



UWS Academic Portal

Microplastic pollution identified in deep-sea water and ingested by benthic invertebrates in the Rockall Trough, North Atlantic Ocean

Courtene-Jones, Winnie; Quinn, Brian; Gary, Stefan; Mogg, Andrew; E. Narayanaswamy, Bhavani

Published in:
Environmental Pollution

DOI:
[10.1016/j.envpol.2017.08.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.08.026)

Published: 01/12/2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Courtene-Jones, W., Quinn, B., Gary, S., Mogg, A., & E. Narayanaswamy, B. (2017). Microplastic pollution identified in deep-sea water and ingested by benthic invertebrates in the Rockall Trough, North Atlantic Ocean. *Environmental Pollution*, 231(1), 271-280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.08.026>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Microplastic pollution identified in deep-sea water and**
2 **ingested by benthic invertebrates in the Rockall Trough,**
3 **North Atlantic Ocean.**

4 **Winnie Courtene-Jones^{1*}; Brian Quinn²; Stefan F. Gary¹; Andrew O. M. Mogg¹; Bhavani E.**
5 **Narayanaswamy¹**

6 ¹ Scottish Association for Marine Science, Scottish Marine Institute, Oban, Argyll, PA37 1QA,
7 Scotland

8 ² Institute of Biomedical and Environmental Health Research (IBEHR), School of Science &
9 Sport, University of the West of Scotland, Paisley, PA1 2BE, Scotland.

10

11 **Corresponding Author**

12 * E-mail: winnie.courtene-jones@sams.ac.uk

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 Microplastics are widespread in the natural environment and present numerous ecological threats.
21 While the ultimate fate of marine microplastics are not well known, it is hypothesized that the deep
22 sea is the final sink for this anthropogenic contaminant. This study provides a quantification and
23 characterisation of microplastic pollution ingested by benthic macroinvertebrates with different
24 feeding modes (*Ophiomusium lymani*, *Hymenaster pellucidus* and *Colus jeffreysianus*) and in
25 adjacent deep water > 2200 m, in the Rockall Trough, Northeast Atlantic Ocean. Despite the
26 remote location, microplastic fibres were identified in deep-sea water at a concentration of 70.8
27 particles m⁻³, comparable to that in surface waters. Of the invertebrates examined (n = 66), 48 %
28 ingested microplastics with quantities enumerated comparable to coastal species. The number of
29 ingested microplastics differed significantly between species and generalized linear modelling
30 identified that the number of microplastics ingested for a given tissue mass was related to species
31 and not organism feeding mode or the length or overall weight of the individual. Deep-sea
32 microplastics were visually highly degraded with surface areas more than double that of pristine
33 particles. The identification of synthetic polymers with densities greater and less than seawater
34 along with comparable quantities to the upper ocean indicates processes of vertical re-distribution.
35 This study presents the first snapshot of deep ocean microplastics and the quantification of
36 microplastic pollution in the Rockall Trough. Additional sampling throughout the deep-sea is
37 required to assess levels of microplastic pollution, vertical transportation and sequestration, which
38 have the potential to impact the largest global ecosystem.

39

40 **Capsule**

41 Microplastics were identified in deep-sea benthic invertebrates and adjacent water > 2200 m deep
42 in the Rockall Trough with quantities comparable to surface concentrations.

43

44 **INTRODUCTION**

45 Plastic debris is a pervasive anthropogenic contaminant found extensively in the aquatic
46 environment worldwide (Cozar et al., 2014; Hammer et al., 2012). As a major source of marine
47 pollution, plastic debris meets ocean health index criteria and has been recognized as a global
48 threat, joining other marine stressors such as climate change, ocean acidification, overfishing and
49 habitat destruction (Amaral-Zettler et al., 2015; Halpern et al., 2012). The majority of plastic items
50 manufactured have single-use application (Thompson et al., 2009) and between 4.8×10^9 to 12.7
51 $\times 10^9$ kg of plastic is estimated to have entered the ocean in 2010 alone (Jambeck et al., 2015); by
52 contrast an estimated 2.7×10^8 kg is afloat in surface waters (Eriksen et al., 2014). The progressive
53 fragmentation of plastic objects into ever smaller and more numerous pieces should lead to the
54 gradual increase of microplastics quantities (Andrady, 2011; Cozar et al., 2014; ter Halle et al.,
55 2016), however global budgeting identifies major discrepancies between the abundance of plastics
56 in surface waters, especially when considering microplastic particles (Cozar et al., 2014; Eriksen
57 et al., 2014).

