



The use of potassium hydroxide (KOH) solution as a suitable approach to isolate plastics ingested by marine organisms



Susanne Kühn^{a,*}, Bernike van Werven^{a,b}, Albert van Oyen^c, André Meijboom^a,
Elisa L. Bravo Rebolledo^{a,d}, Jan A. van Franeker^a

^a Wageningen University and Research, Department Wageningen Marine Research, Ankerpark 27, 1781 AG, Den Helder, The Netherlands

^b University of Utrecht, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands

^c CARAT GmbH, Harderhook 22, 46395 Bocholt, Germany

^d Elisa Bravo – Ecological and Biological Research, Zwaluwlaan 17, 3722 CH Bilthoven, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 September 2016

Received in revised form 15 November 2016

Accepted 15 November 2016

Available online 29 November 2016

Keywords:

Marine debris

Plastic

Potassium hydroxide (KOH)

Extraction method

ABSTRACT

In studies of plastic ingestion by marine wildlife, visual separation of plastic particles from gastrointestinal tracts or their dietary content can be challenging. Earlier studies have used solutions to dissolve organic materials leaving synthetic particles unaffected. However, insufficient tests have been conducted to ensure that different categories of consumer products partly degraded in the environment and/or in gastrointestinal tracts were not affected. In this study 63 synthetic materials and 11 other dietary items and non-plastic marine debris were tested. Irrespective of shape or preceding environmental history, most polymers resisted potassium hydroxide (KOH) solution, with the exceptions of cellulose acetate from cigarette filters, some biodegradable plastics and a single polyethylene sheet. Exposure of hard diet components and other marine debris showed variable results. In conclusion, the results confirm that usage of KOH solutions can be a useful approach in general quantitative studies of plastic ingestion by marine wildlife.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Marine pollution, and specifically plastic pollution, has gained major attention in the scientific world, as well as in the public perception. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has placed marine debris on the global agenda, and listed it as one of the major emerging environmental problems of this time (UNEP, 2011). By now at least 557 species of marine wildlife have been recorded to either ingest plastic or get entangled in marine debris (Kühn et al., 2015) including several species considered threatened by international standards (Gall & Thompson, 2015). Plastic ingestion by marine wildlife such as seabirds, marine mammals and turtles has received attention in many publications since the late 1960s (e.g. Kenyon & Kridler, 1969; Baltz & Morejohn, 1976; Ryan, 1987; Walker & Coe, 1990; Balazs, 1985; Duguay et al., 1980). Dedicated research on ingestion of plastic by fish however, only gained significant attention from 2010 onwards (e.g. Boerger et al., 2010; Foekema et al., 2013; Lusher et al., 2013; Rummel et al., 2016; see online Supplement Table 1). The increased attention for fish can be explained by potential toxicological impacts of chemicals associated with ingested plastics and the fact that these chemicals may

be consumed by humans (Rochman et al., 2012, 2013). Some of these substances are additives integrated into the plastic during manufacture and processing to alter the characteristics of the product (Andrady & Neal, 2009). Other substances have been found to get adsorbed while plastic floats in seawater (Teuten et al., 2009; Mato et al., 2001). The uptake of chemical substances might have an effect not only on the organisms themselves, but also on predators higher up in the food chain, including ultimately human consumers (Tanabe et al., 2003; Tanaka et al., 2013; Van Cauwenberghe & Janssen, 2014; Rochman, 2015; Miranda & de Carvalho-Souza, 2016).

Seabirds, turtles and marine mammals can often only be sampled opportunistically in small numbers. However, in studies of smaller marine organisms dedicated sampling of a large number of individuals is possible (e.g. Dantas et al., 2012; Anastasopoulou et al., 2013; Foekema et al., 2013) and recommended by Galgani et al. (2013). This large sample size has an effect on the methodological approach, as individual dissection can be difficult and time consuming in smaller organisms. In particular when the frequency of occurrence of plastic is low and for reasons of financial efficiency it can be necessary to find methods to process larger bulks of samples even though details on individual occurrence are lost. Different methods to speed up these processes have been attempted. Recently, Dehaut et al. (2016) compared different protocols using chemical solutions intended to dissolve organic matter while retaining ingested plastics. Out of six potentially suitable

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: susanne.kuehn@wur.nl (S. Kühn).

fluids, potassium hydroxide (KOH) solutions proved to be the most effective for this purpose. A literature review on articles dedicated to plastic ingestion by marine organisms revealed that a 10% KOH solution has been used in six earlier studies, mainly analysing the ingestion of plastic in fish (Foekema et al., 2013; Rochman et al., 2015; Tahir & Rochman, 2015; Lusher et al. 2016; Tanaka & Takada, 2016; online Supplement Table 1), and also during the analysis of the complete gastrointestinal tract of a beached humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*; Besseling et al., 2015). As KOH is mainly sold as solid material it was assumed that the 10% solution used in these studies ranges from 1.5–1.8 Molar depending on purity of the solid material. Dehaut et al. (2016) recommend the use of KOH for future research after testing pristine polymer types, whereas plastics ingested by marine wildlife is mainly composed of plastic consumer wastes that have a) undergone various treatments during production processes b) have been subjected to variable periods of environmental degradation (Ter Halle et al., 2016), and c) may be affected by chemical or enzymatic processes in the gastrointestinal tract of the species studied. The pH in stomachs can vary depending on its fullness. It has been found that the pH in albatross stomachs can be as low as 1.5 (Gremillet et al., 2012) and 1.4 in fish (Lavell, 1989). Enzymatic degradation (Tokiwa et al., 2009) as well as temperature might also alter the characteristics of plastic in stomachs of organisms.

Thus, in addition to fresh industrial polymer types, the scope of the current study was extended to a range of consumer products and included environmentally degraded samples collected from beaches. Furthermore the potential impacts from digestive processes were evaluated by repeating KOH solution tests on a selection of samples that had been exposed to stomach fluids of northern fulmars (*Fulmarus glacialis*), acids, or both prior to the KOH solution treatment. A number of so-called biodegradable or compostable plastics was included in these KOH solution experiments. Circumstances at sea differ tremendously from degradation processes in the compost industry (Accinelli et al., 2012; Shah et al., 2013) and increasing proportions of biodegradable plastics may persist in the marine environment for long periods of time. Such plastics may already be or become a relevant issue in studies of plastic ingestion by marine wildlife.

