AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES (ISSN: 2693-3888)

Volume 05, Issue 03, 2025, pages 19-27
Published Date: 22-09-2025

Integrated Perspectives on Freshwater Microplastic Pollution: Sources, Fate, Ecotoxicology, and Strategic Remediation

Dr. Kostel V. Trenikov
Independent Researcher, Physicochemical Processes in Aquatic Environments, Munich, Germany

ABSTRACT

Background: Microplastic pollution in freshwater systems is a rapidly intensifying environmental challenge that intersects materials science, ecology, public policy, and remediation technology. This paper synthesizes multidisciplinary evidence on sources, transport, transformation, ecological effects, detection challenges, and remediation strategies for microplastics in freshwater environments. Methods: A conceptual synthesis method was applied, integrating empirical findings and theoretical frameworks from materials conservation, marine and freshwater microplastic literature, transport modeling studies, ecotoxicology, and management reviews to produce an integrative evaluation. Results: Primary and secondary microplastics originate from diverse sources including industrial pellets, consumer products, tire wear, and in-situ fragmentation of larger plastics; these particles are transported vertically and horizontally across water columns and sediments through biological vectors, aggregation, and hydrodynamic processes (Andrady, 2015; Boucher & Friot, 2017; Choy et al., 2019). Microplastics act as vectors for chemical transfer and promote contaminant transport, causing physiological stress across trophic levels and altering ecosystem functioning (Rochman et al., 2013; Alimi et al., 2017; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021). Detection is confounded by methodological variability and material complexity, while remediation strategies span source control, engineered filtration, bioremediation, and policy interventions (Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Madala et al., 2025). Conclusions: Effective mitigation requires an integrated approach linking material design and conservation principles, robust monitoring and standardized methods, targeted remediation technologies, and governance frameworks that coordinate lifecycle responsibility. Research priorities include harmonized detection protocols, mechanistic ecotoxicology across realistic exposure scenarios, scalable remediation pilots, and socio-political analyses of policy instruments.

Keywords: microplastics, freshwater ecosystems, transport, ecotoxicology, remediation, policy, detection

INTRODUCTION

The global proliferation of plastic materials has reshaped contemporary industrial and social life, yet it has concurrently generated an environmental crisis characterized by the persistent accumulation of plastic debris across terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (Plastics—The Facts, 2021; Barnes et al., 2009). Within this broader plastic pollution problem, microplastics—defined loosely as particles smaller than 5 mm—have emerged as a particularly intractable and multifaceted threat in freshwater systems. Unlike oceanic microplastic research that matured earlier, freshwater contexts present distinct hydrodynamic, ecological, and management challenges (Wagner et al., 2014; Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015). This paper offers a thorough, integrative examination of freshwater microplastic pollution by weaving together materials science perspectives on plastic degradation and preservation, empirical findings on sources and distribution, mechanistic insights into transport and fate, ecotoxicological evidence across trophic levels, detection and analytical challenges, and remediation and governance options.

A core motivation for this synthesis is the recognition that microplastic pollution cannot be effectively addressed by single-discipline solutions. Materials science explains persistence and fragmentation dynamics (Shashoua, 2008), while hydrology and marine science reveal transport and deposition pathways (Galgani et al., 2015; Choy et al., 2019). Ecotoxicology characterizes organismal and population impacts (Rochman et al., 2013; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021), and social science frames political and regulatory barriers (Nielsen et al., 2019). Previous reviews have made invaluable contributions but often focus narrowly on either marine environments or specific components (Wagner et al., 2014; Boucher & Friot, 2017). This work fills a gap by centering freshwater systems and explicitly linking the lifecycle of plastics (from production to disposal) to in-river processes and management strategies.

The problem statement is as follows: freshwater microplastic pollution is pervasive, originates from heterogeneous and often cryptic sources, exhibits complex transport and transformation behaviors, adversely affects biota and ecosystem functions, and resists straightforward remediation due to detection limitations and governance fragmentation. There is a pressing need to synthesize existing disciplinary insights into coherent, actionable recommendations that can guide research, monitoring, and policy toward effective mitigation. The remainder of the article develops this synthesis, beginning with methods, then presenting a careful description of sources and fate, followed by detailed ecotoxicological consequences, detection and methodological challenges, an assessment of remediation and policy strategies, and concluding with forward-looking research and governance priorities.

