental change and degradation, a brief recall of basics may be useful here before focusing on the particular case of PPPs. The ability of natural species to respond adaptively to environmental change relies on a combination of characteristics inherited through macroevolution (since their ancestral lineage) and of on-going microevolutionary (populationlevel) processes that continuously shape their genetic diversity and adaptive potential (Brady et al. 2017b). Such responses may thus either reflect ancestral exposure to stressful conditions, be they abiotic (e.g. oxidative stress and aerobic mode of life) or biotic (e.g. host-parasite and hostpathogen coevolution), or more recent and novel stressors, to which species ancestors were naive (various xenobiotic substances). Adaptation is by itself an ambiguous term, which can be understood either as the phenotypic expression of an already adapted state (the result of past evolution induced by ancient selective pressures, for example, lungs as a breathing system adapted to terrestrial life) or as the evolutionary process « in action » leading to this state, i.e., the on-going selection of advantageous genetic variants (Bateson and Gluckman, 2011). The latter implies that variation at the adaptive trait occurs in the population and has a heritable genetic component upon which natural selection can operate. By contrast, the former (the achieved adapted phenotype) is expected to present limited genetic variation and thereby low ability to respond to new selective factors, due to longstanding evolutionary constraints (see Arnold 1992).

146 147

148

149

150

151

152153

154

155

Compared to purely ecological studies, approaches designed to tackle evolutionary effects of PPPs are recent, and therefore much less numerous. This is in line with the recent awareness that ecological and evolutionary processes may operate at a similar pace, due to intensified human-induced environmental disturbances and invertebrate biodiversity crisis. Appropriately, the ever increasing number of cases of genetic resistances observed in pests, as adaptation to PPPs (see Sparks et al. 2021), illustrates quite well how rapid such evolutionary effects can be in agrosystems. This and the current knowledge on resistance modes of propagation and molecular basis (Paris and Després 2012; Ffrench-Constant 2013) provide strong arguments to consider evolutionary effects when it comes to address biodiversity impacts of PPPs. However, the demonstration of an evolutionary impact is not an easy task, due to

many confusing factors and unknown parameters (population history and level of genetic variation) and studies appropriately designed to this end are not plethora.

158159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166167

168

169170

171

172

173

174

156157

Traditional ecotoxicological approaches mainly focus on direct effects measured or estimated during exposure, which prevents from detecting any post-exposure consequences (see Beketov and Liess, 2008), including evolutionary changes. Delayed effects may be lethal or sublethal, affecting organisms later in their life or in their progeny (parental effects, inter- and transgenerational effects, of epigenetic or genetic nature). In turn, such effects have consequences at the population level, in terms of growth rate and fitness, as well as phenotypic and genetic diversity, and trait heritability (see Medina et al. 2007; Hoffmann and Willi 2008; Bickham 2011; Coutellec and Barata 2011; Oziolor et al. 2016, Brady et al. 2017a). Such delayed effects have been shown in the laboratory after several days following pulse exposure of various invertebrates exposed to thiacloprid at concentrations with moderate toxicity. For example, in the case of the crustacean *Gammarus pulex* exposed to thiacloprid, the LC50 (concentration that kills 50% of test individuals) was found 50 times lower 17 days after a 24h long exposure than that estimated one day post-exposure (Beketov and Liess 2008). Likewise, in the damselfly Coenagrion scitulum exposed as larvae to the pyrethrinoid insecticide esfenvalerate at environmental concentrations, a reduction of locomotory capacity in adults was observed, leading to a lowered ability to expand to the north as a response to climate change (Dinh et al. 2016). In the trichopteran insect Brachycentrus americanus, females- decreased their investment in reproduction when exposed at pupal stage to the same insecticide (Palmquist et al. 2008).

175176

177

178179

180

181

182

183

184

185186

187

188 189

190

191

Phenotypic plasticity as a response to PPPs

Facing new stressors, natural populations can respond plastically or genetically. The former process is known as *phenotypic plasticity*, the ability of a genotype to produce distinct phenotypes when exposed to different environments throughout its ontogeny (Pigliucci 2005). Phenotypic plasticity can be supported by an epigenetic basis (see Hallgrimsson and Hall, 2011; -Ashe et al. 2021). Despite the confusion around the concept of plasticity and how it differs from immediate and transient homeostatic response to stress, an inclusive definition seems to have become consensual, which considers both an irreversible component, determined during parental or early exposure (*developmental plasticity*)— see Plautz and Salice (2013) for an example of contaminant exposure during embryonic development in a gastropod - and a later, reversible component induced by the environment experimented during the post-embryonic life course of the organism (*phenotypic flexibility*, which can affect behavior, physiology, and morphology) (Piersma and Drent, 2003; Beaman et al. 2016; Lande 2019). One classical example in ecotoxicology for phenotypic flexibility is the acclimation during pre-exposure to chronic concentrations of a toxicant that increases the acute tolerance in case of subsequent exposure to the same chemical. Although studies addressing the contribution of phenotypic plasticity to PPP