2. Methods

2.1. Sample collection and preparation

For this study 74 different types of particles were examined, 63 of which belonged to different plastic types and shapes, and an additional 11 samples of other debris or natural hard dietary items. Of the 63 plastic particle types, six belonged to biodegradable plastics and 57 to conventional plastics. 16 particles were pristine industrial polymers, 36 were taken from fresh consumer products and 14 were collected from beaches (containing samples of both environmentally degraded industrial pellets and consumer waste). An overview of particles studied is given in Table 1 and full details are available in the online Supplement. All items have been categorized following Van Franeker et al. (2011) and OSPAR (2015) which distinguish industrial pellets, sheets, threads, foams, fragments, threads and 'other'. For the purpose of this study the category 'other' has been split into a category for rubber-like materials and one for other plastics. Plastic debris was collected from beaches in the north of the Netherlands, especially the island of Texel (53° 1' N, 4° 8' E) over a number of recent years. A majority of the 63 tested plastic samples (n = 48) had an identified polymer composition, either provided directly by the producer (supplied by Carat GmbH), read from product labels, or identified using FTIR-ATR (Fourier Transform Infrared-Attenuated Total Reflection; Shimadzu Prestige, No. of Scans: 10, Resolution: 4 (1/cm), Spectra: 4000–600 1/cm, Apodization: Happ-Genzel, Library ATR Polymer2, IRs Polymer 2, T-Polymer). The other 15 samples are of an unknown polymer type. The KOH solution resistance of 11 samples of items regularly encountered in marine

Table 1

Characterization of samples used in the KOH experiment (n = 74) by category, origin and (when applicable) polymer type. Classification of categories follows van Franeker et al. (2011).

Category	Nr. of samples (Conventional/biodegradable)	Pristine/consumer/beach	Nr. of samples with known polymer basis ^a
Pellets	20 (18/2)	16/0/4	16
Sheet	14 (11/3)	0/12/2	9
Thread	4 (4/0)	0/3/1	3
Foam	7 (7/0)	0/4/3	6
Fragment	8 (7/1)	0/8/0	7
Rubber	8 (8/0)	0/6/2	6
Other synthetic	2 (2/0)	0/2/0	1
Other debris ^b	3	0/1/2	na
Natural ^c	8	na	na

^a Identified polymers used in this study: ABS = acrylonitrile butadiene styrene, CA = cellulose acetate, EVA = ethylene-vinyl acetate, HD-PE = high density polyethylene, GPPS = general purpose polystyrene, LD-PE = low density polyethylene, NBR = nitrile butadiene rubber, PA = polyamide, PBT = polybutylene terephthalate, PC = polycarbonate, PE = polyethylene, PET = polyethylene terephthalate PP = polypropylene, PS = polystyrene, PUR = polyurethane, PVC = polyvinyl chloride, SAN = styrene acrylonitrile resin and different biodegradable bioplastics: Bio4Pack, Cradonyl, Mater-Bi, PHB = Polyhydroxybutyrate, PLA = polylactic acid, Wenterra.

^b Including: palm fat, paraffin, metal fish hook.

^c Including: seaweed, squid beaks, polychaete beaks, sheep wool, seal whisker, fish otoliths, bird feather, manilla rope.

organisms or on beaches was tested, including seaweed, squid beaks, polychaete beaks, sheep wool, seal whiskers, fish otoliths, bird feathers, manilla rope and a metal fish hook. Other debris includes lumps of beached paraffin and palm fat. Full details can be found in the online Supplement.

2.2. Sample processing

Larger objects were cut to particles sized approximately 5 mm diameter as industrial plastic pellets and some natural objects had such size already. With a few exceptions (e.g. natural substances, a fish hook, a soft airgun bullet), 10 particles were combined to one sample and were then weighed to the nearest 0.0001 g (Sartorius 1702MP8). The 63 samples weighed on average 0.29 g, sd ± 0.67 g (maximum weight 4.49 g). They were put in glass jars and submerged in circa 20 ml of a 1 Molar KOH solution (Fisher Chemicals) at 18–21 °C (hereafter referred to as room temperature) for two days. Samples were then rinsed under tap water on a 0.3 mm sieve, dried at room temperature for six days and weighed again.

Earlier publications using 10% KOH solutions (depending on purity 1.5–1.8 M concentration) and earlier trials (see online Supplement) had shown full dissolution of fish tissue. Therefore in the current study, the lower 1 M concentration was used in order to further reduce any potential effect on plastics. Drying the samples at room temperature was the chosen method to keep the procedure as simple as possible in other situations where no incubators are available. Furthermore this approach corresponds to the method used during the standard fulmar research (Van Franeker et al., 2011).

Tests exposing sprat (*Sprattus sprattus*) to a KOH solution of 1 M at room temperature for two days, showed that samples of stomachs and intestines (ca. 1 g), and even a whole sprat (10.5 cm, 8.9 g), dissolved completely (except for the otoliths), with remains passing through a 0.3 mm sieve without problems. Therefore he tests with individually known plastics using 1 M solution for two days exposure were executed.

2.3. Tests in gastrointestinal fluids

In a second experiment 22 samples were subjected to a simulated gastrointestinal environment prior to the KOH treatment (see Table 2). The treatment in KOH followed the same procedures as mentioned

Table 2

Characteristics of samples ($n = 22$) exposed to stomach fluid and/or acids (HCl) prior to the KOH experiment. None of the samples belonging to the categories “other synthetics” and “other debris” were tested. For details on polymer types and natural substances see Table 1.

Category	Nr. of samples (Conventional/biodegradable)	Pristine/consumer/beach	Nr. of identified polymer types
Pellets	9 (9/0)	8/1/0	8
Sheet	1 (1/0)	0/1/0	0
Foam	4 (4/0)	0/3/1	3
Fragment	1 (0/1)	0/1/0	1
Rubber	3 (3/0)	0/2/1	1
Natural	2	na	na

Table 3

Summarized results of tests in which individually known synthetic substances were exposed to KOH solution of 1 M for two days at room temperature. Tabulated are mass changes in percentages of samples after KOH treatment and 6 days of drying time at room temperature. None of the changes in synthetics, rubbers and biodegradable plastics were significant.

Category	n	Average change	± sd	Minimum change	Maximum change
Synthetic pellets	18	0%	± 1%	0%	3%
Synthetic sheets	11	4%	± 23%	− 7%	75%
Synthetic threads	4	16%	± 25%	0%	51%
Synthetic foams	7	44%	± 43%	9%	119%
Synthetic fragments	7	0%	± 0%	0%	1%
Other synthetics	2	− 16%	± 22%	− 31%	0%
Rubbers	8	2%	± 2%	0%	6%
Biodegradable plastics	6	− 7%	± 42%	− 100%	14%
Natural Materials	8	− 31%	± 60%	− 100%	38%
Non natural materials	3	0%	± 1%	− 1%	1%
Animal tissues	4	− 54%	± 50%	− 100%	0%

above (2 days, 1 M KOH). After weighing, the subsamples were put in stomach fluids of northern fulmars, or in undiluted hydrochloric acid (HCl, 1 N standard solution, Acros Organics) or in a mixture of these for one day. Stomach fluids originated from northern fulmars hunted for human consumption on the Faroe Islands and were stored at -20°C until usage. For the chemical composition of fulmar stomach fluids see: Wang et al. (2007). From literature the pH value in stomachs of live seabirds was known to be around 1.5 (Gremillet et al., 2012). However, when measured in the lab the pH of the stomach fluid was

