

1 **Reply to “Letter to Editor regarding the article “Evaluation of the phytotoxicity of**  
2 **conventional and biodegradable plastic bags using seed germination tests” by Balestri et al.**  
3 **(2019) published on Ecological Indicators 102(2019):569–580”**

4

5 Elena Balestri<sup>a,\*</sup>, Virginia Menicagli<sup>a</sup>, Viviana Ligorini<sup>a</sup>, Sara Fulignati<sup>b</sup>, Anna Maria Raspolli  
6 Galletti<sup>b</sup>, Claudio Lardicci<sup>a</sup>

7

8 <sup>a</sup> Department of Biology, University of Pisa, Via Derna 1, 56126 Pisa, Italy

9 <sup>b</sup> Department of Chemistry and Industrial Chemistry, University of Pisa, Via Moruzzi, 13, 56124  
10 Pisa, Italy

11

12 \*Corresponding author

13 [elena.balestri@unipi.it](mailto:elena.balestri@unipi.it)

14 University of Pisa, via Derna 1, 56126 Pisa, Italy

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 We thank Dr. Degli-Innocenti and colleagues for reading our article published on Ecological  
28 Indicators, whose correct title is “Phytotoxicity assessment of conventional and biodegradable  
29 plastic bags using seed germination test” (Balestri et al., 2019), and for taking the time to express  
30 concerns regarding the paper in a letter to the Editor (Degli-Innocenti et al., 2019). Most of these  
31 concerns could be derived from misunderstandings of the rationale of the study. We also thank the  
32 authors and the Editor for giving us the opportunity to elucidate some points that probably were not  
33 enough clear in the manuscript.

34 Firstly, we would like to clarify that the study was designed to evaluate the possible impact of  
35 both non-biodegradable (conventional) bags and compostable plastic bags incorrectly deposited on  
36 coastal environments through rainwater leaching i.e., migration of water-soluble organic  
37 compounds from bags into water, on early life plant stages. In species with non-dormant seeds, the  
38 uptake of available pore water by seed is rapid (hours) and activates the process of germination  
39 under favorable conditions (Oracz et al., 2012; Wolny et al., 2018). Since in beaches and sand  
40 dunes rainwater rapidly penetrates through sand due to high substrate porosity and can be readily  
41 imbibed by seeds (Maun, 2009), our study specifically referred to the possible effects of the water  
42 percolating from bags soon after precipitation on seed germination. Therefore, the kinetics of  
43 leaching, the biodegradation rate of leached substances into soils, and their potential effects on  
44 plants were outside the purpose of the study. Secondly, a “globally” established standard procedure  
45 to determine the potential toxicity of littered plastic items such as bags on the germination of seeds  
46 of species inhabiting coastal habitats is still not available. So, seeds of a terrestrial plant (*Lepidium*  
47 *sativum* L.) commonly used in phytotoxicity tests were tested, and some procedures prescribed in  
48 currently available standard ecotoxicological tests were adjusted to the study purpose.

49  
50 Below there are our responses to the specific concerns expressed by Degli-Innocenti and colleagues  
51 in their letter to the Editor.

52

53 **(1) First reason of concern “communication of the results is sometimes inaccurate**  
54 **and misleading”**

55 *The abstract by mistake refers that “both conventional and biodegradable bags released into water*  
56 *intentionally added chemicals, such as the noxious bisphenol A, and other phytotoxic substances*  
57 *probably generated during bag manufacturing”. This is not true for biodegradable bags, as then*  
58 *reported in Section 3 (Results and discussion), but the sentence is very misleading for those readers*  
59 *who only read abstracts.*

60 We partially agree with Degli-Innocenti and colleagues. Indeed, the study has shown that both  
61 non-biodegradable and compostable plastic bags have released into water intentionally added  
62 chemicals and other substances with phytotoxic activity. However, bisphenol A was released only  
63 from non-biodegradable bags, as reported in section 3. In the abstract, the results of the leaching  
64 experiments performed on the two bag types were combined in a sentence in order to not exceed the  
65 word limit for the abstract indicated by the Journal. However, we recognize that this could be  
66 misleading for those readers who only read the abstract, and hence we apologize for the  
67 inconvenience. We hope the Editor of the journal could help us correct this in our online article in  
68 Ecological Indicators.