58 Microplastics, defined here as particles $1 \mu\text{m}$ - 5mm in diameter (Arthur et al., 2009) are
59 of particular environmental concern as they are a similar size to prey items and sediment grains
60 and are therefore bioavailable to a wide diversity of organisms. Ingestion is reported in numerous
61 species with documented impacts ranging from lethal to sub-lethal (Browne et al., 2008; Cole et
62 al., 2015; Murray and Cowie, 2011; Welden and Cowie, 2016; Wright et al., 2013a), and trophic
63 transfer of microplastics has been observed (Farrell and Nelson, 2013; Setälä et al., 2014).

64 Additionally, small particles have been shown to translocate within the bodies of crabs and mussels
65 (Browne et al., 2008; Farrell and Nelson, 2013), consequently microplastics potentially have a
66 greater toxicological effect than larger plastic items. The high surface area to volume ratio means
67 small particles have a greater area over which to absorb environmental contaminants; these may
68 accumulate in the plastic, however the effect of plastic co-contaminants on biota is not yet clear
69 (Koelmans, 2015).

70 The long-term fate and ‘lifecycle’ of microplastics in the marine environment is poorly
71 understood. Distribution is influenced by abiotic (ocean currents, physical shearing, fragmentation
72 and natural sinking (GESAMP, 2015)) and biotic factors (such as fouling (Fazey and Ryan, 2016),
73 consumption and incorporation in faecal material (Cole et al., 2016) and settling detritus (Long et
74 al., 2015)). These provide vertical transport pathways for microplastics from the sea surface to the
75 benthos, thus it is hypothesized that microplastics are sequestered in the deep sea. There is a severe
76 paucity of knowledge regarding microplastic pollution in the deep sea; however within the last few
77 years microplastics have been documented in deep-sea sediments in regions of the Mediterranean
78 Sea and the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans (Fischer et al., 2015; Van Cauwenberghe et al.,
79 2013; Woodall et al., 2014), and more recently isolated from deep-sea benthic invertebrates
80 (Taylor et al., 2016).

81 This study aims to provide a thorough assessment and quantification of microplastic
82 ingestion by deep-sea benthic invertebrates displaying different feeding modes and presents the
83 first quantification of microplastic pollution in deep-sea water. To test the hypothesis that
84 microplastics are present at a deep-sea site in the Rockall Trough, Northeast Atlantic Ocean,
85 benthic fauna and water samples were collected from a depth > 2200 m. Samples were analysed

86 to i) determine whether microplastics occur in this remote deep-sea location and ii) characterise
87 and quantify the microplastics present.

88

89 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

90 **Sampling location**

91 The Rockall Trough is situated to the west of Scotland, UK. The monitoring site, 'Gage Station
92 M', is located in the Rockall Trough (57.300°N, -10.383°W) near the foot of Anton Dohrn
93 seamount at a depth of 2200 m (Figure 1). During the 2016 research cruise DY052 aboard *R.R.S.*
94 *Discovery*, four epibenthic sled tows and one Conductivity, Temperature, Depth (CTD) cast for
95 deep-sea water were undertaken.

96

97 **Field methods**

98 **On-board quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC)**

99 QA/QC procedures were designed and employed at all stages to reduce the potential for sample
100 contamination. Standard non-plastic equipment such as metal and glass were used as much as
101 possible; all equipment was cleaned thoroughly by wiping with 70 % ethanol on non-shedding
102 paper three times prior to use. Ships water supplies were fitted with a mesh cartridge filter to
103 remove contaminants, these were tested for efficiency prior- and post-sampling by running water
104 through an 80 µm filter for two hours and examining these under the microscope. Prior to work
105 commencing and between each sled haul the deck was washed down with the ship's fire hose. The
106 number of people working on samples was kept to a minimum. The same personal protective
107 equipment was worn for the duration of sampling and stored separately. Sample fibres from

108 clothing, along with any potential contaminants from the research vessel such as ropes, piping,
109 mesh screens etc were taken to be analysed alongside the deep-sea samples.

110

111 **Deep-sea benthic sampling**

112 Two Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution-pattern epibenthic sleds, rigged with main and
113 extension nets of mesh size 0.5 mm were used to obtain samples following historical methods. The
114 sleds were deployed individually down to the seafloor with the doors open and trawled along the
115 seabed for ~60 minutes before the sled doors closed by a pre-set timer mechanism and the net
116 hauled slowly to the surface. Once on-board the net was opened and material was emptied into
117 lidded plastic buckets, before being washed over stacked sieves of mesh sizes 4 mm, 0.5 mm and
118 0.42 mm. Macrofauna retained on the 4 mm sieve were individually wrapped in aluminium foil,
119 placed in lidded buckets separated by taxonomic groups and frozen at -20°C to be utilized in this
120 study.