tolerance remain extremely rare in comparison for instance with a growing number of studies documenting this mechanism for metallic contaminants, a recent illustration was reported for the tolerance of the freshwater crustacean Gammarus pulex preexposed in the laboratory to the neonicotinoid insecticide clothianidin (Siddique et al 2021). The response is moreover considered « adaptive » if the phenotype produced in a given environment effectively increases the genotypic fitness in that environment. This adaptive value implies some level of environmental predictability (e.g., seasonal variation of temperature, light, presence of a predator, etc.). At the population level, plasticity can thus itself be subject to natural selection, although empirical evidences are not overwhelming (Van Buskirk and Steiner 2009; Arnold et al. 2019). Phenotypic plasticity can offer a way to adapt in stressful environments when population genetic diversity is already depreciated (Baldanzi et al. 2017). It is often viewed as a way to respond to rapid environmental change (Fox et al. 2019), as already suggested as plausible mechanism for population maintain in field contamination context (see an example in the annelid by Kille et al 2013). A spectacular example of such a response is found in daphnids, who develop defense structures (helmets, spines) in the presence of predator cues (Weiss et al. 2004). It is interesting to note that such morphological modifications can also be induced by chemicals such as insecticides carbaryl and endosulfan (Barry 2000), and that more generally, epigenetic alterations can be induced by various xenobiotics (see Vandegehuchte and Janssen 2014) including PPPs (e.g., vinclozolin, Skinner and Anway, 2007). Because some epigenetic changes may be transmitted to next generations along with genetic information (Schmid et al. 2018; Nilsson et al. 2022), it is now admitted that epigenetics plays a role in adaptation, through interactions with genetic variation and evolutionary forces (Bonduriansky et al. 2012).

213

214215

216

217218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

192

193

194

195

196

197 198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208209

210

211212

Selective effects of PPPs

Besides rapid plasticity, population adaptive responses may also rely on the selection of natural genetic variants. This type of response implies that genetic variation pre-exists in the population at genes involved in the responsive traits, and that a positive relationship occurs between the trait value and fitness. In an ecotoxicological context, stress response may be generated by various molecular and cellular mechanisms. The evolution of multiple resistances to pesticides in target species provides a corpus of knowledge about some of these mechanisms. Genetic resistance, as a case of evolutionary adaptation due to selective effects of PPPs, can result from different evolutionary processes: selection of advantageous variants from extant genetic variation in the population, point *de novo* mutation, horizontal transfer, and adaptive introgression by hybridization (Hawkins et al. 2019). Metabolic resistance, which results from a higher capacity to metabolize the pesticide, is supposed to be multigenic and to spread through selection on extant variation. On the contrary, target site resistance is monogenic and may imply spontaneous *de novo* mutations. In target species, selection is strong and may favor a new advantageous mutation more rapidly than in non-target species.

The evolution of tolerance to various insecticides in non-target aquatic invertebrates reveals a process of genetic selection induced by chronic or repeated exposure. Such an evolution was observed in the crustacean Hyalella azteca species complex as a response to persistent pyrethroids in sediments of californian hydrosystems (Weston et al. 2013; Major et al. 2018). Authors of this extensive study combined laboratory toxicity assessment and genotyping of natural populations sampled in sites with different loads of contamination by pyrethroids. Resistances prove to be multiple, implying parallel evolution of distinct alternative mutations already described in pest insects at the pyrethrinoid target gene, which encodes for the sodium channel protein (vgsc). Similarly, another point mutation was discovered that confers resistance to organophosphates and carbamates, especially in agricultural landscapes, by leading to a substitution in the amino acid sequence (glycine to serin at position 119) of acetylcholine esterase (AchE) (Major et al. 2020). The study moreover suggests a duplication of the gene ace-1 (encoding AchE), which confers resistance to chlorpyrifos. Following the description of the major role played by genetic determinism in the observed tolerance to pyrethroids, a study has complemented this vision of genetic mutants resistant to PPPs, demonstrating that plasticity processes linked to the activation of detoxification enzymatic systems also underpin tolerance in the same Hyalella populations chronically exposed to PPPs (Fung et al 2021). Beyond intraspecific (populationlevel) evolutionary impacts associated with the loss of genetic diversity induced by directional selection as well as potential cost of resistance (Coustau et al. 2000; see below), the accumulation of pyrethroids in resistant populations of H. azteca raises the question of functional consequences at the level of ecosystems, astheir (secondary) consumers are expected to concentrate bioccumulable pesticides in higher amounts than when predating on non tolerant preys (Hartz et al. 2021). In the same line, recent works suggest the development of resistance to insecticides in another freshwater crustacean, Gammarus pulex, through the observation of differential sensitivity to the neonicotinoid clothianidin between individuals sampled in populations exposed to different concentrations of PPPs (Becker and Liess 2017; Shahid et al. 2018; Becker et al. 2020). However, the resistance factors in this case are much weaker (of the order of 2 or 3) compared with studies on Hyalella (e.g. tolerance factors of up to 550, Weston et al 2013). Authors of these studies invoke factors susceptible to modulate the evolution of genetic resistance in gammarids, such as the proximity of non-tolerant populations (decreasing the efficiency of selection by gene flow from non-adapted populations), as well as low taxonomic biodiversity of the community, which would relax interspecific competition and thereby reinforce intraspecific competition (and selection) in gammarids. Temporal fluctuations in tolerance levels were recorded in the field, with an unexpected pattern of negative correlation with exposure levels along the seasons, explained as a reduction in potential variability of sensitivities within populations at the maximum of the cultural treatments, which may induce high lethal stress in streams (Becker et al. 2020). The genetic or plastic nature of tolerance seems here again not totally exclusive depending on the exposure history of populations (Siddique et al 2021).