METHODOLOGY

This research employs a conceptual synthesis methodology suited to integrative reviews that aim to draw theoretical connections across diverse literatures rather than perform quantitative meta-analysis. The selection of sources was constrained strictly to the references supplied as input; consequently, the review draws entirely on the materials science, marine and freshwater microplastic research, ecotoxicology studies, and policy analyses contained in the provided reference list (Shashoua, 2008; Plastics—The Facts, 2021; Nielsen et al., 2019; Andrady, 2015; Galgani et al., 2015; Wagner et al., 2014; Eerkes-Medrano & Thompson, 2018; Rochman & Hoellein, 2020; Rochman et al., 2013; Barnes et al., 2009; Boucher & Friot, 2017; Andrady, 2017; Alimi et al., 2017; Bellasi et al., 2020; Choy et al., 2019; Madala et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2019; Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021; Baskar & Gawade, 2021; Li et al., 2019). The adopted method involves:

1.Thematic extraction: Identifying core themes across the supplied literature — materials degradation and persistence, sources and lifecycle of plastics, patterns of distribution and transport, ecological effects and toxicological mechanisms, analytical and monitoring challenges, and remediation and governance approaches. Each theme was mapped to specific references to ensure claims are firmly grounded.

2.Synthesis and integration: Interweaving theoretical constructs from materials conservation (longevity, weathering pathways) with empirical findings on microplastic transport (vertical distribution, aggregation dynamics) and ecotoxicological evidence to form mechanistic narratives of how microplastics behave and affect freshwater systems. This step emphasizes causally coherent explanations rather than mere summarization.

3.Critical analysis: Evaluating the strengths and limitations of existing evidence, highlighting methodological gaps (e.g., sampling biases, inconsistent size classes), and inspecting the robustness of causal inferences in ecotoxicology and transport studies.

4.Prescriptive framing: Translating the integrated synthesis into actionable research priorities and management recommendations that respect the lifecycle of plastics and the ecological realities of freshwater environments.

Throughout, every significant factual assertion and conceptual claim is referenced to the original materials. The objective is not to produce novel empirical data but to create a rigorous, publication-ready narrative that consolidates interdisciplinary insights for researchers, managers, and policymakers.

RESULTS

This section presents a descriptive analysis of the integrated evidence under distinct but interrelated subheadings: sources and typologies, environmental persistence and degradation, transport and distribution mechanisms, ecological and toxicological impacts, detection and monitoring challenges, and existing remediation and governance actions.

Sources and typologies of freshwater microplastics

The literature classifies microplastics into primary and secondary categories. Primary microplastics are manufactured at microscopic sizes for specific uses—such as microbeads in personal care products and industrial pellets—whereas secondary microplastics arise from the breakdown of larger plastic items through mechanical abrasion, UV weathering, and biological action (Boucher & Friot, 2017; Andrady, 2017). In freshwater systems, additional notable sources include tyre and road wear particles that enter waterways via stormwater runoff, fibers shed from synthetic textiles during laundering, and fragmented litter from improper waste management (Plastics—The Facts, 2021; Li et al., 2019). The dominance of any source varies by catchment characteristics: urban basins often show higher fiber loads from sewage and laundry effluent, while agricultural or industrial catchments may present elevated pellet or film fragments associated with packaging and agricultural plastics (Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2019).

Critically, the lifecycle perspective demonstrates that upstream production choices—polymer composition, additives, and product design—shape downstream fragmentation dynamics and environmental persistence (Shashoua, 2008). For example, polymers with high crystallinity may resist fragmentation longer but, upon mechanical breakdown, produce fragments with different surface properties influencing sorption of hydrophobic contaminants (Andrady, 2015; Shashoua, 2008). This linkage between production and pollution underscores the need for lifecycle responsibility in mitigation strategies (Nielsen et al., 2019).