found to be around 4. To correct for this change, acid was added artificially, as stomach fluid apparently changes its pH value after death or during storage. To be able to differentiate between possible effects caused by either stomach fluid or acid or both samples were treated with these substances separately and in combination. After treatments, the samples were rinsed as described for the KOH tests above. After an initial drying period of 3 days, parts of the samples still felt wet and had excess weight. For practical reasons the samples then had to be stored for four weeks in plastic bags. Following storage samples were dried for an additional arbitrary period of five days before weighing for a second time.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis were conducted for mass differences before and after KOH treatments and were performed using Genstat 18th Edition (Payne et al., 2015). Potential usage of *t*-test for paired samples was evaluated by the Shapiro-Wilk test for Normality, which showed that only data for industrial pellets were sufficiently close to normality to allow usage of the *t*-test. As a non-parametric alternative, the Mann-Whitney *U* test (equal to Wilcoxon rank-sum) was used for the tests. Significance level was taken as $p < 0.05$.

3. Results

Among the traditional plastics, most items with relatively smooth hard surfaces, (the industrial pellets and fragments) were completely unaffected with 0% average mass change, and at most 3% change in an individual type (Table 3). Results for pellets by *t*-test paired samples showed differences before and after KOH treatment to be non-significant ($n = 18$, $p = 0.076$). The Mann-Whitney *U* tests revealed no statistical differences in any of the categories of synthetics, rubbers or biodegradables (Categories and sample sizes shown in Table 3).

The categories contain a broad range of different polymers that remain unaffected from exposure to 1 M KOH solution, and this is valid also for particles showing environmental degradation (e.g. discoloured yellowish pellets collected from the beach) and also in tests simulating potential gastrointestinal degradation of the materials (Table 4). Full results are available in the online Supplement.

Other categories of synthetic materials showed much more variable results, although mostly not in the sense of mass loss. Some types of sheet- and threadlike materials, especially foams, retained considerable

Table 4

Details of standard KOH solution impacts on industrial plastic pellets, pristine and from beaches, including simulated impacts from digestion processes in seabird stomachs (stomach fluids SF; acid environment (HCl) or their combination). Shown are percentages of change in mass of plastic after treatments.

Synthetic pellets Description	Origin	Polymer type	Treatment weight change			
			KOH solution	SF + KOH	HCl + KOH	SF + HCl + KOH
Black pellets, possibly recycled	Beach		− 0.1%			
White pellets	Pristine	LD-PE	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%
White pellets	Pristine	PP	0.0%	0.4%	− 0.6%	0.1%
White pellets	Pristine	PBT	0.0%			
White pellets	Beach		0.0%			
Transparent pellets	Pristine	EVA VA19%	0.0%			
Purple pellets	Pristine	PET	0.1%	0.4%	7.0%	− 2.9%
Green pellets	Pristine	PE-LLD recycled	0.1%			
Transparent pellets	Pristine	SAN	0.1%			
White pellets	Pristine	PA66	0.2%	1.9%	1.4%	1.7%
Transparent pellets	Pristine	GPPS	0.2%			
Discoloured (yellowish) pellets	Beach		0.2%			
Black biobead (sewage usage?)	Beach		0.2%	0.2%	− 0.1%	0.1%
Transparent pellets	Pristine	PC	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Transparent pellets	Pristine	PA6	1.0%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%
White pellets	Pristine	ABS	1.1%			
White pellets	Pristine	HD-PE	1.6%	0.5%	0.0%	0.6%
Orange pellets	Pristine	HD-PE	2.8%			
Total	$n = 18$		0.4%	0.6%	1.0%	0.2%

moisture under the test conditions, and became heavier, apparently given insufficient time to fully dry.

In a few samples, however, substantial loss of mass was observed. One sheet-like plastic of low density polyethylene (LD-PE) lost 7% of original mass. Cigarette filter material (CA cellulose acetate) lost 31% of its mass, and among the biodegradable plastic types, a sample from a bag made from PLA (polylactic acid) dissolved completely, while pellets from a material known as Cradonyl lost 33% of their original mass.

Non-plastic debris that was tested showed resistance to KOH solution. In this short experiment, lack of change in a fish hook was expected, but remarkably, the fairly soft materials of beach collected lumps of paraffin and palm fat did not suffer weight loss from exposure to the KOH solution.

Among non-plastic materials found in, for example, bird stomachs, many substances were dissolved by the KOH solution (Polychaete jaws, sheep wool, seal whiskers, bird feathers) but others were largely retained, two notable examples being fish otoliths and squid beaks. The difference between squid beaks and polychaete worm jaws is remarkable as both are assumed to be built from the same natural polymer, keratin. Table 3 summarizes the results by category of material. Full details are given in the online Supplement.

Balloon rubber, likely largely consisting of natural latex, did not show a decrease in weight, but rather, exceeded its original mass after processing. It was also seen that the exposure of balloon rubber to the stomach fluid of northern fulmars triggers a change in material characteristics. The rubbery structure was lost and the material became fluid and sticky. These results correspond to the personal observations of the authors when finding balloon remains or similar substances in the stomachs of northern fulmars: although not evident inside the stomach, once removed and laid out to dry, many of these items become a mucoid mud rather than a dried particle.

Foamed materials in particular when exposed to fulmar stomach fluids, sometimes showed an excessive increase in weight (see online supplement) indicating that the oily substances in these stomach fluids had settled in the airy spaces and were not removed by simple rinsing in cold water and subsequent drying. Results for industrial pellets (Table 4) indicate, however, that the conclusion is justified that exposure to stomach fluids or HCL does not make plastic polymers more prone to dissolving in KOH solution.

4. Discussion

When promoting a new method it is important to make sure that it works under various circumstances. Exposing stomachs and their contents to KOH solutions is a newly proposed method to efficiently study plastic ingestion in situations where individual visual separation of plastics from gastrointestinal tracts is too difficult or too labour intensive. However, the assumption that indeed organic components are dissolved and all synthetic materials are retained needs proper testing. Such testing should include not only virgin polymer types, but must consider a wide variety of synthetic consumer products, also taking into account the potential impacts from material degradation in the environment or in the gastrointestinal tracts of species studied.

During this study, plastics of different categories, polymer types and origins as well as natural substances and items were tested and exposed to a KOH solution in a concentration which easily dissolved the tissues of a small fish species (*Sprattus sprattus*, solution of 1 Molar KOH concentration, applied during 2 days at room temperature). The results show that a wide range of polymer types, in different shapes and forms, and partly subjected to earlier environmental degradation were not affected by this KOH solution treatment. As was reported by Dehaut et al. (2016) one of the few synthetic substances that was dissolved in KOH solution was cellulose acetate (CA), in this study represented by a cigarette filter. Cigarette filters are often found in high numbers on tourist beaches (Ocean Conservancy, 2016). Besides additives added to the polymer during production processes, the toxic

compounds of cigarettes are attached to the filters and have been proved to be toxic to fish (Slaughter et al., 2011). However, in plastic samples from the marine environment, cigarette filters seem infrequent. Once soaked, the material will probably disintegrate and loose fibrous elements (Puls et al., 2011) and will not be easily detected in the water or in animal stomachs or intestines. In long term studies of plastic ingestion in northern fulmars in the North Sea (Van Franeker et al., 2011) there are only a few records of ingested cigarette filters. Results for the Netherlands suggest maybe 3 such cases in over a 1000 stomachs analysed.