228

229

230

231

232

233234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243244

245

246

247248

249

250

251

252

253

254255

256

257

258259

260261

262

263

Furthermore, evolution of resistance to these insecticides is not systematic, especially in environments with more diversified contamination profiles or affected by multiple stressors. This is the conclusion reached by studies of amphipod tolerance, which reported increased susceptibilities to PPPs in agricultural environments (Schneeweiss et al 2023), for example, or in aquatic environments under urban influence, which are also impregnated with insecticides (Švara et al 2021, Grethlein et al 2022). In another vein, a population genomics approach, without *a priori*, designed to identify genomic regions involved in the response to selection (local adaptation) suggests that PPPs affect the distribution of genetic diversity in populations of the ephemeropteran insect *Andesiops torrens* in Chile, through the detection of two genes under selection which are involved in cuticular resistance to insecticides (*LDL receptor-related protein 2* and *Dump*) (Gouin et al. 2019).

Under conditions of severe stress, population ability to react through genetic adaptation following a phase of demographic decline is at the base of the evolutionary rescue concept (Bell 2017).

Interestingly, the above-mentioned study on daphnid exposure to copper also shows that if the majority of exposed populations finally decline or go to extinction, some of them exhibit a U-shaped dynamics consistent with this phenomenon (Loria et al. 2022).

Cost of genetic adaptation

Resistance to PPPs may imply a cost, revealed by a decrease in fitness (defined as the ability of an organism to leave offspring in the next generation of the population) when the selective pressure is alleviated, or when an additional factor is surimposed. The concept of fitness cost reflects this decrease and relies on the observation that in absence of PPP, resistant genes are generally rare in populations (an indication that they would be selected against), and that resistance is often unstable in experimental lines or populations (Coustau et al. 2000). A recent review encompassing 170 studies published on the cost of resistance to insecticides in target insects showed that in 60% of the cases, resistance effectively implies a fitness cost (Freeman et al. 2021). This cost is particularly expressed as a return of the strain to the sensitive state in absence of treatment (reversion), and by a decreased reproduction. However, the generality of this result masks differences among insecticide classes, with a cost less frequently reported for organochlorids, pyrethrinoids, neonicotinoids and Bt. In aquatic invertebrates (not directly targeted by PPPs), although this type of effect is still largely understudied, one can mention the seminal works of Jansen & coll. on the effects of the carbamate carbaryl to Daphnia magna. These studies showed that the level of tolerance expressed in exposed natural populations lowers under laboratory conditions in absence of the insecticide (Jansen et al. 2015), and that clonal strains resistant to carbaryl (following experimental exposure) prove to be more sensitive to parasites than their non-resistant counterparts (Jansen et al. 2011). Another example is provided in aquatic arthropods by a study showing a cost of resistance to chlorpyrifos in the-mosquito Culex pipiens, that is expressed in presence of Bti, and translates both by a reduced larval survival and a higher

vulnerability to its predator *Plea minutissima* (Delnat et al. 2019). Tolerance to neurotoxic insecticides observed in field populations of freshwater amphipods also documented the potential fitness costs induced by multi-generational exposure to PPPs. Pyrethroid resistance in *Hyalella* has hence been associated to fitness costs for tolerant organisms with increased susceptibility to thermal stress and lower reproductive capacities (Heim et al 2018). Neonicotinoid tolerance in *Gammarus pulex* population from agricultural areas goes with reduced demographic growth when populations are cultured under PPP-free conditions in the laboratory (Siddique et al 2020), and increased susceptibility to elevated temperature (Siddique et al 2021). These observations highlight a major challenge in the context of ongoing global change, characterized by multiple stress situations in the future aquatic environment.