69

70 **(2) Second reason of concern “the tested dose was arbitrary but it is described as if it were a**  
71 **realistic pollution degree”**

72 *The authors mention studies on quantification of litter deposition in the marine environment*  
73 *(Munari et al., 2015; Alshawafi et al., 2017; Pasternak et al., 2017; Schmuck et al., 2017).*

74 *However, it is obvious that such deposits were formed in many years of accumulation and not in*  
75 *just one simultaneous discharge. Therefore, the concentration of soluble substances in the area*  
76 *surrounding the deposits cannot be simply deduced by the number of littered items found per m<sup>2</sup>,*  
77 *because diffusion from litter occurred in different times in the past with different kinetics.*

78 *Therefore, the number of plastic bags used in the extraction procedure does not mimic any realistic*

79 *pollution occurring in natural environments. Naming the extracts as “low, medium and high*  
80 *pollution degree” is misleading because there is no link with any specific real or potential pollution*  
81 *event.*

82 In fact, in our study the name attributed to the bag extracts (low, medium and high pollution)  
83 was clearly not referred to the concentrations of water-soluble substances released from plastic bags  
84 in natural environments, but rather to different degrees of “bag pollution” previously detected in  
85 nature, as explained in the section 2.1 of the paper. These bag pollution degrees were estimated  
86 from published data on the abundance of plastic items collected on beaches periodically subjected  
87 to clean-up operations (Munari et al., 2016; Alshawafi et al., 2017; Pasternak et al., 2017). This  
88 means that bag deposits on beaches were not formed in many years of accumulation, as stated by  
89 Degli-Innocenti and colleagues, but presumably only after few, single deposition events. Naming  
90 the extracts as “low, medium and high pollution degree” is not misleading since it is linked with  
91 realistic “bag” pollution events.

92

93 **(3) Third reason of concern “no information on rate and level of migration from bags to soil**  
94 **and on the subsequent fate in soil, but statements on the potential impact of bags because of**  
95 **leakage are present all over in the article.”**

96 *The unsystematic nature of this pre-treatment makes it impossible to consider it as a simulation of*  
97 *the fate a bag can undergo in case of littering.” ... “In particular, the diffusion rate and the total*  
98 *amount of the water-soluble substances migrated from the bags into the soil, and the fate of the*  
99 *substances in soil after migration (including persistence) were not determined. The lack of all this*  
100 *highly relevant information means no conclusions on “soil pollution” can be drawn.”*

101 Our statements on the potential effect of bags in the article were based on the results of leaching  
102 laboratory tests which demonstrated the capacity of bags to readily release water-soluble  
103 compounds into water, a phenomenon that can occur in nature during precipitations. For the reasons  
104 mentioned in the premise, assessing the diffusion rate, the amounts and the persistence of the

105 substances migrated from bags into soils was outside the scope of our study even if it is a further  
106 interesting issue. We also point out that the weathering bag treatment, i.e. the exposure of bags in  
107 sand dune, was not a “*simulation*”, but one of the possible fates that a bag could really undergo  
108 once entered natural habitats. Indeed, many plastic items entering natural coastal environments,  
109 including bags, can be transported by winds, or directly deposited on sand dunes where they are  
110 exposed to natural weathering (Poeta et al., 2014; Andrady, 2015; Šilc et al., 2018). Artificial  
111 weathering experiments are unlikely to reproduce the complexity of the interactions occurring  
112 among littered plastic items and natural abiotic/biotic factors in such habitats. In our study, the  
113 natural weathering treatment was performed to discriminate between the possible effects of bag  
114 content and those of natural abiotic/biotic factors on rainwater quality, as we claimed in the  
115 Material and methods section. This information is highly relevant from an ecological point of view.  
116 Indeed, observing a phytotoxic effect of the leachate from bags abandoned on dunes, one cannot  
117 establish if this effect is due to the release of substances used in bag manufacturing or the interplay  
118 of the bag and abiotic factors, for example the deposition of sea salts that can influence germination  
119 and seedling growth (Maun, 2009). In addition, the main aim of this treatment was not to determine  
120 the amount and fate of compounds released by bags into sand during dune exposure, rather to  
121 establish if weathered bags might still retain the capacity to affect rainwater quality, and thus seeds.