121

122 **Deep-sea water sampling**

123 Two-hundred and forty litres of water were collected using a Sea-Bird 24-way CTD system with
124 stainless steel frame. All 24 niskin bottles were fired 7 m from the seabed at a depth of 2227 m.
125 On deck prior to sampling, the spigot of each niskin bottle was cleaned by rinsing it thoroughly
126 with deionised water and all water filters and hosing were examined carefully to ensure they were
127 free from contaminants. Niskin bottles were systematically sampled by running the entire volume
128 of water through an 80 µm mesh filter until water flow completely ceased. All sampling was
129 carried out by one individual who remained downwind of the filter throughout. Upon completion,

130 filters were placed in a clean petri dish, sealed with tape and labelled for analysis once back in the
131 laboratory.

132

133 **Laboratory methods**

134 **Laboratory QA/QC**

135 Samples were prepared and analysed in a separate small laboratory only used by the scientist
136 carrying out the analysis. Air vents were sealed and the door remained closed for the duration of
137 the experiment to reduce air-borne contamination sources. The work benches were cleaned with
138 70 % ethanol on non-shredding paper and allowed to dry fully; this was repeated three times prior
139 to commencing work. Standard non-plastic equipment i.e. glass and metal, were used wherever
140 possible and consumables were used directly from sterile packaging. All apparatus was washed
141 with deionised water prior to use and equipment was inspected under a dissecting microscope. The
142 samples were kept covered to minimize exposure risk. Natural fibre clothes were worn under a
143 clean 100 % cotton laboratory coat, these clothes were stored in the laboratory to avoid contact
144 with external synthetic fibres.

145 Background laboratory contamination was assessed in two ways based on (Courtene-Jones
146 et al., 2017). Dampened filter paper (30 mm diameter, Whatman No. 1) was placed into a clean
147 petri dish and left exposed for the duration of the experiment to monitor air-borne fibres, these
148 were then sealed and labelled for further analysis. Tape lift screening (TLS) was employed to test
149 for surface microplastics; after the benches had been cleaned, a 5 cm² piece of adhesive tape was
150 cut and placed on the bench surface in three random locations before being placed on an acetate
151 sheet and examined under a microscope, this process was carried out before and after laboratory
152 procedures. Samples of putative contaminants, such as the sterile packaging, adhesive tape and

153 acetate sheet used for TLS, natural fibre clothing and filter paper used were taken to be analysed
154 alongside the deep sea samples.

155

156 **Inspection of deep-sea water filters**

157 The 80 µm mesh filters were transferred to individual lidded glass petri dishes. The gauze were
158 systematically and thoroughly examined under a dissecting microscope (Wild M5); any potential
159 microplastics were removed using forceps and transferred to a small petri dish containing a 30 mm
160 diameter of filter paper (Whatman No. 1). The samples remained covered when not in use to reduce
161 airborne contamination.

162

163 **Enzymatic digestion of deep-sea macroinvertebrates**

164 Fauna > 4 mm were identified to species level in covered glass petri dishes; individuals of
165 *Ophiomusium lymani* (n = 40), *Hymenaster pellucidus* (n = 19) and *Colus jeffreysianus* (n = 7)
166 were used for microplastics analysis (Figure SI 1).

167 Specimens were removed from the freezer and allowed to defrost while wrapped in
168 aluminium foil for 45 minutes. The length of the central disc (*H. pellucidus* and *O. lymani*), or the
169 shell (*C. jeffreysianus*) were measured with metal dial calipers and the mass of the entire specimen
170 was recorded (Sartorius electronic balance) to the nearest 0.0001 g. Specimens were rinsed
171 thoroughly in a flow of deionised water prior to dissection. Dissections varied slightly between
172 species; for *O. lymani* the central disc was opened in a clean glass petri dish and all tissue was
173 removed from the exoskeleton. For *H. pellucidus* the central disc was opened along with each of
174 the five arms and the tissue was dissected from the body cavity. The shell of *C. jeffreysianus* was
175 crushed by applying pressure and the complete tissue mass was removed. For all species the soft

176 tissue was weighed using a Sartorius electronic balance and placed in a glass beaker containing 20
177 ml of 0.3125 % concentration trypsin solution, prepared using Gibco™ trypsin diluted with
178 deionised water (Courtene-Jones et al., 2017). Beakers were covered with glass covers and placed
179 on heated magnetic stirrers set to stir at 250 rpm at 38-42°C and left to digest for 25 minutes.