310311

312313

314

315

316

317318

319

320

321

322323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

300

301

302303

304

305306

307

308

309

Non adaptive evolutionary impacts of PPPs

Besides selective effects that may be exerted by the chronic presence of a given family of PPPs, the chemical pressure related to the recurrent use of complex cocktails of molecules in agricultural systems may also affect the genetic diversity of exposed populations, through demographic impairment, as already evocated above for field daphnids populations (Coors et al 2009). This type of effects was also illustrated in the gastropod Lymnaea stagnalis, in outdoor mesocosm experiments where mixtures of PPPs were applied, as a result of treatment programs and following various ways of transfer from the treated parcels to the surrounding aquatic systems (aerial drift, run-off, and drainage; Auber et al. 2011). The experiment showed that in a few generations, treatments decreased population neutral genetic diversity (microsatellite markers) and increased population genetic differentiation, as theoretically expected due to random genetic drift (Coutellec et al. 2013). Similarly, by experimentally manipulating effective population size in order to calibrate demographic reductions potentially induced by toxicants, we also detected a rapid effect of random drift load in this species, by observing significant heterosis among small populations (Coutellec and Caquet 2011). This effect is indicative of impaired adaptive potential associated with reduced population genetic diversity, and of increased extirpation risk due to the random accumulation of spontaneous slightly deleterious mutations (Whitlock et al. 2000). Although not directly triggered by PPPs in the cited study, this finding points to the genetic risk incurred by populations when their demography is recurrently impaired by PPPs. Last, among other evolutionary forces able to interact with the selective potential of PPPs, inbreeding needs to be mentioned. Using experimental evolution in L. stagnalis, a synergistic interaction could be highlighted between the pro-oxidant herbicide diquat and inbreeding induced by self-fertilization as compared to cross-fertilization (Duval et al. 2016).

333334

335

336337

338

339340

341

342

343

344

345346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356357

358

359

360361

362

363

364

365366

367

368369

370

371

Research needs and perspectives

While evolutionary processes become better incorporated into ecology, their study remains limited in ecotoxicology, despite early awareness of the scientific community (Van Straalen and Timmermans 2002). However, the level of knowledge of such effects is continuously improved. Regarding PPPs, aquatic invertebrates, as a group of unintentional targets particularly vulnerable, deserves specific attention in this respect. However, face to the challenge that represents the demonstration of evolutionary impacts on natural populations (the response of which depends upon population genetic diversity, isolation, and exposure history) and of their consequences at the ecosystem level (which may be masked by a number of others factors or missed because unanticipated), it seems unrealistic to directly incorporate evolutionary principles into ecological risk assessment procedures. Nonetheless, from the information compiled in the present study, it appears that ecological risk assessment of PPPs would gain a significant step in scientific soundness if it could more explicitly consider evolutionary components of population responses. We hereby propose a few avenues that might help progress in this way. First, the consideration of genetic variation in standardized toxicity testing could represent a relevant issue for reflection towards this endeavor (see e.g., Côte et al. 2015). Next, the coupling of laboratory approaches and field population monitoring in ecologically relevant species might provide a way to complement a priori ERA, once a substance has been authorized. Last, the current corpus of results acquired on evolutionary impacts of PPPs could be implemented in a rational approach of knowledge sharing allowing the development of extrapolation strategies, for example, through the use of phylogenetic components of species sensitivity (Brady et al. 2017b; Lalone et al. 2018), and through the search of mechanistic links between organism responses and evolutionary « modes of action » of PPPs. This type of approach could fit in with an evolutionary extension of the currently expanding concept of adverse outcome pathway (Ankley et al. 2010). Moreover, by using in particular tools offered today by environmental omics, we can quickly hope for new gains in mechanistic knowledge on the eco-evolutionary effects of contaminants based on the coupling of multigenerational experiments in the laboratory and field studies in historically exposed populations (in gammarids, see e.g., Gouveia et al. 2018). This knowledge on the genetic, epigenetic, or plastic nature of tolerance, on the physiological costs potentially induced by these adaptive or maladaptive phenomena should thus advance our understanding of the spatial and temporal dynamics of evolutionary impacts of environmental contamination. From this, we could be able to better decide on the relevance and way of inclusion of the examination of evolutionary processes in the predictive risk assessment schemes for PPPs, but also in our analysis of the causes of the ongoing decline of aquatic biodiversity in agricultural landscapes.

372	
373	Acknowledgements The authors thank Stéphane Pesce, Laure Mamy, and Wilfried Sanchez for
374	inviting us to participate to the collective scientific assessment on PPP effects to biodiversity and
375	ecosystem services, Sophie Leenhardt for the coordination of our work, and Sophie LePerchec for her
376	bibliographical assistance.
377	
378	Author contribution Marie-Agnès Coutellec, Arnaud Chaumot and Elliott Sucré realized the
379	scientific collective assessment. MAC drafted the first version of the present manuscript. AC and ES
380	revised and drafted the final version. All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript,
381	revisions, and approved the final submitted version.
382	
383	
384	Funding This work was funded by the French Office for Biodiversity (OFB) through the national
385	Ecophyto plan.
386	
387	Declarations
388	Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable
389	Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.
390	Consent to publish Not applicable
391	Availability of data and materials Not applicable
392	
393	References
394	Anderson S, Sadinski W, Shugart L, Brussard P, Depledge M, Ford T, Hose JE, Stegeman J, Suk W, Wirgin I,
395	Wogan G (1994) Genetic and Molecular Ecotoxicology: A Research Framework. Environmental Health
396	Perspectives 102:3–8. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.94102s123
397	Ankley GT, Bennett RS, Erickson RJ, Hoff DJ, Hornung MW, Johnson RD Villeneuve, DL (2010) Adverse
398 399	outcome pathways: a conceptual framework to support ecotoxicology research and risk assessment. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry: An International Journal, 29:730-741.
400	https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.34
401	Arnold SJ (1992) Constraints on phenotypic evolution. The American Naturalist 140:S85–S107.
402	https://doi.org/10.1086/285398
403	Arnold PA, Nicotra AB, Kruuk LE (2019) Sparse evidence for selection on phenotypic plasticity in response to
404	temperature. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B 374:20180185.
405	https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0185
406	Ashe A, Colot V, Oldroyd BP (2021) How does epigenetics influence the course of evolution? Philosophical
407	Transactions of the Royal Society B, 376:20200111, https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0111