122

123 **(4) Fourth reason of concern “the germination test was carried out on filter paper and not in**  
124 **soil as prescribed by standard global procedures”**

125 *In subsection 2.2 the authors describe the *Lepidium sativum* germination test. *L. sativum* was used*  
126 *as indicator of bag leachate phytotoxicity, in agreement with specific standard ecotoxicity tests*  
127 *(UNICHIM, 2003; OECD, 2006; ISO, 2012a,b). However, the authors did apply only the*  
128 *UNICHIM procedure. Seeds were tested on filter paper soaked with the extracts rather than in soil,*  
129 *as prescribed by the globally established test methods. This is a relevant deviance from the*  
130 *International standards.*

131

132 As mentioned above in our premise, “globally” established standard methods designed to test the  
133 potential phytotoxicity of leachates from plastic items on the germination of seeds of coastal plant  
134 species have not been established, to our knowledge. Current international standard tests such as  
135 OECD (2006) and ISO (2012 a,b) prescribe the use of soils as plant growing substrates, but they are  
136 mainly designed to assess the toxic effects of soil-incorporated solid or liquid chemical substances  
137 on seedling emergence and growth. However, some countries have also established own  
138 procedures. We chose to use the Italian standard test, UNICHIM (2003), and to adjust it for the  
139 study purpose. This test can be applied not only to solid but also to liquid matrices such as rainwater  
140 and leachates, and it allows to assess their effects on earlier plant life history stages, i.e., seed  
141 germination and root elongation (UNICHIM, 2003; Baudo et al., 2013). The UNICHIM procedure  
142 involves the use of cellulose filter paper as germination medium, and this substrate has also been  
143 used in previous ecological studies and toxicological tests (Hoekstra et al., 2002; Pavel et al., 2013;  
144 Manãs and De las Heras, 2018; Bosker et al., 2019). We obviously agree with Degli-Innocenti and  
145 colleagues that seeds germinate in soil, and not on filter paper under natural conditions. However,  
146 the use of this inert germination substrate allows to readily observe the seed germination process  
147 and to overcome some problems related to the interpretation of the results of tests with natural soils,  
148 due to the variability of physical/chemical soil properties and microbial populations (OECD, 2006).  
149 *The potential effects of this deviance should have been investigated or at least discussed because*  
150 *under natural conditions seeds germinate in soil and not on filter paper. The exposure of*  
151 *biodegradable water-soluble substances to soil can lead to a fast biodegradation and thus to a*  
152 *substantial reduction of their permanence time in the environment”.*

153 We point out that the study was not a test on the biodegradation effect of bags in soils on seeds,  
154 rather it was aimed at assessing the potential effects of the water that might percolate from bags  
155 during rainfalls on seeds. As mentioned in our premise, this water is readily available in sandy soils  
156 and the uptake of soil pore-water by non-dormant seeds is rapid and activates the process of

157 germination in few hours (Oracz et al., 2012; Wolny et al., 2018). Organic compounds dissolved in  
158 soil pore-water can be also easily absorbed by plant roots (Zhang et al., 2017). Therefore, if the  
159 release of water-soluble biodegradable substances from bags into rainwater occurred in periods  
160 favorable to seed germination (for example in spring and autumn), these substances would affect  
161 seeds by contaminating rainwater (at least transitorily), much prior to be biodegraded in sandy soil.