Remarkably, among several samples representing polyethylene (PE) one bag labelled as being made of LD-PE showed some degradation, with 7% mass loss in the experiment. The reason for this contradictory case is not clear, but could indicate degradation or production issues.

Two out of six biodegradable plastics showed substantial degradation following KOH treatment: fragments from a bag made from polylactic acid (PLA) disappeared completely, and granules of a material called Cradonyl lost one third of their original mass. In 2014, bio-based and biodegradable plastics together represented <1% of the global plastic production (EUBP, 2016). Even though the degradation of bioplastics in the ocean is very slow (Accinelli et al., 2012; O'Brine & Thompson, 2010), this suggests that only a small share of the marine debris currently consists of this material. In the near future, the proportion of such polymers will likely remain low, even though the production is expected to quadruple by 2019 (EUBP, 2016). However, the effects of this development should be monitored, as on the longer term this might have consequences on the composition of plastics found in the ocean and subsequently in marine organisms.

Treatment of samples with seabird stomach fluids and acids to simulate digestive processes did not change the results of the KOH tests. The results of this study indicate that the chosen KOH solution concentration (1 M, two days at room temperature) can be safely applied in a quantitative study to estimate levels of plastic ingestion by small fish. Proportions of ingested plastics that are lost through KOH treatment will be relatively small. The tests, however, also showed that drying times needed to get rid of moisture in foamed plastics were substantial, and that such problems were aggravated by fatty stomach fluids. This implies that when a study species ingests a substantial proportion of foamed materials, additional procedures for cleaning and drying the isolated plastics should be considered and tested. Standard protocols often advise to quantify plastic ingestion by marine wildlife in terms of plastic mass (Ryan et al., 2009; Van Franeker et al., 2011; OSPAR, 2015; Provencher et al., 2016). Components of the dissolved KOH could also contribute to the increased weight.

An initial trial with samples containing a mix of plastics collected on beaches (see online supplement) suggests that the conclusions are similarly valid with increased concentrations of 10% KOH solutions. Results by Dehaut et al. (2016) suggest that such a concentration can also be applied safely at a temperature of 50 °C. On the other hand, a preliminary test on digestion of seabird intestines under our standard exposure of 1 M KOH for 2 days, showed them to be immune to that concentration even if duration was prolonged. Depending on the tissue to be dissolved, concentration and duration may need to be increased to achieve disintegration of the organic material. The fulmar intestines tested in these studies were found to dissolve completely in three days in 5 M KOH solution at 60 °C. Resistance of plastics to such other conditions will vary and needs additional testing. When studies of plastic ingestion are combined with research of the diet, care should be taken with KOH applications. Important diet items such as fish otoliths and squid beaks appear to be resistant, but some other similar components disappeared. Therefore it is recommended to test typical prey items occurring in the species studied to make sure they are resistant to the KOH dissolution procedure.

Overall, the results of this study confirm in detail that the KOH approach to separate plastics from organic matter is a valuable and practical method in studies of plastic ingestion by marine wildlife.

Acknowledgements

The first author was funded by the Joint Program Initiative (JPI) Oceans PLASTOX (Direct and indirect ecotoxicological impacts of microplastics on marine organisms) project through the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) under the project number ALW-NWO 856.15.001. Christopher Miele checked grammar and spelling of this manuscript. Marine litter studies by Wageningen Marine research receive long-term support from the Netherlands Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment. We want to thank the anonymous reviewer for the critical revision of the earlier version of this manuscript.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.034>.