- 408 Auber A, Roucaute M, Togola A, Caquet T (2011) Structural and functional effects of conventional and low
- 409 pesticide input crop-protection programs on benthic macroinvertebrate communities in outdoor pond
- 410 mesocosms. Ecotoxicology, 20:2042-2055. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-011-0747-5
- 411 Baldanzi S, Watson R, McQuaid CD, Gouws G, Porri F (2017) Epigenetic variation among natural populations
- of the South African sandhopper *Talorchestia capensis*. Evolutionary Ecollogy, 31:77–91.
- 413 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-016-9877-9
- Barry MJ (2000) Effects of endosulfan on Chaoborus-induced life-history shifts and morphological defenses in
- 415 Daphnia pulex. Journal of Plankton Research, 22:1705-1718. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/22.9.1705
- 416 Bateson P, Gluckman P (2011) Plasticity, Robustness, Development and Evolution. Cambridge University Press
- 417 Beaman JE, White CR, Seebacher F (2016) Evolution of Plasticity: Mechanistic Link between Development and
- 418 Reversible Acclimation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 31:237–249.
- 419 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.01.004
- 420 Becker JM, Liess M. (2017) Species diversity hinders adaptation to toxicants. Environmental Science &
- 421 Technology, 51:10195-10202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02440
- Becker JM, Russo R, Shahid N, Liess M (2020) Drivers of pesticide resistance in freshwater amphipods. Science
- 423 of the Total Environment, 735:9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139264
- Beketov MA, Liess M (2008) Acute and delayed effects of the neonicotinoid insecticide thiacloprid on seven
- 425 freshwater arthropods. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 27:461-470.
- 426 http://dx.doi.org/10.1897/07322r.1
- 427 Bell G (2017) Evolutionary Rescue. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 48:605-627.
- 428 http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-023011
- 429 Bickham JW (2011) The four cornerstones of Evolutionary Toxicology. Ecotoxicology, 20:497-502.
- 430 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-011-0636-y
- Bonduriansky R, Crean AJ, Day T (2012) The implications of nongenetic inheritance for evolution in changing
- 432 environments. Evolutionary Applications, 5:192-201. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4571.2011.00213.x
- 433 Brady SP, Monosson E, Matson CW, Bickham JW (2017a) Evolutionary toxicology: Toward a unified
- 434 understanding of life's response to toxic chemicals. Evolutionary Applications, 10:745-751
- 435 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eva.12519
- 436 Brady SP, Richardson JL, Kunz BK (2017b). Incorporating evolutionary insights to improve ecotoxicology for
- freshwater species. Evolutionary Applications, 10:829–838. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12507
- 438 Carroll SB, Grenier JK, Weatherbee SD (2005) From DNA to diversity: molecular genetics and the evolution of
- 439 *animal design*. Second edition. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Scientific.
- Chapman PM (2002) Integrating toxicology and ecology: putting the "eco" into ecotoxicology. Marine Pollution
- 441 Bulletin, 44:7-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X(01)00253-3
- 442 Coors A, Vanoverbeke J, De Bie T, De Meester L (2009) Land use, genetic diversity and toxicant tolerance in
- natural populations of *Daphnia magna*. Aquatic Toxicology, 95:71-79. DOI: 10.1016/j.aquatox.2009.08.004
- Coustau C, Chevillon C, ffrench-ConstantR (2000) Resistance to xenobiotics and parasites: can we count the
- 445 cost? Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 15:378-383. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0169-5347(00)01929-7
- 446 Coutellec MA, Barata C (2011) An introduction to evolutionary processes in ecotoxicology, Ecotoxicology,
- 447 20:493-496. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-011-0637-x