162

163 **(5) Fifth reason of concern “the analysis of abnormalities is not a validated ecotoxicity test**  
164 **and needs proper controls”**

165 *The problem is that the detection of abnormalities in the development of *L. Sativum* seedlings is not*  
166 *an ecotoxicity test which has previously been systematically applied to chemicals. It is a new*  
167 *approach. Therefore, the conclusions drawn by the authors are largely flawed because they not are*  
168 *obtained through a validated test.*

169 Degli-Innocenti and colleagues focused their concerns on the use of developmental  
170 abnormalities in *L. sativum* seedlings as endpoint in the phytotoxicity test, but they neglected other  
171 responses to bag leachate observed in the study, such as hypocotyl and root growth inhibition,  
172 which are endpoints widely applied in standard ecotoxicity tests (OECD, 2006; UNICHIM, 2003;  
173 ISO 2012a,b). We also point out that the detection of seedling abnormalities in ecotoxicity tests is  
174 not a new approach. Indeed, *L. sativum* is among those species reported in Annex 2 (List of Species  
175 historically used in plant testing) of the OECD (2006), and the section of this document concerning  
176 the visual assessment of phytotoxicity, reports “At the end of the test, measurement of percent  
177 emergence and biomass of surviving plants should be recorded, as well as visible detrimental  
178 effects on different parts of the plant. The latter include abnormalities in appearance of the emerged  
179 seedlings, stunted growth, chlorosis, discoloration, mortality, and effects on plant development”.  
180 Although the detection of seedling abnormalities in *L. sativum* has not routinely been applied to  
181 assess the ecotoxicity of chemicals, this semi-quantitative/qualitative endpoint provides important  
182 additional information on sample’s toxicity. An irregular germinated seed has not the ability to

183 develop in a normal plant even when growing in soil under favorable conditions (ISTA, 2003). In  
184 addition, a recent study, probably escaped the attention of Degli-Innocenti and colleagues, provided  
185 evidence of the suitability of abnormalities as an endpoint in phytotoxicity tests (Manãs and De las  
186 Heras, 2018).

187 *The test is affected by severe methodological flaws. No reference substances are applied.*  
188 *Preliminary studies should have been carried out testing substances already characterized for*  
189 *ecotoxicity/phytotoxicity to determine whether the development of abnormalities in L. sativum were*  
190 *consistent with the expected ecotoxicity and to determine the sensitivity and the reproducibility of*  
191 *the test method.*

192 However, the use of a positive reference substance may be required periodically in some  
193 procedures (OECD, 2006), and it serves to verify the sensitivity of the method (ISO 5667-16,  
194 2017). Alternatively, historical growth measurement of controls could be used to evaluate the  
195 performance of the test system, and can serve as an intra-laboratory quality control measure  
196 (OECD, 2006). In our study, the sensitivity of the method was proven by the observed adverse  
197 effects of seeds to leachates obtained not only from compostable bags but also from conventional  
198 bags made of high-density polyethylene. The abnormalities observed in our study were consistent  
199 with those found in *L. sativum* seedlings following the exposure to a reference toxicant (zinc  
200 sulphate heptahydrate) reported in a previous study (Manãs and De las Heras, 2017). The validity  
201 and reproducibility of our test were ensured by high seed germination (> 90%) obtained with  
202 distilled water as a negative reference substance (or control), a procedure adopted in previous  
203 ecological and ecotoxicological studies (Hoekstra et al., 2002; OECD, 2006; Josko et al., 2017;  
204 Manãs and De las Heras, 2018; Bosker et al., 2019).