References

- Accinelli, C., Sacca, M.L., Mencarelli, M., Vicari, A., 2012. Deterioration of bioplastic carrier bags in the environment and assessment of a new recycling alternative. *Chemosphere* 89:136–143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2012.05.028>.
- Anastasopoulou, A., Mytilineou, C., Smith, C.J., Papadopoulou, K.N., 2013. Plastic debris ingested by deep-water fish of the Ionian Sea (Eastern Mediterranean). *Deep-Sea Res. I Oceanogr. Res. Pap.* 74:11–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2012.12.008>.
- Andrady, A.L., Neal, M.A., 2009. Applications and societal benefits of plastics. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B Biol. Sci.* 364:1977–1984. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0304>.
- Balazs, G.H., 1985. Impact of ocean debris on marine turtles: entanglement and ingestion. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the workshop on the fate and impact of marine debris, 26–29 November 1984, Honolulu, Hawaii. NOAA Technical Memo NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-54, pp. 387–429.
- Baltz, D.M., Morejohn, G.V., 1976. Evidence From Seabirds And Plastic Particle Pollution Off Central California Western Birds. 7 pp. 11–12.
- Besseling, E., Foekema, E.M., Van Franeker, J.A., Leopold, M.F., Kühn, S., Bravo Rebolledo, E.L., Heße, E., Mielke, L., Ilzer, J., Kamminga, P., 2015. Microplastic in a macro filter feeder: humpback whale *Megaptera novaeangliae*. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 95, 248–252.
- Boerger, C.M., Lattin, G.L., Moore, S.L., Moore, C.J., 2010. Plastic ingestion by planktivorous fishes in the North Pacific Central Gyre. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 60:2275–2278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.08.007>.
- Dantas, D.V., Barletta, M., da Costa, M.F., 2012. The seasonal and spatial patterns of ingestion of polyfilament nylon fragments by estuarine drums (Scaenidae). *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 19, 600–606.
- Dehaut, A., Cassone, A.-L., Frère, L., Hermabessiere, L., Himber, C., Rinnert, E., Rivière, G., Lambert, C., Soudant, P., Huvet, A., 2016. Microplastics in seafood: benchmark protocol for their extraction and characterization. *Environ. Pollut.* 215, 223–233.
- Duguay, R., Duron, M., Alzieu, C., 1980. Observation de tortues luth (*Dermodochelys coriacea* L.) dans les partus charentais en 1979. *Annales de la Société de Sciences Naturelles de la Charente-Maritime*. 6, pp. 681–691.
- EU BP, 2016. Frequently Asked Questions on Bioplastics. European Bioplastics, Berlin, p. 21.
- Foekema, E.M., De Groot, C., Mergia, M.T., van Franeker, J.A., Murk, A.J., Koelmans, A.A., 2013. Plastic in North Sea fish. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47:8818–8824. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es400931b>.
- Galgani, F., Hanke, G., Werner, S., Oosterbaan, L., Nilsson, P., Fleet, D., Kinsey, S., Thompson, R.C., Van Franeker, J.A., Vlachogianni, T., Scoullou, M., Mira Veiga, J., Palatinus, A., Matiddi, M., Maes, T., Korpinen, S., Budziak, A., Leslie, H., Gago, J., Liebezeit, G., 2013. Guidance on Monitoring of Marine Litter in European Seas - A Guidance Document Within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. EUR-26113 EN. JRC Scientific and Policy Reports JRC83985. (128pp). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2788/99475>.
- Gall, S.C., Thompson, R.C., 2015. The impact of debris on marine life. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 92, 170–179.
- Gremillet, D., Prudor, A., le Maho, Y., Weimerskirch, H., 2012. Vultures of the seas: hyperacidic stomachs in wandering albatrosses as an adaptation to dispersed food resources, including fishery wastes. *PLoS One* 7, e37834. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0037834>.
- Kenyon, K.W., Kridler, E., 1969. Laysan albatrosses swallow indigestible matter. *Auk* 86, 339–343.
- Kühn, S., Bravo Rebolledo, E.L., van Franeker, J.A., 2015. Deleterious effects of litter on marine life. In: Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M. (Eds.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. Springer, pp. 75–116 (<http://edepot.wur.nl/344861>).
- Lavell, R., 1989. *Nutrition and Feeding of Fish*. Springer.
- Lusher, A., McHugh, M., Thompson, R., 2013. Occurrence of microplastics in the gastrointestinal tract of pelagic and demersal fish from the English Channel. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 67, 94–99.
- Lusher, A.L., O'Donnell, C., Officer, R., O'Connor, I., 2016. Microplastic interactions with North Atlantic mesopelagic fish. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.: J. Conseil.* 73, 1214–1225.
- Mato, Y., Isobe, T., Takada, H., Kanehiro, H., Ohtake, C., Kaminuma, T., 2001. Plastic resin pellets as a transport medium for toxic chemicals in the marine environment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 35, 318–324.
- Miranda, D.d.A., de Carvalho-Souza, G.F., 2016. Are we eating plastic-ingesting fish? *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 103 (1–2):109–114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.035>.
- O'Brine, T., Thompson, R.C., 2010. Degradation of plastic carrier bags in the marine environment. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 60:2279–2283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.08.005>.
- Ocean Conservancy, 2016. *International Coastal Cleanup Annual Report*. p. 24 (Washington, DC).
- OSPAR, 2015. *Guidelines For Monitoring Of Plastic Particles In Stomachs Of Fulmars In The North Sea Area Ospar Commission Agreement 2015–03* (Vol. Source: EIIA 15/5/12 Add.1., pp. 26).
- Payne, R., Murray, D., Harding, S., 2015. An Introduction to the Genstat Command Language (18th Edition). VSN International, Hemel Hempstead, UK. <http://cdn.vsnl.co.uk/downloads/genstat/release18/doc/CommandIntro.pdf> (133pp).
- Provencher, J.F., Bond, A.L., Avery-Gomm, S., Borrelle, S.B., Bravo Rebolledo, E.L., Hammer, S., Kühn, S., Lavers, J.L., Mallory, M.L., Trevaill, A., Van Franeker, J.A., 2016. Quantifying ingested debris in marine megafauna: a review and recommendations for standardization. *Anal. Methods* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C6AY02419J> (In press).
- Puls, J., Wilson, S.A., Hölter, D., 2011. Degradation of cellulose acetate-based materials: a review. *J. Polym. Environ.* 19, 152–165.
- Rochman, C.M., 2015. The complex mixture, fate and toxicity of chemicals associated with plastic debris in the marine environment. In: Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M. (Eds.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. Springer, pp. 117–140.
- Rochman, C.M., Hoh, E., Hentschel, B.T., Kaye, S., 2012. Long-term field measurement of sorption of organic contaminants to five types of plastic pellets: implications for plastic marine debris. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47:1646–1654. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es303700s>.
- Rochman, C.M., Browne, M.A., Halpern, B.S., Hentschel, B.T., Hoh, E., Karapanagioti, H.K., Rios-Mendoza, L.M., Takada, H., Teh, S., Thompson, R.C., 2013. Policy: classify plastic waste as hazardous. *Nature* 494:169–171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/494169a>.
- Rochman, C.M., Tahir, A., Williams, S.L., Baxa, D.V., Lam, R., Miller, J.T., Miller, J.T., Teh, F.-C., Werorilangi, S., Teh, S.J., 2015. Anthropogenic debris in seafood: plastic debris and fibers from textiles in fish and bivalves sold for human consumption. *Sci. Report.* 5, 14340.
- Rummel, C.D., Löder, M.G., Fricke, N.F., Lang, T., Griebeler, E.-M., Janke, M., Gerdt, G., 2016. Plastic ingestion by pelagic and demersal fish from the North Sea and Baltic Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 102, 134–141.
- Ryan, P.G., 1987. The incidence and characteristics of plastic particles ingested by seabirds. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 23:175–206. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0141-1136\(87\)90028-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0141-1136(87)90028-6).
- Ryan, P.G., Moore, C.J., Van Franeker, J.A., Moloney, C.L., 2009. Monitoring the abundance of plastic debris in the marine environment. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* 364:1999–2012. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0207>.
- Shah, A.A., Hasan, F., Shah, Z., Kanwal, N., Zeb, S., 2013. Biodegradation of natural and synthetic rubbers: a review. *Int. Biodeterior. Biodegrad.* 83, 145–157.
- Slaughter, E., Gersberg, R.M., Watanabe, K., Rudolph, J., Stransky, C., Novotny, T.E., 2011. Toxicity of cigarette butts, and their chemical components, to marine and freshwater fish. *Toxicol. Control.* 20 (Suppl. 1), i25–i29.
- Tahir, A., Rochman, C.M., 2015. Plastic particles in silverside (*Stolephorus heterolobus*) collected at Paotere Fish Market, Makassar. *Int. J. Agric. Syst.* 2, 163–168.
- Tanabe, S., Watanabe, M., Minh, T.B., Kunisue, T., Nakanishi, S., Ono, H., Tanaka, H., 2003. PCDDs, PCDFs, and coplanar PCBs in albatross from the North Pacific and Southern Oceans: levels, patterns, and toxicological implications. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 38: 403–413. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es034966x>.
- Tanaka, K., Takada, H., 2016. Microplastic fragments and microbeads in digestive tracts of planktivorous fish from urban coastal waters. *Sci. Report.* 6, 34351.
- Tanaka, K., Takada, H., Yamashita, R., Mizukawa, K., Fukuwaka, M.-a., Watanuki, Y., 2013. Accumulation of plastic-derived chemicals in tissues of seabirds ingesting marine plastics. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 69:219–222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.12.010>.
- Ter Halle, A., Ladirat, L., Gendreau, X., Goudouneche, D., Pusineri, C., Routaboul, C., Tenaillon, C., Duployer, B., Perez, E., 2016. Understanding the fragmentation pattern of marine plastic debris. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 5668–5675.
- Teuten, E.L., Saquing, J.M., Knappe, D.R., Barlaz, M.A., Jonsson, S., Bjorn, A., Rowland, S.J., Thompson, R.C., Galloway, T.S., Yamashita, R., Ochi, D., Watanuki, Y., Moore, C., Viet, P.H., Tana, T.S., Prudente, M., Boonyatumanond, R., Zakaria, M.P., Akkhang, K., Ogata, Y., Hirai, H., Iwasa, S., Mizukawa, K., Hagino, Y., Imamura, A., Saha, M., Takada, H., 2009. Transport and release of chemicals from plastics to the environment and to wildlife. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B Biol. Sci.* 364:2027–2045. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0284>.
- Tokiwai, Y., Calabria, B.P., Ugwu, C.U., Aiba, S., 2009. Biodegradability of plastics. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 10, 3722–3742.
- UNEP, 2011. *UNEP Year Book, 2011: Emerging Issues in our Global Environment* United Nations Environmental Programme, Nairobi. p. 79.
- Van Cauwenbergh, L., Janssen, C.R., 2014. Microplastics in bivalves cultured for human consumption. *Environ. Pollut.* 193, 65–70.
- Van Franeker, J.A., Blaize, C., Danielsen, J., Fairclough, K., Gollan, J., Guse, N., Hansen, P.L., Heubeck, M., Jensen, J.K., Le Guillou, G., Olsen, B., Olsen, K.O., Pedersen, J., Stienen, E.W., Turner, D.M., 2011. Monitoring plastic ingestion by the northern fulmar *Fulmarus glacialis* in the North Sea. *Environ. Pollut.* 159:2609–2615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.06.008>.
- Walker, W.A., Coe, J.M., 1990. Survey of marine debris ingestion by odontocete cetaceans. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Second International Conference on marine debris, Honolulu, Hawaii. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-154, pp. 2–7.
- Wang, S.W., Iverson, S.J., Springer, A.M., Hatch, S.A., 2007. Fatty acid signatures of stomach oil and adipose tissue of northern fulmars (*Fulmarus glacialis*) in Alaska: implications for diet analysis of Procellariiform birds. *J. Comp. Physiol. B* 177, 893–903.