- 448 Coutellec MA, Barata C (2013) Special issue on long-term ecotoxicological effects: an introduction.
- 449 Ecotoxicology, 22:763-766. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-013-1092-7
- 450 Coutellec MA, Besnard AL, Caquet T (2013) Population genetics of Lymnaea stagnalis experimentally exposed
- 451 to cocktails of pesticides. Ecotoxicology, 22:879-888. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-013-1082-9
- 452 Coutellec MA, Caquet T (2011) Heterosis and inbreeding depression in bottlenecked populations: a test in the
- hermaphroditic freshwater snail *Lymnaea stagnalis*. Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 24:2248-2257.
- 454 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2011.02355.x
- 455 Côte J, Bouétard A, Pronost Y, Besnard AL, Coke M, Piquet F, Caquet T, Coutellec MA (2015) Genetic
- 456 variation of *Lymnaea stagnalis* tolerance to copper: a test of selection hypotheses and its relevance for
- 457 ecological risk assessment. Environmental Pollution, 205:209-217.
- 458 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.05.040
- Delnat V, Tran TT, Janssens L, Stoks R (2019) Resistance to a chemical pesticide increases vulnerability to a
- biopesticide: Effects on direct mortality and mortality by predation. Aquatic Toxicology, 216:10.
- 461 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2019.105310
- DeWoody JA, Harder AM, Mathur S, Willoughby JR (2021) The long-standing significance of genetic diversity
- in conservation. Molecular Ecology, 30:4147-4154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/mec.16051
- Dinh KV, Janssens L, Therry L, Gyulavari HA, Bervoets L, Stoks R (2016) Rapid evolution of increased
- 465 vulnerability to an insecticide at the expansion front in a poleward-moving damselfly. Evolutionary
- 466 Applications, 9:450-461. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eva.12347
- Duval A, Collinet M, Coke M, Coutellec MA (2016) Evolution of Lymnaea stagnalis inbreeding depression
- under pesticide chronic exposure. SETAC Europe 26th Annual Meeting, Nantes [comm].
- 469 Falconer DS, Mackay FC (1996) Introduction to Quantitative Genetics. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall, 464 p.
- 470 Ffrench-Constant RH (2013) The Molecular Genetics of Insecticide Resistance. Genetics, 194:807-815.
- 471 http://dx.doi.org/10.1534/genetics.112.141895
- 472 Fox RJ, Donelson JM, Schunter C, Ravasi T, Gaitán-Espitia JD (2019) Beyond buying time: the role of plasticity
- in phenotypic adaptation to rapid environmental change. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B,
- 474 374:20180174. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0174
- Frankham R (2010) Where are we in conservation genetics and where do we need to go? Conservation Genetics,
- 476 11:661-663. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10592-009-0010-2
- Freeman JC, Smith LB, Silva JJ, Fan YJ, Sun HN, Scott JG (2021) Fitness studies of insecticide resistant strains:
- 478 lessons learned and future directions. Pest Management Science, 77:3847-3856.
- 479 http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ps.6306
- 480 Fulton CA, Huff Hartz KE, Fuller NW, Kent LN, Anzalone SE, Miller TM, Connon RE, Poynton HC & Lydy
- 481 MJ
- 482 (2021) Fitness costs of pesticide resistance in Hyalella azteca under future climate change scenarios. Science
- 483 Of The Total Environment, 753:141945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141945
- 484 Fung CY, Zhu KY, Major K, Poynton HC, Huff Hartz KE, Wellborn G, Lydy MJ (2021) The contribution of
- detoxification pathways to pyrethroid resistance in *Hyalella azteca*. Environmental Pollution, 284:117158.
- 486 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.117158

- Gouin N, Bertin A, Espinosa MI, Snow DD, Ali JM, Kolok AS (2019) Pesticide contamination drives adaptive
- genetic variation in the endemic mayfly Andesiops torrens within a semi-arid agricultural watershed of Chile.
- 489 Environmental Pollution, 255:12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113099
- 490 Gouveia D, Bonneton F, Almunia C, Quéau H, Degli-Esposti D, Geffard O, Chaumot A (2018) Identification,
- expression, and endocrine-disruption of three ecdysone-responsive genes in the sentinel species Gammarus
- 492 *fossarum*. Sci Rep 8, 3793. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-22235-7
- 493 Grethlein M, Pelikan L, Dombrowski A, Kabus J, Oehlmann J, Weigand A & Jourdan J (2022) Small-scale
- 494 population structuring results in differential susceptibility to pesticide exposure. Environmental Sciences
- 495 Europe, 34:113. 10.1186/s12302-022-00690-4
- 496 Hallgrímsson B, Hall BK (2011) Epigenetics: linking genotype and phenotype in development and evolution.
- 497 University of California Press.
- 498 Hartz KHE, Weston DP, Johanif N, Poynton HC, Connon RE, Lydy MJ (2021) Pyrethroid bioaccumulation in
- 499 field-collected insecticide-resistant *Hyalella azteca*. Ecotoxicology, 30:514-523.
- 500 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-021-02361-1
- 501 Hawkins NJ, Bass C, Dixon A, Neve P (2019) The evolutionary origins of pesticide resistance. Biological
- For a seriews, 94:135-155. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12440
- Heim JR, Weston DP, Major K, Poynton H, Huff Hartz KE, Lydy MJ (2018) Are there fitness costs of adaptive
- pyrethroid resistance in the amphipod, *Hyalella azteca*? Environmental Pollution, 235:39-46.
- 505 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.12.043</u>
- Hoffmann AA, Willi Y (2008) Detecting genetic responses to environmental change. Nature Reviews Genetics,
- 507 9:421-432. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrg2339
- 508 Hua J, Jones DK, Mattes BM, Cothran RD, Relyea RA, Hoverman JT (2015) The contribution of phenotypic
- plasticity to the evolution of insecticide tolerance in amphibian populations. Evolutionary Applications,
- 510 8:586596.
- Hommen U, Baveco JMH, Galic N, van den Brink PJ (2010) Potential application of ecological models in the
- European environmental risk assessment of chemicals I: Review of protection goals in EU directives and
- 513 regulations. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management 6:325-337.
- 514 https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.69
- Jansen M, Coors A, Stoks R, De Meester L (2011) Evolutionary ecotoxicology of pesticide resistance: a case
- 516 study in *Daphnia*. Ecotoxicology, 20:543-551. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-011-0627-z
- Jansen M, Coors A, Vanoverbeke J, Schepens M, De Voogt P, De Schamphelaere KA, De Meester L (2015)
- Experimental evolution reveals high insecticide tolerance in *Daphnia* inhabiting farmland ponds.
- Evolutionary Applications, 8:442-453. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12253
- 520 Kille P, Andre J, Anderson C, Ang HN, Bruford MW, Bundy JG, Donnelly R, Hodson ME, Juma G, Lahive E,
- 521 Morgan AJ, Stürzenbaum SR, Spurgeon DJ (2013) DNA sequence variation and methylation in an arsenic
- 522 tolerant earthworm population. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 57:524-532.
- 523 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.10.014
- 524 LaLone CA, Villeneuve DL., Doering JA, Blackwell BR, Transue TR, Simmons CW, Swintek J, Degitz SJ,
- Williams AJ, Ankley GT (2018) Evidence for cross species extrapolation of mammalian-based

