

# All that glitters is not plastic: the case of open-ocean fibres


Giuseppe Suaria<sup>1</sup>, Aikaterini Achtypi<sup>1</sup>, Vonica Perold<sup>2</sup>, Stefano Aliani<sup>1</sup>, Andrea Pierucci<sup>4</sup>,  
Jasmine Lee<sup>3</sup>, and Peter Ryan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> CNR-ISMAR (Institute of Marine Sciences - National Research Council), La Spezia 19032, Italy

<sup>2</sup> FitzPatrick Institute, DST-NRF Centre of Excellence, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa

<sup>3</sup> School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia

<sup>4</sup> Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Università di Cagliari, 09126, Italy




# WATER SAMPLING



National Research  
Council of Italy



- 5 research cruises between January and November 2017.
- 916 seawater samples collected at 617 locations (2/3 replicates per station).
- 710 bulk-water samples collected with a 10-liter stainless steel bucket.
- 206 paired sub-surface samples collected from the ship's underway pump.
- Sampling was made outside of the bow wave, while the ship was slowly moving forward.
- Water was poured into 10-liters pre-washed containers for on-board gravity filtration.
- Vacuum or gravity-filtered through 20-63  $\mu\text{m}$  mesh filters ( $\varnothing 55$  mm) and stored in petri-pads at  $-5^{\circ}\text{C}$ .





- Bucket always rinsed three-times in seawater before sampling.
- All filters, lab-ware and sampling equipment triple rinsed with MilliQ water prior to use.
- Samples and sampling equipment kept covered at all times during processing

## **AERIAL CONTROLS** (n=125)

Clean filters exposed to the open-air during sampling and laboratory procedures.

**$2.0 \pm 3.2$  fibres·h<sup>-1</sup> (median: 1.0)**


Low airborne contamination levels during sampling (i.e. ~0.2-0.3 fibres/sample, given that processing took 5-10 minutes).

## **PROCEDURAL BLANKS** (n=22)


10 liters of Milli-Q filtered on-board using the same sampling equipment.

**$1.1 \pm 1.1$  fibres·l<sup>-1</sup> (median: 0.65)**

Greater contamination risk, but still significantly lower than environmental concentrations ( $p < 0.0005$ ).




**All samples were conservatively  
reduced by 1.0 fibres·l<sup>-1</sup>**








- Counting and sorting at the stereomicroscope by the same individual according to standard criteria.
- Raw fiber concentrations computed for all samples and expressed as fibres·l<sup>-1</sup>
- A random subset of 2134 fibres (i.e. ~10 fibres/sample) extracted for  $\mu$ FTIR analysis (Bruker LUMOS in ATR-mode).
- Fiber length and diameter measured to the nearest 1  $\mu$ m from the digital images collected by the instrument.
- Polymer ID with commercial and custom libraries augmented with spectra of common fabrics, clothing and textiles.
- Only matches > 75-80% with reference spectra were accepted as verified polymers.
- Fibres were classified as: **Synthetic** (polyester, acrylic, polyamides, aramids, polypropylene), **Animal** (wool, silk) or **Cellulosics** both natural (cotton, linen, jute, kenaf, hemp, flax, sisal) and man-made (rayon/viscose, acetate).



## ABUNDANCE AND DISTRIBUTION

- 23,593 fibres counted (median 18 fibres/sample,  $Q_1$ - $Q_3$ : 10-31)
- Fibres found in 99.7% of samples (range: 0.02-25.8 fibres·l<sup>-1</sup>)
- Median concentration: **1.7 fibres·l<sup>-1</sup>** (uncorrected)
- No clear trend in relation to distance with land



**Length:** median 1.07 mm (range: 0.09–27.06 mm)  
Only 10 fibers longer than 10 mm and only 3 >15 mm.

**Diameter:** median 16.7  $\mu$ m ( $Q_1$ - $Q_3$ : 15.0-20.4  $\mu$ m; range: 5-239  $\mu$ m)

**Colors:** Most fibers were dark/black (57.1%) or light/grey (24.2%), followed by blue (10.1%), red/orange (5.2%), yellow/amber (2.9%) and green (0.4%).