Environmental persistence and degradation pathways

Plastic materials were designed for durability; their molecular structures confer resistance to many natural degradation pathways (Shashoua, 2008). In freshwater settings, degradation involves a suite of physical, chemical, and biological processes. Photodegradation driven by ultraviolet radiation modifies polymer chains, making larger items more susceptible to fragmentation, while mechanical abrasion from sediment and bedload transport accelerates physical breakage. Hydrolysis and oxidative pathways also contribute, but at rates that vary considerably by polymer chemistry and environmental conditions (Shashoua, 2008; Andrady, 2015).

The net result is long residence times for plastic fragments across diverse microenvironments. Fragments may fragment progressively to micro and nano scales, a process that increases surface area and potentially enhances interaction with biotic and abiotic contaminants (Andrady, 2017; Alimi et al., 2017). The compositional heterogeneity—additives such as plasticizers, flame retardants, and stabilizers—further complicates persistence by altering material brittleness and sorption capacities (Shashoua, 2008; Rochman et al., 2013). Consequently, persistence is not merely a function of polymer backbone stability but also of particle geometry, additive chemistry, and environmental forcings such as sunlight exposure and mechanical stress.

Transport and distribution mechanisms in freshwater systems

Microplastics demonstrate complex transport behaviors that govern their spatial and temporal distribution within freshwater systems. Research indicates vertical distribution is not uniform: particles are found throughout the epipelagic to mesopelagic analogs in freshwater columns, often mediated by aggregation with organic matter, biofouling, and incorporation into fecal pellets and detrital aggregates (Choy et al., 2019; Alimi et al., 2017). Biofouling alters buoyancy, causing initially buoyant particles to sink, while mineral aggregation can accelerate deposition to sediments (Alimi et al., 2017). Flow dynamics—surface currents, turbulence, and episodic high-flow events—redistribute particles longitudinally and laterally, concentrating them in depositional zones like river bends, backwaters, and lacustrine sediments (Galgani et al., 2015; Barnes et al., 2009).

Biological transport is increasingly recognized as a crucial vector: ingestion and egestion by organisms such as zooplankton, fish, and benthic invertebrates can relocate plastics vertically and horizontally, effectively coupling trophic and physical transport pathways (Choy et al., 2019; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021). The interplay between physical aggregation processes and biological activity leads to episodic pulses of microplastic movement, complicating predictive modeling and monitoring strategies (Alimi et al., 2017; Choy et al., 2019).

Ecotoxicological impacts across trophic levels

Empirical studies demonstrate that microplastics provoke adverse effects at organismal, population, and potentially community scales. Laboratory and field evidence indicate particle ingestion can cause physical abrasion, blockage, reduced nutritional intake, and altered energy allocation (Rochman et al., 2013; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021). Rochman et al. (2013) showed that ingestion of plastics can facilitate transfer of hazardous chemicals to fish and induce hepatic stress, illustrating the role of microplastics as vectors for chemical exposure. Moreover, microplastics' propensity to sorb persistent organic pollutants and metals magnifies their risk profile by creating complex exposure pathways that combine particulate and chemical stressors (Alimi et al., 2017; Rochman & Hoellein, 2020).

The severity of impacts depends on particle size, shape, polymer type, and associated chemical loads, as well as species-specific feeding strategies and trophic position. Benthic organisms that ingest sediment particles are particularly vulnerable in depositional zones where microplastics accumulate (Bellasi et al., 2020; Baskar & Gawade, 2021). Higher trophic levels can experience biomagnification of associated chemicals and indirect effects through altered prey availability and habitat modification (Castro-Castellon et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2019). Importantly, field studies underline that combined stressors—microplastics plus eutrophication, hypoxia, or other pollutants—can produce synergistic effects that are not predictable from single-stress experiments (Castro-Castellon et al., 2021).

Detection and monitoring challenges

Robust assessment of microplastic pollution is hampered by methodological heterogeneity. Studies vary in sampling equipment (nets, pumps, sediment corers), size cutoffs, density separation protocols, and analytical identification techniques (visual sorting, FTIR, Raman spectroscopy), producing results that are often not directly comparable (Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Li et al., 2019). Furthermore, methodological constraints limit detection of the smallest fractions (nano- and small microplastics), which may be critically important for biological uptake and chemical transfer (Andrady, 2017; Alimi et al., 2017).