1 **Online Supplement to Kühn *et al.* 2016. The use of potassium hydroxide (KOH) solution**
 2 **as a suitable approach to isolate plastics ingested by marine organisms. Marine**
 3 **Pollution Bulletin, in press doi: [http://dx.doi.org/DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.](http://dx.doi.org/DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.034)**
 4 **marpolbul.2016.11.034**

5 **Online Supplement Table 1: Different methods used to extract plastics from fish in**
 6 **chronological order. Only studies dedicated to plastic research are included, showing**
 7 **that visual inspection of the gastrointestinal tract is the method mainly used in research**
 8 **however, recently more and more studies focus on dissolving the biological material.**

Reference	Visual inspection	KOH	other	unknown
Carpenter <i>et al.</i> , 1972				X
Kartar <i>et al.</i> , 1976				X
Kubota, 1990				X
Cliff <i>et al.</i> , 2002				X
Fujieda <i>et al.</i> , 2008				X
Haetrakul <i>et al.</i> , 2009	X			
Boerger <i>et al.</i> , 2010	X			
Possatto <i>et al.</i> , 2011	X			
Davison & Asch, 2011	X			
Dantas <i>et al.</i> , 2012	X			
Ramos <i>et al.</i> , 2012				X
Anastasopoulou <i>et al.</i> , 2013	X			
Choy & Drazen, 2013	X			
Foekema <i>et al.</i> , 2013		X		
Gassel <i>et al.</i> , 2013	X			
Jantz <i>et al.</i> , 2013	X			
Lusher <i>et al.</i> , 2013	X			
Benjamin <i>et al.</i> , 2014			Gravimetrics	
Di Benedetto & Awabdi, 2014	X			
Avio <i>et al.</i> , 2015			Density separation, chemical digestion	
Collard <i>et al.</i> , 2015			Chemical digestion	
Neves <i>et al.</i> , 2015	X			
Rochman <i>et al.</i> , 2015		X		
Romeo <i>et al.</i> , 2015	X			
Zoeter-Vanpoucke, 2015			Acid digestion	
Tahir & Rochman, 2015		X		
Battaglia <i>et al.</i> , 2016	X			
Bellas <i>et al.</i> , 2016	X		Alkaline digestion (NaOH)	
Cannon <i>et al.</i> , 2016	X			
Liboiron <i>et al.</i> , 2016	X			
Lusher <i>et al.</i> , 2016		X		
Miranda & de Carvalho-Souza, 2016	X			
Nadal <i>et al.</i> , 2016	X			
Rummel <i>et al.</i> , 2016	X			
Tanaka & Takada, 2016		X		