# RESULTS



National Research  
Council of Italy




- **Fiber concentration was not homogenous across ocean basins**
- High concentrations were found in the Mediterranean Sea and in the Southern Ocean.
- Fiber concentrations tended to increase from north to south (negative correlation with latitude).
- Using the 25-75% CI of our dataset, we estimate a **global load of  $0.2\text{--}1.1 \times 10^{18}$  floating fibers**.
- In terms of weight, the total amount of textile fibers (**86–383 thousand tonnes**) is in the same order of magnitude of floating plastics (**93–236 thousand tonnes**; van Sebille et al. 2016).




# RESULTS



- Significant differences were found also in fiber lengths and diameters among ocean basins.
- Fibers from the Mediterranean were significantly longer and thicker than those found in other basins.
- Fibers from the Southern Ocean were significantly shorter than all other basins.
- Fibers from the Indian and the Atlantic Ocean were of intermediate length



The fibers extracted from procedural blanks (n=161) were significantly thinner, but not shorter than those extracted from seawater samples.



- **91.8% of all analyzed fibres (n = 1984) were natural fibres of animal or plant origin.**
- Most fibres are non-synthetic: cotton 50%, wool 11.6% or other cellulose 29.5%.
- Only 8.3% synthetic, with polyester the most abundant (6.2%), followed by nylon (0.7%), acrylic (0.7%), polypropylene (0.4%) and aramid fibers (0.3%).


# μFTIR ANALYSIS



National Research  
Council of Italy



- The composition of fibers was not homogenous across ocean basins, but the general trend remains constant (cellulosics >70-80% in all oceanic basins).
- The proportion of synthetic fibers increased at higher latitudes from 6.8% in the Med to 12.6% in Antarctic waters south of 60°S (similar pattern for wool fibres).



Fibers extracted from the blanks (n=150) were characterized by a higher proportion of cellulosics (87.3%) and a shortage of wool (4.7%) if compared to seawater samples.



- ✓ Most fibres at the sea surface are not plastic, but dyed cellulosics (both natural and man-made).
- ✓ The assumption that most if not all fibers are synthetic has led to significant overestimates of the abundance of microplastics in natural ecosystems (fibers often account for 80-90% of all particle counts).
- ✓ Synthetic fibres dominate global textile production (62%), but accounts for only 8% in our samples.
- ✓ Cellulosic and animal fibres account for 80% and 12% of our samples, despite comprising only 36% and 2% of global production. This contrasts with the pattern of plastic litter (PE and PP most common).
- ✓ This discrepancy might be explained by:
  1. Higher shedding rates of natural fabrics compared to synthetic textiles.
  2. The historical dominance of plant and animal fiber use in textiles.
  3. Lower-than expected degradation rates of natural fibres at sea (role of dyes, additives?).
- ✓ All polymers found in our study have densities greater than seawater and should sink.
- ✓ Their widespread occurrence in surface waters could be explained by constant atmospheric deposition coupled to retention within the surface microlayer and/or turbulence and re-suspension processes
- ✓ Research on the fate and impacts of textile fibers is often unbalanced in favor of plastic polymers.
- ✓ More information is needed on the degradation of natural vs synthetic fibers as well as a better understanding of ecological impacts and biodegradation rates in a range of environmental conditions.

# REFERENCES



National Research  
Council of Italy



- Suaria, G., Achtypi, A., Perold, V., Lee J.R., Pierucci, A., Bornman, T., Aliani, S., Ryan, P.G. (2020). Microfibers in oceanic surface waters: a global characterization. *Science Advances*, in press.
- Ryan, P.G., Suaria, G., Perold, V., Pierucci, A., Bornman, T.G., Aliani, S. (2019). Sampling microfibres at the sea surface: The effects of mesh size, filtered volume and water depth. *Environmental Pollution*, 258, 113413  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113413>
- Le Guen, C., Suaria, G., Sherley, R., Ryan, P.G., Aliani, S., Boehme L., Brierley, A.S. (2020). Microplastic study reveals the presence of natural and synthetic fibres in the diet of King Penguins (*Aptenodytes patagonicus*) foraging from South Georgia. *Environment International*, 134:105303  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105303>
- Suaria G., Musso M., Achtypi A., Bassotto D., Aliani S. (2020) Textile Fibres in Mediterranean Surface Waters: Abundance and Composition. In: Cocca M. et al. (eds) Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Microplastic Pollution in the Mediterranean Sea. ICMPMS 2019. Springer Water. Springer, Cham.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45909-3\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45909-3_12)