The fragmentation continuum—from macro to nano—raises conceptual challenges for monitoring: where should monitoring stop? Different regulatory and research needs drive varying thresholds. Systematic biases also emerge from sampling timing (e.g., ignoring episodic flood events), spatial coverage (few studies use rigorous probabilistic designs), and analytical thresholds, leading to underestimates or misrepresentations of true environmental loads (Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Li et al., 2019). Addressing these challenges requires standardized protocols, intercalibration exercises, and technological innovation to detect and quantify submicron particles in complex matrices (Andrady, 2017; Madala et al., 2025).

Remediation, management, and governance

Management strategies fall into three interdependent categories: prevention at source, in situ remediation/engineering controls, and policy or governance measures. Source control emphasizes design for reduced shedding, biodegradable or more easily recoverable materials, and extended producer responsibility to redirect lifecycle incentives (Plastics—The Facts, 2021; Nielsen et al., 2019). In situ engineering approaches include stormwater filtration, improved wastewater treatment (enhanced tertiary filtration and membrane technologies), and catchment-scale interventions like gross pollutant traps and constructed wetlands that capture particulate loads (Madala et al., 2025; Li et al., 2019). Biological remediation and biodegradation approaches remain experimental but hold promise if matched to specific polymers and environmental conditions (Shashoua, 2008; Andrady, 2017).

Governance instruments range from bans on microbeads and single-use plastics to more complex producer responsibility frameworks and integrated catchment management. The political dimensions of plastic pollution are nontrivial: actors across supply chains have divergent incentives, and policy effectiveness depends on multi-scalar coordination—from municipal wastewater operators to national regulatory bodies (Nielsen et al., 2019). The literature emphasizes that piecemeal measures are insufficient; durable mitigation requires harmonized regulations, investment in infrastructure, public engagement, and innovation in materials science and product design (Nielsen et al., 2019; Plastics—The Facts, 2021).

DISCUSSION

The integrated evidence leads to several interpretive insights, critical reflections on limitations, and delineation of research and policy priorities.

Interpreting the integrated dynamics of sources, fate, and effects

A lifecycle lens reveals that upstream decisions—about polymer choice, product design, and additive chemistry—are foundational determinants of downstream microplastic profiles (Shashoua, 2008; Plastics—The Facts, 2021). The empirical work on transport and biological mediation suggests that microplastics cannot be compartmentalized within neat environmental strata; instead, they dynamically traverse water columns, sediments, and biological conduits, producing temporally variable exposure landscapes for organisms (Choy et al., 2019; Alimi et al., 2017). Ecotoxicological studies, both laboratory and field, illustrate mechanisms by which microplastics exert harm—physical obstruction, reduced feeding efficiency, energy reallocation, and chemical transfer—but they also underline context dependence: species traits, pollutant co-exposures, and habitat conditions modulate outcomes (Rochman et al., 2013; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021). Thus, mitigation strategies must be multifaceted, addressing both the contingent ecological pathways and the systemic drivers of plastic proliferation.

Methodological limitations and their consequences for inference

The diversity of methodological practices in monitoring and experimentation reduces the comparability of results and may bias risk assessments. For instance, studies focusing on surface waters alone miss substantial sediment reservoirs and benthic exposures (Galgani et al., 2015; Bellasi et al., 2020). Laboratory ecotoxicology often uses pristine, spherical polystyrene beads as proxies for environmental microplastics; while valuable for mechanistic studies, such proxies can misrepresent the heterogeneous shapes, aging states, and chemical burdens of field particles (Andrady, 2017; Castro-Castellon et al., 2021). These methodological mismatches risk both underestimating real exposures and misdirecting remediation priorities. The literature points to an urgent need for standardized sampling and reporting frameworks, alongside the inclusion of environmentally realistic particle types and mixtures in toxicological research (Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Li et al., 2019).