9

- 10 Anastasopoulou, A., Mytilineou, C., Smith, C.J. & Papadopoulou, K.N. (2013). Plastic debris ingested by deep-
 11 water fish of the Ionian Sea (Eastern Mediterranean). *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic*
 12 *Research Papers*, 74, 11-13. doi: 10.1016/j.dsr.2012.12.008
- 13 Avio, C.G., Gorbil, S. & Regoli, F. (2015). Experimental development of a new protocol for extraction and
 14 characterization of microplastics in fish tissues: first observations in commercial species from Adriatic
 15 Sea. *Marine Environmental Research*, 111, 18-26.
- 16 Battaglia, P., Pedà, C., Musolino, S., Esposito, V., Andaloro, F. & Romeo, T. (2016). Diet and first documented
 17 data on plastic ingestion of *Trachinotus ovatus* L. 1758 (Pisces: Carangidae) from the Strait of Messina
 18 (central Mediterranean Sea). *Italian Journal of Zoology*, 83, 121-129.
- 19 Bellas, J., Martínez-Armental, J., Martínez-Cámara, A., Besada, V. & Martínez-Gómez, C. (2016). Ingestion of
 20 microplastics by demersal fish from the Spanish Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts. *Mar Pollut Bull*,
 21 109, 55-60.
- 22 Benjamin, D., Rozario, J.V., Jose, D., Prabhakaran, M., Kurup, B.M. & Harikrishnan, M. (2014). Plastic ingestion
 23 by Bigeye Thresher shark *Alopias superciliosus* off Ratnagiri southwest coast of India. *International*
 24 *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 5, 277-281.
- 25 Boerger, C.M., Lattin, G.L., Moore, S.L. & Moore, C.J. (2010). Plastic ingestion by planktivorous fishes in the
 26 North Pacific Central Gyre. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 60, 2275-2278. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.08.007
- 27 Cannon, S.M.E., Lavers, J.L. & Figueiredo, B. (2016). Plastic ingestion by fish in the Southern Hemisphere: A
 28 baseline study and review of methods. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 107, 286-291. doi:
 29 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.03.057>
- 30 Carpenter, E.J., Anderson, S.J., Harvey, G.R., Miklas, H.P. & Peck, B.B. (1972). Polystyrene Spherules in
 31 Coastal Waters. *Science*, 178, 749-750. doi: 10.1126/science.178.4062.749
- 32 Choy, C.A. & Drazen, J.C. (2013). Plastic for dinner? Observations of frequent debris ingestion by pelagic
 33 predatory fishes from the central North Pacific. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 485, 155-163. doi:
 34 10.3354/meps10342
- 35 Cliff, G., Dudley, S.F.J., Ryan, P.G. & Singleton, N. (2002). Large sharks and plastic debris in KwaZulu-Natal,
 36 South Africa. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 53, 575-581.
- 37 Collard, F., Gilbert, B., Eppe, G., Parmentier, E. & Das, K. (2015). Detection of anthropogenic particles in fish
 38 stomachs: an isolation method adapted to identification by Raman spectroscopy. *Arch Environ Contam*
 39 *Toxicol*, 69, 331-339.
- 40 Dantas, D.V., Barletta, M. & da Costa, M.F. (2012). The seasonal and spatial patterns of ingestion of
 41 polyfilament nylon fragments by estuarine drums (Sciaenidae). *Environmental Science and Pollution*
 42 *Research*, 19, 600-606
- 43 Davison, P. & Asch, R.G. (2011). Plastic ingestion by mesopelagic fishes in the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre.
 44 *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 432, 173-180.
- 45 Di Benedetto, A.P. & Awabdi, D.R. (2014). How marine debris ingestion differs among megafauna species in a
 46 tropical coastal area. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 88, 86-90. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.09.020
- 47 Foekema, E.M., De Gruijter, C., Mergia, M.T., van Franeker, J.A., Murk, A.J. & Koelmans, A.A. (2013). Plastic in
 48 North Sea Fish. *Environ Sci Technol*, 47, 8818-8824. doi: 10.1021/es400931b
- 49 Fujieda, S., Uchiyama, M., Azuma, T., Fukuda, R. & Arita, Y. (2008). Ingestion case of plastics by black marlin
 50 *Makaira indica* and lancetfish *Alepisaurus ferox* caught in the East Indian Ocean. *Mem Fac Fish*
 51 *Kagoshima Univ*, 57, 47-48.
- 52 Gassel, M., Harwani, S., Park, J.S. & Jahn, A. (2013). Detection of nonylphenol and persistent organic
 53 pollutants in fish from the North Pacific Central Gyre. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 73, 231-242. doi:
 54 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.05.014
- 55 Haetrakul, T., Munanansup, S., Assawawongkasem, N. & Chansue, N. (2009). *A case report: Stomach foreign*
 56 *object in whaleshark (Rhincodon typus) stranded in Thailand*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of
 57 the 4th International Symposium on SEASTAR2000 and Asian Bio-logging Science (The 8th
 58 SEASTAR2000 workshop).
- 59 Jantz, L.A., Morishige, C.L., Bruland, G.L. & Lepczyk, C.A. (2013). Ingestion of plastic marine debris by
 60 longnose lancetfish (*Alepisaurus ferox*) in the North Pacific Ocean. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 69, 97-104. doi:
 61 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.01.019>
- 62 Kartar, S., Abou-Seedo, F. & Sainsbury, M. (1976). Polystyrene waste in the Seventh Estuary: A progress
 63 report. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 4, 144.
- 64 Kubota, T. (1990). *Synthetic materials found in the stomachs of lancetfish from Suruga Bay, Central Japan*.
 65 Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Second International Conference on marine debris.
 66 Honolulu, Hawaii. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-154. pp
 67 710-717.
- 68 Liboiron, M., Liboiron, F., Wells, E., Richard, N., Zahara, A., Mather, C., Bradshaw, H., Murichi, J., 2016. Low
 69 plastic ingestion rate in Atlantic Cod (*Gadus morhua*) from Newfoundland destined for human
 70 consumption collected through citizen science methods. *Mar Poll Bull*, In press. doi:
 71 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.10.043>
- 72 Lusher, A., McHugh, M. & Thompson, R. (2013). Occurrence of microplastics in the gastrointestinal tract of
 73 pelagic and demersal fish from the English Channel. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 67, 94-99.
- 74 Lusher, A.L., O'Donnell, C., Officer, R., O'Connor, I., 2016. Microplastic interactions with North Atlantic
 75 mesopelagic fish. *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil* 73, 1214-1225.
- 76 Miranda, D.d.A. & de Carvalho-Souza, G.F. (2016). Are we eating plastic-ingesting fish? *Mar Pollut Bull*, 103,
 77 109-114. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.035>
- 78 Nadal, M., Alomar, C., Deudero, S., 2016. High levels of microplastic ingestion by the semipelagic fish bogue
 79 *Boops boops* (L.) around the Balearic Islands. *Env Poll* 214, 517-523.

- 80 Neves, D., Sobral, P., Ferreira, J.L. & Pereira, T. (2015). Ingestion of microplastics by commercial fish off the
81 Portuguese coast. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 101, 119-126.
- 82 Possatto, F.E., Barletta, M., Costa, M.F., Ivar do Sul, J.A. & Dantas, D.V. (2011). Plastic debris ingestion by
83 marine catfish: An unexpected fisheries impact. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 62, 1098-1102. doi:
84 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.01.036>
- 85 Ramos, J.A., Barletta, M. & Costa, M.F. (2012). Ingestion of nylon threads by Gerreidae while using a tropical
86 estuary as foraging grounds. *Aquatic Biology*, 17, 29-34.
- 87 Rochman, C.M., Tahir, A., Williams, S.L., Baxa, D.V., Lam, R., Miller, J.T., Miller, J.T., Teh, F.-C., Werorilangi,
88 S. & Teh, S.J. (2015). Anthropogenic debris in seafood: Plastic debris and fibers from textiles in fish
89 and bivalves sold for human consumption. *Scientific reports*, 5.
- 90 Romeo, T., Pietro, B., Pedà, C., Consoli, P., Andaloro, F. & Fossi, M.C. (2015). First evidence of presence of
91 plastic debris in stomach of large pelagic fish in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 95, 358-361.
- 92 Rummel, C.D., Löder, M.G., Fricke, N.F., Lang, T., Griebeler, E.-M., Janke, M. & Gerdts, G. (2016). Plastic
93 ingestion by pelagic and demersal fish from the North Sea and Baltic Sea. *Mar Pollut Bull*, 102, 134-
94 141.
- 95 Tahir, A. & Rochman, C.M. (2015). Plastic Particles in Silverside (*Stolephorus heterolobus*) Collected at Paotere
96 Fish Market, Makassar. *International Journal of Agriculture System*, 2, 163-168.
- 97 Tanaka, K. & Takada, H. (2016). Microplastic fragments and microbeads in digestive tracts of planktivorous fish
98 from urban coastal waters. *Scientific reports*, 6.
- 99 Vanpoucke Mechthild, Z. (2015). *Impact of microplastic uptake: contamination in sprat and microplastic-*
100 *mediated uptake of PAHs by European shore crab*. Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research
101 (ILVO), Master thesis. pp 46.