180 The resulting mixture was poured through 52 µm mesh gauze before being transferred to a
181 covered glass petri dish. The gauze was thoroughly examined under a Wild M5 dissecting
182 microscope and any potential microplastics were transferred to a small petri dish containing 30
183 mm diameter filter paper (Whatman No. 1), samples remained covered when not in use to reduce
184 risk of aerial contamination. After all potential microplastics had been transferred to the petri dish
185 it was sealed and labelled for further analysis.

186

187 **Microplastic identification**

188 The length of each microplastic particle was measured using the ocular scale of a Wild M5
189 dissecting microscope. Potential microplastics obtained from the water sample and extracted from
190 fauna, along with putative contaminants from the ship and laboratory QA/QC procedures were
191 identified using a Perkin-Elmer Spectrum 100 Fourier Transformation Infrared spectroscope
192 coupled with a universal Attenuated Total Reflectance accessory (ATR-FTIR) equipped with a
193 diamond detector. Each spectra produced was the result from a series of four high resolution scans
194 in the wavelength range 600 - 4000 cm⁻¹ with a spectral resolution of 4 cm⁻¹. Spectra were
195 visualised in OMNIC 9.2.98 (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) with use of the inbuilt libraries to aid
196 identification. The reference library spectra represent clean samples not typically found in the
197 environment. Additional references were generated from plastics from non-typical sources such as
198 beach debris, consumer products and textiles samples to provide more environmentally relevant

199 samples. As well as using these libraries (in-built and user generated), the characteristic functional
200 group signals were examined visually to confirm the identity of the materials being assessed.

201

202 **Scanning Electron Microscope imaging**

203 A sub-sample of the microplastic fibres extracted from deep-sea water (polyester n = 6) and
204 invertebrates (polyester and acrylic n = 8), along with pristine acrylic and polyester fibres obtained
205 from known textile samples (n = 2) were sputter coated with gold-palladium and imaged using a
206 JOEL JSM-6390 Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) with a 20kV electron accelerating
207 velocity. A series of SEM images, ensuring an overlap of ~80 % between each, were taken of each
208 fibre.

209

210 **Three-dimensional fibre reconstruction and surface area quantification**

211 Three-dimensional reconstructions of the fibre sub-samples imaged with the SEM were rendered
212 using Agisoft Photoscan Professional V1.2.6 photogrammetry software (Agisoft LLC). The
213 software produces high-resolution three-dimensional surface models, from which surface area
214 quantification of complex objects can be achieved as described in Burns et al., (2015) (Summarised
215 in supplementary information). Models were calibrated against objects of known length and by
216 point-to-point measurements, the resolution of the models were 0.01 μm .

217 As fibres visually appeared twisted and flattened, estimates of baseline surface area were
218 calculated for each of the fibres by multiplying length by width, thus assuming particles were
219 analogous to smooth rectangles. These calculations provide an estimation of surface area for each
220 specific sized particle and surface areas achieved with photogrammetric methods are reported as a
221 ratio relative to the baseline.

222

223 **Statistical analysis**

224 Data was tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test and for homogeneity of
225 variance with the Fligner-Killeen test and was found not to meet the criteria for parametric
226 statistics. To assess microplastic abundance, analysis was performed both using the raw
227 microplastic abundance data and after standardising microplastic quantities by the wet weight (w.
228 w.) tissue mass of an individual. Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed on each of these raw and
229 standardised datasets to investigate differences between species, with subsequent posthoc analysis
230 with a Dunn's test. Microplastic surface area data was not normally distributed, therefore a
231 Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to compare baseline to measured surface areas for the deep sea
232 (fauna and water) and pristine fibres.

233 Generalized linear modeling (GLM) was conducted to relate the response variable (the
234 number of ingested microplastics) to the five factors (organism mass, length, tissue mass, feeding
235 mode and species). Log transformations of organism mass, tissue mass and length were undertaken
236 and the Poisson distribution was used since the response variable was count data. Prior to running
237 the model, collinearity was checked using the Pearson correlation coefficient (indicated by values
238 > 0.6 (Zuur et al., 2010) and the variance inflation factor (VIF; by sequentially removing the
239 variable with the highest value, until all remaining VIFs were below the suggested value of 2 (Zuur
240 et al., 2010)). Those variables found to be collinear (length and weight) were not included in the
241 model, consequently the variables species, feeding mode and tissue weight were retained and
242 considered in relation to the response variable (the number of microplastics). Models with and
243 without interaction effects between all variables (species, feeding mode, tissue weight) were

244 considered and optimisation was achieved by sequentially removing the least significant variable
245 or interaction term (determined by the highest p-value). Model overdispersion was tested using the
246 dispersion test in the *AER* package and by calculating the residual deviance of the model divided
247 by the degrees of freedom. All statistical analysis was performed in RStudio V 0.99.892 (R Core
248 Team, 2016) with use of the *PMCMR* (Pohlert, 2014), *dunn.test* (Dinno, 2017) *VIF* (Lin, 2015)
249 and *AER* (Kleiber and Zeileis, 2017) libraries.