205 *Finally it should have been clarified if natural GRAS substances could elicit the response if tested*  
206 *at very high doses.”* Again, *“For example, the application of immature compost onto soil causes*  
207 *negative effects on seed germination, plant growth and development (Morel et al., 1985). The*



208 *possibility that biodegradable substances present in the extracts in high dose could elicit the*  
209 *response must be verified. Under these conditions, the results should be considered as preliminary.*

210 We agree with Degli-Innocenti and colleagues that high amounts of natural GRAS substances as  
211 well as immature compost could negatively affect seed germination and plant/root development.  
212 However, “*that biodegradable substances present in the extracts in high dose could elicit the*  
213 *response*” could be verified, but it is irrelevant from an ecological point of view. Indeed, coastal  
214 habitats are not cultivated fields nor composting environments, and hence no GRAS substances in  
215 high amounts should not enter these environments, especially in oligotrophic zones. Therefore, even  
216 if biodegradable substances were present in high dose in bag extracts and elicited the responses  
217 observed in *L. sativum* seedlings, this would not alleviate the impact that bags could cause on seeds  
218 when dispersed in natural environments. In addition, similar negative effects on seeds were found  
219 with leachates from conventional non-biodegradable bags.

220

221

222 Our study provided a first experimental evidence of the potential impact of the introduction of  
223 both compostable and conventional non-biodegradable bags in coastal habitats through leaching by  
224 rainwater. This information is a key requirement to assess the ecological risk derived from plastic  
225 items if dispersed in coastal environments, and the preliminary nature of the results of our study  
226 was explicitly claimed in the discussion section “*Clearly, further studies are needed to confirm our*  
227 *hypotheses about the effects of these compounds on higher plants.*”, and again in the conclusion  
228 section “*The Lepidium sativum seed germination test reveals that bag leachates can adversely*  
229 *affect seedling growth, and they could be thus potentially toxic to other higher plants*”. However,  
230 we take this opportunity to inform that the consistency of the effects of both compostable and non-  
231 biodegradable bags on coastal plants has also been proven by results of a recent field study  
232 (Menicagli et al., 2019) that demonstrated the relatively long-term persistence (more than 12

233 months) of small (10x10 cm) bag macro-fragments once buried on sand dunes, as well as their  
234 adverse effects on seed emergence and growth.

235 We disagree with Degli-Innocenti and colleagues that our statement “*current standards on*  
236 *compostability cannot exclude the occurrence of adverse environmental effects of bags when*  
237 *abandoned on natural habitats*” is pointless. Obviously, current standards are not designed to  
238 assess the behavior of littered bags in natural environments. But this issue was posed because the  
239 meaning of the certification “compostability” (i.e. biodegradable in industrial composting facilities)  
240 is not probably clear to all scientists (Harrison et al., 2018). In addition, there is confusion among  
241 terms like bioplastics, bio-based and biodegradable and compostable plastics. The average  
242 consumer and certain media often do not distinguish between the meaning of biodegradable and  
243 compostable, so many people have assumed that biodegradable and compostable plastics can break  
244 down completely in the environment without affecting organisms (Harrison et al., 2018). It is  
245 sufficient to conduct a research on internet using the terms “plastic or compostable or  
246 biodegradable” to ascertain it. On the other hand, in a Novamont press release (2 July 2019,  
247 [https://www.novamont.com/eng/leggi\\_press.php?id\\_press=53](https://www.novamont.com/eng/leggi_press.php?id_press=53) ,  
248 <https://www.polimerica.it/articolo.asp?id=22100>), Degli-Innocenti himself stated that “*All products*  
249 *must be collected and recycled, including biodegradable products made of Mater-Bi, which must be*  
250 *recovered in the form of compost together with kitchen waste. Nothing must be discarded*  
251 *irresponsibly whether on the ground or in the sea, as this creates a potential ecological risk. The*  
252 *intrinsic biodegradability of Mater-Bi products is a factor that can mitigate ecological risk. This,*  
253 *however, must not become a commercial message but a further element to help assess the*  
254 *environmental profile of biodegradable products*”.