Policy and governance tensions

The political dynamics of plastic governance are characterized by misaligned incentives, information asymmetries, and jurisdictional fragmentation (Nielsen et al., 2019). Regulatory successes—such as microbead bans—demonstrate that targeted policies can reduce specific sources, but broader systemic change demands reconfiguration of production and consumption norms, financial instruments to internalize environmental costs, and equitable transition policies for affected industries. The literature also highlights equity considerations: lower-income regions often lack wastewater and waste management infrastructure, resulting in disproportionate downstream burdens that compound environmental justice concerns (Plastics—The Facts, 2021; Nielsen et al., 2019). Effective governance must therefore integrate technical solutions with socio-economic strategies that consider distributional impacts and capacity constraints.

Remediation feasibility and tradeoffs

Engineering fixes—advanced filtration in wastewater treatment plants, stormwater controls, and targeted sediment remediation—offer tangible reductions in particulate loads but face scale, cost, and unintended effect challenges. Membrane technologies can capture small particles but create concentrated waste streams requiring disposal; wetland systems can trap microplastics but may transfer particulate loads into sediments where long-term fate is uncertain (Madala et al., 2025; Li et al., 2019). Bioremediation strategies and biodegradable plastics present promise but must be critically assessed for ecological safety and degradation byproducts (Shashoua, 2008; Andrady, 2017). Tradeoffs are unavoidable; choosing interventions requires careful evaluation of efficacy, co-benefits, and risks across spatial and temporal scales.

Research priorities

Synthesis of the literature yields priority areas where investment will disproportionately improve understanding and management:

1.Standardized monitoring protocols that harmonize size classes, sampling methods, and reporting standards to enable comparability and trend detection (Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015).

2.Mechanistically grounded ecotoxicology that employs environmentally realistic particles (aged, heterogeneous compositions) and examines chronic, sublethal endpoints across trophic levels and life history stages (Castro-Castellon et al., 2021).

3.Process studies of aggregation and biofouling to refine predictive transport models that integrate hydrodynamics and biological mediation (Alimi et al., 2017; Choy et al., 2019).

4.Pilot studies of scalable remediation that assess techno-economic feasibility, system interactions, and disposal pathways for captured microplastics (Madala et al., 2025).

5.Policy experiments and governance research that evaluate instruments such as extended producer responsibility, deposit return schemes, and infrastructure financing, with attention to equity and compliance mechanisms (Nielsen et al., 2019; Plastics—The Facts, 2021).

Addressing these priorities will require interdisciplinary collaboration spanning materials science, hydrology, ecology, toxicology, engineering, and social science.

Limitations of this synthesis

While this paper integrates a broad array of themes, its scope was deliberately limited to the references provided. This constraint ensured depth of engagement with supplied materials but excluded other potentially relevant empirical and theoretical contributions published outside the provided list. Consequently, while the synthesis frames robust conceptual linkages and prescriptive priorities, specific numerical estimates and meta-analytic effect sizes could not be computed here. Future systematic reviews that include wider bibliographic coverage and quantitative aggregation will be essential for refining risk assessments and cost-benefit analyses.

CONCLUSION

Freshwater microplastic pollution arises from a complex interplay of production choices, environmental degradation processes, hydrodynamic and biological transport mechanisms, and socio-political structures that shape prevention and remediation. The body of literature synthesized here demonstrates that microplastics are not inert contaminants; they interact with ecosystems as vectors of chemical transfer, modifiers of habitat, and stressors to organisms across trophic levels. Addressing the challenge demands integrated strategies that combine upstream design changes, robust monitoring and standardized methods, targeted engineering and ecological remediation, and governance instruments that align incentives across the plastic lifecycle. Research must prioritize harmonized detection protocols, environmentally realistic toxicology, mechanistic transport studies, and pilot remediation projects, while policy must emphasize lifecycle responsibility, equitable infrastructure investments, and adaptive governance that responds to evolving scientific knowledge. Only through such coordinated, interdisciplinary action can freshwater systems be protected from the pervasive and persistent threat posed by microplastic pollution.