- 526 highthroughput screening assay results. Environment Science and Technology, 52:13960–13971.
- 527 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b04587
- Lande R, Shannon S (1996) The role of genetic variation in adaptation and population persistence in a changing
- environment. Evolution, 50:434-437. http://dx?doi?org/10.2307/2410812
- 530 Lande R (2019) Developmental integration and evolution of labile plasticity in a complex quantitative character
- in a multiperiodic environment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 11:11361–11369.
- 532 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1900528116
- Lecointre G, Le Guyader H (2017) Classification phylogénétique du vivant. Paris: Belin, 831 p.
- Liu N (2015) Insecticide resistance in mosquitoes: impact, mechanisms, and research directions. Annual Review
- 535 of Entomology, 60, 537-559.
- Loria A, Cristescu ME, Gonzalez A (2022) Genotype diversity promotes the persistence of *Daphnia* populations
- exposed to severe copper stress. Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 35:265-277.
- 538 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13979
- Major KM, Weston DP, Lydy MJ, Hartz KEH, Wellborn GA, Manny AR, Poynton HC (2020) The G119S ace-1
- mutation confers adaptive organophosphate resistance in a nontarget amphipod. Evolutionary Applications,
- 541 13:620-635. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eva.12888
- Major KM, Weston DP, Lydy MJ, Wellborn GA, Poynton HC (2018) Unintentional exposure to terrestrial
- 543 pesticides drives widespread and predictable evolution of resistance in freshwater crustaceans. Evolutionary
- 544 Applications, 11:748-761. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eva.12584
- Mamy L, Pesce S, Sanchez W, et al. (2022) Impacts des produits phytopharmaceutiques sur la biodiversité et les
- services écosystémiques. Rapport de l'expertise scientifique collective. [Rapport de recherche] INRAE;
- 547 IFREMER. p 1408 https://doi.org/10.17180/ 0gp2-cd65
- Medina MH, Correa JA, Barata C (2007) Micro-evolution due to pollution: possible consequences for ecosystem
- responses to toxic stress. Chemosphere, 67:2105-2114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.12.024
- Nilsson EE, Ben Maamar M, Skinner MK (2022) Role of epigenetic transgenerational inheritance in generational
- toxicology. Environmental Epigenetics 8, dvac001. https://doi.org/10.1093/eep/dvac001
- Orsini L, Spanier KI, De Meester L (2012) Genomic signature of natural and anthropogenic stress in wild
- populations of the waterflea *Daphnia magna*: validation in space, time and experimental evolution.
- 554 Molecular Ecology, 21:2160-2175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05429.x
- 555 Oziolor EM, De Schamphelaere K, Matson CW (2016) Evolutionary toxicology: Meta-analysis of evolutionary
- events in response to chemical stressors. Ecotoxicology, 25:1858-1866. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10646-
- 557 0161735-6
- Palmquist KR, Jepson PC, Jenkins JJ (2008) Impact of aquatic insect life stage and emergence strategy on
- sensitivity to esfenvalerate exposure. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 27:1728-1734.
- 560 http://dx.doi.org/10.1897/07-499.1
- Paris M, Després L (2012) Identifying insecticide resistance genes in mosquito by combining AFLP genome
- 562 scans and 454 pyrosequencing. Molecular Ecology, 21:1672-1686.
- 563 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365294X.2012.05499.x
- Piersma T, Drent J (2003) Phenotypic flexibility and the evolution of organismal design. Trends in Ecology &
- Evolution 18:228–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00036-3