255 Finally, we would like to point out that our study was not a criticism to the environmental  
256 benefits provided by biodegradable/compostable plastic items. We also appreciated the recent  
257 efforts of Degli-Innocenti and colleagues to assess the biodegradability of Mater-Bi samples on  
258 marine sediments and their impact on marine organisms

259 ([https://www.novamont.com/eng/leggi\\_press.php?id\\_press=53](https://www.novamont.com/eng/leggi_press.php?id_press=53)) and we hope our studies could aid  
260 to develop more eco-sustainable items and new standard toxicity tests to further reduce “*the*  
261 *potential ecological risk*” of an introduction of bags on coastal environments. We can understand  
262 the controversial issues raised from the results of our research because of their potential commercial  
263 relevance. However, we are independent scientists without conflicts of interest, and we are not  
264 responsible for how the results of the study, which was published on an international peer-reviewed  
265 scientific Journal destined to a specialized audience (scientists, policy-makers, and resource  
266 managers investigating or applying ecological and environmental indicators), and of other our  
267 related published studies, could be misunderstood and/or manipulated by media to divulgate  
268 messages (i.e., either that compostable items minimize the problem of marine litter or that they are a  
269 false solution to the marine litter problem).

270

## 271 **References**

272

273 Alshawafi, A., Analla, M., Alwashali, E., Aksissou, M., 2017. Assessment of marine debris on the  
274 coastal wetland of Martil in the North-East of Morocco. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 117, 302–310.

275 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.01.079>

276 Andrady, A.L., 2015. Persistence of plastic litter in the oceans. In: Bergmann, M., Gutow, L.,

277 Klages, M. (Eds.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. Springer, Berlin.

278 Balestri, E., Menicagli, V., Ligorini, V., Fulignati, S., Raspolli Galletti, A.M., Lardicci, C., 2019.

279 Phytotoxicity assessment of conventional and biodegradable plastic bags using seed germination

280 test. *Ecol. Indic.* 102, 569–580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.03.005>

281 Baudo, R., Faimali, M., Onorati, F., Pellegrini, D., Mugnai, C., 2013. Batterie di saggi

282 ecotossicologici per sedimenti ed acque interne. I manuali di ecotossicologia. ISPRA, Manuali e

283 Linee Guida 88/2013.

284 Bosker, T., Bouwman, L.J., Brun, N.R., Behrens, P., Vijver, M.G., 2019. Microplastics accumulate  
285 on pores in seed capsule and delay germination and root growth of the terrestrial vascular plant  
286 *Lepidium sativum*. *Chemosphere*, 226, 774-781.  
287 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.03.163>

288 Degli-Innocenti, F., Farachi, F., Gazzilli, A., Breton, T., Tosin, M., 2019. Letter to the editor  
289 regarding the article “Evaluation of the phytotoxicity of conventional and biodegradable plastic  
290 bags using seed germination tests” by Balestri et al., published on *Ecological Indicators*  
291 102(2019):569–580. *Ecol. Indic.* 107, 105601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105601>

292 Harrison, J.P., Boardman, C., O’Callaghan, K., Delort, A.-M., Song, J., 2018. Biodegradability  
293 standards for carrier bags and plastic films in aquatic environments: a critical review. *R. Soc.*  
294 *open sci.* 5, 171792. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsos.171792>

295 Hoekstra, N.J., Bosker, T., Lantinga, E.A., 2002. Effects of cattle dung from farms with different  
296 feeding strategies on germination and initial root growth of cress (*Lepidium sativum* L.). *Agric.*  
297 *Ecosyst. Environ.* 93, 189–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809\(01\)00348-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(01)00348-6)

298 ISO 11269-1, 2012a. Soil Quality – Determination of the Effects of Pollutants on Soil Flora– Part 1:  
299 Method for the Measurement of Inhibition of Root Growth. International Organization for  
300 Standardization.

301 ISO 11269-2, 2012b. Soil quality – Determination of the effects of pollutants on soil flora  
302 – Part 2: Effects of Contaminated Soil on the Emergence and Early Growth of Higher  
303 Plants. International Organization for Standardization.

304 ISO 5667-16, 2017. Water quality- Sampling- Part 16: Guidance on biotesting of samples.  
305 International Organization for Standardization.