102

103

104

105

106 **Online Supplement Table 2: Results of initial trial in which a mix of beach collected**
 107 **particles was subjected to KOH solution. No details for individual particles were**
 108 **recorded.**

Category	Original number of pieces/mass		After 7 days in 10% KOH solution and then 7 days drying period at room temperature (18-21°C)		
	Number	Mass (g)	Number	Mass (g)	%
Pellets	17	0.4552	17	0.4555	0.1%
Sheets	11	1.2570	11	1.2517	-0.4%
Threads	10	1.0999	11*	1.0795	-1.9%
Foam	18	0.3187	18	0.3479	9.2%
Fragments	13	0.7321	13	0.7311	-0.1%
Other**	9	2.9708	11*	2.8517	-4.0%
Total	78	6.8337	81	6.7174	-1.7%
*The difference of number of pieces before and after treatments is caused by fragmentation of some of the particles during processing					
**Other synthetics include: rubber bands, garden hose like material and balloons					

109

110 Our initial approach started with a test of 78 plastic pieces, mainly beach collected plastic debris which
 111 were exposed to a 10% KOH solution as used in other published studies and recommended by Dehaut *et*
 112 *al.* (2016). Grouped in plastic categories as used in the protocol for the monitoring of plastic ingestion in
 113 the northern fulmar (Van Franeker *et al.*, 2011; OSPAR, 2015) a range of mainly beach collected debris
 114 was first weighed, then kept in KOH solution for 7 days at room temperature, after that rinsed with tap
 115 water and dried at room temperature (18-21°C) for another 7 days before reweighing.

116 This test indicated very little change from prolonged exposure to 10% KOH solution. Light weight loss
 117 was observed in threadlike materials and 'other' synthetic materials, containing for example rubbery
 118 types of materials and balloon remains. Foams increased in mass, interpreted as retaining fluids and thus
 119 insufficient drying time for this type of material.

120

Online Supplement Table 3: Full details of samples and test results used for the experiment with shape, origin, polymer type and the weight before and after the exposure to 1 Molar KOH for two days at room temperature. In a second experiment a part of the samples were exposed to stomach fluid of northern fulmars (*Fulmarus glacialis*) and acid (HCl) prior to KOH exposure. Drying time is expressed as days (d)

Item number and characteristics						KOH treatment only				Stomach fluid + KOH treatment				HCl + KOH treatment				Stomach fluid + HCl + KOH treatment					
Code	n	Category	Origin	Polymer type	Description	pre weight	post weight 4 d drying	post weight 6 d drying	% change after KOH treatment	n	pre weight	post weight 3 d drying	post weight 8 d drying	% change stomach fluid treatment	pre weight	post weight 3 d drying	post weight 8 d drying	% change HCl treatment	pre weight	post weight 3 d drying	post weight 8 d drying	% change stomach fluid+HCl treatment	
KOH-TEST-001	10	Pellet	pristine	HD-PE	White pellets	0.2103	0.2137	0.2137	2%	5	0.1016	0.1023	0.1021	0%	0.0935	0.0935	0.0935	0%	0.0983	0.0989	0.0989	1%	
KOH-TEST-002	10	Pellet	pristine	LD-PE	White pellets	0.2516	0.2513	0.2516	0%	5	0.1252	0.1265	0.1259	1%	0.1216	0.1214	0.1219	0%	0.1229	0.1235	0.1234	0%	
KOH-TEST-003	10	Pellet	pristine	GPPS	Transparent pellets	0.2129	0.2132	0.2133	0%														
KOH-TEST-004	10	Pellet	pristine	PC	Transparent pellets	0.1993	0.1996	0.1999	0%	5	0.1095	0.11025*	0.1096	0%	0.1085	0.1085	0.1086	0%	0.104	0.1038	0.1043	0%	
KOH-TEST-005	10	Pellet	pristine	PA66	White pellets	0.1757	0.1762	0.176	0%	5	0.0593	0.0604	0.0604	2%	0.0656	0.0672	0.0665	1%	0.0605	0.0618	0.0615	2%	
KOH-TEST-006	10	Pellet	pristine	ABS	White pellets	0.1254	0.1266	0.1268	1%														
KOH-TEST-007	10	Pellet	pristine	PBT	White pellets	0.1911	0.1912	0.1911	0%														
KOH-TEST-008	10	Pellet	pristine	recycled PE-LLD	Green pellets	0.356	0.3561	0.3563	0%														
KOH-TEST-009	10	Pellet	pristine	PET	Purple pellets	0.1526	0.1528	0.1527	0%	5	0.0794	0.0795	0.0797	0%	0.1021	0.1088*	0.10925	7%	0.0622	0.0593*	0.0604	-3%	
KOH-TEST-010	10	Pellet	pristine	PA6	Transparent pellets	0.116	0.1172	0.1172	1%	5	0.069	0.0704	0.07	1%	0.0651	0.0663	0.066	1%	0.0644	0.0655	0.0654	2%	
KOH-TEST-011	10	Pellet	pristine	HD-PE	Orange pellets	0.3595	0.3596	0.3694	3%														
KOH-TEST-012	10	Pellet	pristine	PP	White pellets	0.2376	0.2376	0.2376	0%	5	0.1254	0.1270	0.1259	0%	0.1516	0.1505*	0.150625	-1%	0.1371	0.1375	0.1373	0%	
KOH-TEST-013	10	Pellet	pristine	SAN	Transparent pellets	0.1562	0.1564	0.1564	0%														
KOH-TEST-014	10	Pellet	pristine	EVA VA19 %	Transparent pellets	0.2541	0.2543	0.2542	0%														
KOH-TEST-015	10	Pellet	beach		Black pellets, possible recycled	0.4714	0.471	0.4711	0%														
KOH-TEST-016	10	Pellet	beach		Black biobead sewage?	0.315	0.3156	0.3157	0%	5	0.1641	0.1650	0.1645	0%	0.1554	0.155	0.1553	0%	0.1622	0.162	0.1624	0%	
KOH-TEST-017	10	Pellet	pristine	PHB	White pellets, bioplastic	1.3466	1.322	1.3122	-3%	5	0.7465	0.7758	0.7749	4%	0.5377	0.535	0.533	-1%	0.7001	0.7163	0.7155	2%	
KOH-TEST-018	10	Pellet	beach		White pellets	0.3151	0.3157	0.3152	0%														