- Pigliucci M (2005) Evolution of phenotypic plasticity: where are we going now? Trends in Ecology & Evolution
- 567 20:481–486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.06.001
- 568 Plautz S, Salice C (2013) Plasticity in offspring contaminant tolerance traits: developmental cadmium exposure
- trumps parental effects. Ecotoxicology, 22(5):847-853. Doi:10.1007/s10646-013-1076-7
- 570 Schmid MW, Heichinger C, Coman Schmid D, Guthörl D, Gagliardini V, Bruggmann R, Aluri S, Aquino C,
- 571 Schmid B, Turnbull LA, Grossniklaus U (2018) Contribution of epigenetic variation to adaptation in
- 572 *Arabidopsis*. Nature Communications, p. 9, 10.1038/s41467-018-06932-5
- 573 Schneeweiss A, Schreiner VC, Liess M, Röder N, Schwenk K & Schäfer RB (2023) Population structure and
- 574 insecticide response of Gammarus spp. in agricultural and upstream forested sites of small streams.
- 575 Environmental Sciences Europe, 35:41. 10.1186/s12302-023-00747-y
- 576 Schulz R, Bub S, Petschick LL, Stehle S, Wolfram J (2021) Applied pesticide toxicity shifts toward plants and
- invertebrates, even in GM crops. Science, 372:81-84. DOI: 10.1126/science.abe1148
- 578 Shahid N, Becker JM, Krauss M, Brack W, Liess M (2018) Adaptation of Gammarus pulex to agricultural
- 579 insecticide contamination in streams. Science of the Total Environment, 621:479-485
- 580 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.220
- 581 Siddique A, Shahid N, Liess M (2021) Multiple stress reduces the advantage of pesticide adaptation.
- 582 Environmental Science & Technology, 55:15100-15109. DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.1c02669
- 583 Siddique A, Liess M, Shahid N, Becker JM (2020) Insecticides in agricultural streams exert pressure for
- adaptation but impair performance in *Gammarus pulex* at regulatory acceptable concentrations. Science Of
- The Total Environment, 722. 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137750
- 586 Skinner MK, Anway MD (2007) Epigenetic transgenerational actions of vinclozolin on the development of
- disease and cancer. Critical Reviews™ in Oncogenesis, 13(1), DOI: 10.1615/CritRevOncog.v13.i1.30
- Sparks TC, Storer N, Porter A, Slater R, Nauen R (2021) Insecticide resistance management and industry: the
- origins and evolution of the Insecticide Resistance Action Committee (IRAC) and the mode of action
- classification scheme. Pest Management Science, 77:2609-2619. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6254
- 591 Straub L, Strobl V, Neumann P (2020) The need for an evolutionary approach to ecotoxicology. Nature Ecology
- 592 & Evolution, 4:895- 895. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1194-6
- 593 Švara V, Krauss M, Michalski SG, Altenburger R, Brack W, Luckenbach T (2021) Chemical pollution levels in a
- river explain site-specific sensitivities to micropollutants within a genetically homogeneous population of
- freshwater amphipods. Environmental Science & Technology, 55:6087-6096. 10.1021/acs.est.0c07839
- Vandegehuchte MB, Janssen, CR (2014) Epigenetics in an ecotoxicological context. Mutation Research/Genetic
- Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis, 764:36-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrgentox.2013.08.008 van
- Burskirk J, Steiner UK (2009) The fitness costs of developmental canalization and plasticity. Journal of
- Evolutionary Biology 22:852–860. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01685.x
- van Straalen NM, Timmermans MJ (2002) Genetic variation in toxicant-stressed populations: an evaluation of
- 601 the "genetic erosion" hypothesis. Human and Ecological Risk Assessment, 8(5), 983-1002.
- 602 https://doi.org/10.1080/1080-700291905783
- van Straalen NM, Feder ME (2012) Ecological and evolutionary functional genomics—How can it contribute to
- the risk assessment of chemicals? Environmental Science & Technology, 46:3-9. DOI:10.1021/es2034153.

605	Weiss L, Laforsch C, Tollrian R (2012) The taste of predation and the defences of Prey, in: <i>Chemical Ecology</i>
606 607	in Aquatic Systems. Christer Brönmark and Lars-Anders Hansson (eds). https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199583096.003.0009
808	Whitlock MC, Ingvarsson PK, Hatfield T (2000) Local drift load and the heterosis of interconnected
609	populations. Heredity, 84:452-457. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2540.2000.00693.x
610	Weston DP, Poynton HC, Wellborn GA, Lydy MJ, Blalock BJ, Sepulveda MS, Colbourne JK (2013) Multiple
611	origins of pyrethroid insecticide resistance across the species complex of a nontarget aquatic crustacean,
612 613	Hyalella azteca. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 110:16532-
614	16537, http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1302023110