REFERENCES

1. Shashoua, Y. Conservation of Plastics: Materials Science, Degradation and Preservation; Elsevier/Butterworth-Heinemann: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2008; pp. 19–38.
2. Plastics—The Facts 2021. Available online: https://plasticseurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/AF-Plastics-the-facts-2021_250122.pdf (accessed on 21 October 2022).
3. Nielsen, T. D.; Hasselbalch, J.; Holmberg, K.; Stripple, J. Politics and the plastic crisis: A review throughout the plastic life cycle. WIReS Energy Environ. 2019, 9, e360.
4. Andrady, A. L. Persistence of plastic litter in the oceans. In Marine Anthropogenic Litter; Bergman, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2015; pp. 57–72.

5. Galgani, F.; Hanke, G.; Maes, T. Global distribution, composition and abundance of marine litter. In Marine Anthropogenic Litter; Bergman, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2015; pp. 29–56.
6. Wagner, M.; Scherer, C.; Alvarez-Muñoz, D. Microplastics in freshwater ecosystems: What we know and what we need to know. Environ. Sci. Eur. 2014, 26, 12.
7. Eerkes-Medrano, D.; Thompson, R. Occurrence, fate, and effect of microplastics in freshwater systems. In Microplastic Contamination in Aquatic Environments: An Emerging Matter of Environmental Urgency; Zeng, E., Ed.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2018; pp. 95–132.
8. Rochman, C. M.; Hoellein, T. The global odyssey of plastic pollution. Science 2020, 368, 317–325.
9. Rochman, C. M.; Hoh, E.; Kurobe, T.; Teh, S. J. Ingested plastic transfers hazardous chemicals to fish and induces hepatic stress. Sci. Rep. 2013, 3, e3263.
10. Barnes, D. K. A.; Galgani, F.; Thompson, R. C.; Barlaz, M. Accumulation and fragmentation of plastic debris in global environments. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B. 2009, 364, 1985–1998.
11. Boucher, J.; Friot, D. Primary Microplastics in the Oceans: A Global Evaluation of Sources; IUCN: Gland, Switzerland, 2017; 46p.
12. Andrady, A. L. The plastic in microplastics: A review. Mar Pollut Bull. 2017;119(1):12–22. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.01.082
13. Alimi, O. S.; Budarz, J. F.; Hernandez, L. M.; Tufenkji, N. Microplastics and nanoplastics in aquatic environments: aggregation, deposition, and enhanced contaminant transport. Environ Sci Technol. 2017;52(4):1704–1724. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b05559
14. Bellasi, A.; Binda, G.; Pozzi, A.; Galafassi, S.; Volta, P.; Bettinetti, R. Microplastic contamination in freshwater environments: A review, focusing on interactions with sediments and benthic organisms. Environments. 2020;7(4):30. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/environments7040030
15. Choy, C. A.; Robison, B. H.; Gagne, T. O.; Erwin, B.; Firl, E.; Halden, R. U., et al. The vertical distribution and biological transport of marine microplastics across the epipelagic and mesopelagic water column. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44117-2
16. Madala, P.; Amey Waikar; Parate, H. Detection to Remediation: Strategies for Managing Microplastic Pollution in Freshwater Systems. International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and Engineering. 2025;11(3). https://doi.org/10.22399/ijcesen.3452
17. Xu, S.; Ma, J.; Ji, R.; Pan, K.; Miao, A. Microplastics in aquatic environments: Occurrence, accumulation, and biological effects. Sci Total Environ. 2019;703:134699. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.134699
18. Eerkes-Medrano, D.; Thompson, R. C.; Aldridge, D. C. Microplastics in freshwater systems: A review of the emerging threats, identification of knowledge gaps and prioritisation of research needs. Water Res. 2015;75:63–82. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.02.012
19. Castro-Castellon, A. T.; Horton, A. A.; Hughes, J. M.; Rampley, C.; Jeffers, E. S.; Bussi, G., et al. Ecotoxicity of microplastics to freshwater biota: Considering exposure and hazard across trophic levels. Sci Total Environ. 2021;816:151638. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151638

20. Baskar, K.; Gawade, S. Aquatic insects and their importance in assessing ecosystem health. MOJ Ecol Environ Sci. 2021;6(4):136–137. Available from: https://doi.org/10.15406/mojes.2021.06.00226

21. Li, C.; Busquets, R.; Campos, L. C. Assessment of microplastics in freshwater systems: A review. Sci Total Environ. 2019;707:135578. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135578