306 ISTA, 2003. International Rules for Seed Testing. International Seed Testing Association, Zurich,  
307 Switzerland.

308 Josko, I., Oleszczuk, P., Skwarek, E., 2017. Toxicity of combined mixtures of nanoparticles to  
309 plants. *J. Hazard. Mater.* 331, 200-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2017.02.028>

310 Manãs, P., De las Heras, J., 2018. Phytotoxicity test applied to sewage sludge using *Lactuca sativa*  
311 *L.* and *Lepidium sativum* L. seeds. Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol. 15, 273-280.  
312 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13762-017-1386-z>

313 Maun, M.A., 2009. The Biology of Coastal Sand Dunes. Oxford University Press, New York.

314 Menicagli, V., Balestri, E., Vallerini, F., Castelli, A., Lardicci, C., 2019. Adverse effects of non-  
315 biodegradable and compostable plastic bags on the establishment of coastal dune vegetation:  
316 First experimental evidences. Environ. Pollut. 252, 188-195.  
317 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.108>

318 Munari, C., Corbau, C., Simeoni, U., Mistri, M., 2016. Marine litter on Mediterranean shores:  
319 analysis of composition, spatial distribution and sources in northwestern Adriatic beaches. Waste  
320 Manag. 49, 483-490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.12.010>

321 OECD, 2006. Test No. 208: Terrestrial plant test: Seedling emergence and seedling growth test,  
322 OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section 2. OECD Publishing, Paris.  
323 <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264070066-en>

324 Oracz, K., Voegele, A., Tarkowská, D., Jacquemoud, D., Turečková, V., Urbanová, T., Strnad, M.,  
325 Sliwiska, E., Leubner-Metzger, G., 2012. Myriganone A inhibits *Lepidium sativum* seed  
326 germination by interference with gibberellin metabolism and apoplastic superoxide production  
327 required for embryo extension growth and endosperm rupture. Plant Cell Physiol, 53, 81-  
328 95. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pcp/pcr124>

329 Pasternak, G., Zviely, D., Ribic, C.A., Ariel, A., Spanier, E., 2017. Sources, composition and spatial  
330 distribution of marine debris along the Mediterranean coast of Israel. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 114,  
331 1036–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.023>

332 Pavel, V.L., Sobariu, D.L., Diaconu, M., Stătescu, F., Gavrilesco, M., 2013. Effects of heavy metals  
333 on *Lepidium sativum* germination and growth. Environ. Eng. Manag. J. 12, 727-733.  
334 <https://doi.org/10.30638/eemj.2013.089>

335 Poeta, G., Battisti, C., Acosta, A.T.R., 2014. Marine litter in Mediterranean sandy littoral: spatial  
336 distribution patterns along central Italy coastal dunes. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 89, 168-173.  
337 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.10.011>

338 Šilc, U., Kuzmic, F., Cakovic, D., Stesevic, D., 2018. Beach litter along various sand dune habitats  
339 in the southern Adriatic (E Mediterranean). *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 128, 353-360.  
340 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.01.045>

341 UNICHIM 1651, 2003. Qualità dell'acqua – Determinazione dell'inibizione della germinazione e  
342 allungamento radicale in *Cucumis sativus* L. (Cetriolo), *Lepidium sativum* L. (Crescione),  
343 *Sorghum saccharatum* Moench (Sorgo) – (saggio di tossicità cronica breve). UNICHIM.

344 Wolny, E., Betekhtin, A., Rojek, M., Braszewska-Zalewska, A., Lusinska J., Hasterok, R., 2018.  
345 Germination and the early stages of seedling development in *Brachypodium distachyon*. *Int. J.*  
346 *Mol. Sci.* 19, 2916. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ijms19102916>

347 Zhang, C., Feng, Y., Liu, Y., Chang, H., Li, Z., Xue, J., 2017. Uptake and translocation of organic  
348 pollutants in plants: A review. *J. Integr. Agric.* 16, 1659–1668. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(16)61590-3)  
349 [3119\(16\)61590-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(16)61590-3)

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360