250

251 **RESULTS**

252 **QA/QC**

253 No microplastics were identified on the filters fitted to the ships water supply. When analysed with
254 ATR-FTIR spectroscopy none of the potential contaminants sampled from the ship (ropes, filters,
255 clothing) or laboratory (sterile consumable packaging, clothing) had spectra which matched that
256 of material found in deep water or invertebrates samples. Laboratory controls yielded similar
257 results; of the 5 fibres found on the atmospheric controls all were identified as cellulose. The
258 number of fibres on TLS varied from a mean of 6.56 ± 2.60 particles prior to laboratory work
259 commencing, to 10.22 ± 4.18 particles after all laboratory work was undertaken. All fibres were
260 blue, red or white and identified as cellulose/cotton with a distinctive ribbon like morphology when
261 examined under the microscope (Figure SI 2).

262

263 **Identification of microplastics in deep-sea water**

264 ATR-FTIR analysis was performed on 78 potential microplastics obtained from 240 l of deep-sea
265 water; 17 of which were positively identified as synthetic, 28 as cellulose and 33 yielded unclear
266 spectra. This equates to an abundance of 0.0708 synthetic fibres per litre ($70.8 \text{ particles m}^{-3}$) of
267 deep-sea water. All microplastics were monofilament fibres of the colours blue ($n = 13$), red ($n =$
268 2) and transparent ($n = 2$) Five polymers were identified (Figure 2) with polyester comprising the
269 majority of those identified. Sizes of microfibrils ranged widely from a minimum of 0.4 mm
270 recorded for Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) to a maximum of 8.3 mm for an acrylic fibre.

271

272 **Identification of microplastics in deep-sea invertebrates**

273 A total of 359 potential microplastics were extracted from three benthic macroinvertebrate species
274 ($n = 66$ individuals), of which 45 were identified as synthetic from their specific transmission
275 spectra, 165 were identified as cellulose and the remaining 149 did not produce usable spectral
276 data. A total of nine polymers were identified, of which acrylic was most abundant (Figure 2). The
277 majority of synthetic material were monofilament fibres ($n = 39$, 87 %) and the remaining items
278 were fragments ($n = 6$, 13 %). Items were predominantly blue and red in colour ($n = 9$, each
279 accounting for 42 % of the total), however black, green, orange, transparent and multi-coloured
280 items were also identified. Mean particle length ranged from a maximum of 6.25 mm recorded for
281 a polyacrylonitrile fibre to a minimum of 0.023 mm for an acrylic fragment, both ingested by *O.*
282 *lymani* individuals. Overall mean particle length was 1.191 ± 0.0756 mm across all species.

283 Ingested microplastic quantities varied between individuals and species; considering those
284 individuals from which microplastics were extracted, *O. lymani* ingested the greatest number of
285 polymer types and *H. pellucidus* contained the greatest overall abundance with a mean of $1.582 \pm$
286 0.448 SE microplastics g^{-1} w.w. tissue (Table 1). There were significant differences between the

287 number of microplastics ingested between species ($H = 9.7988$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.007$) explained by a
288 highly significant difference between *O. lymani* and *H. pellucidus* (Dunn's test $p = 0.002$) and
289 between *H. pellucidus* and *C. jeffreysianus* (Dunn's test $p = 0.009$) The standardized number of
290 microplastics per gram of tissue also differed significantly between species ($H = 7.0629$, $df = 2$, p
291 $= 0.0293$), again explained by differences between *O. lymani* and *H. pellucidus* (Dunn's test $p =$
292 0.010) and between *H. pellucidus* and *C. jeffreysianus* (Dunn's test $p = 0.016$) (Figure 3).

293 The final GLM included species and the log of tissue mass as an offset of the response
294 variable, the number of microplastics ingested. No interaction terms were included in the model
295 as these had negligible effects on the results. The model, with a Poisson distribution was found to
296 be slightly overdispersed, thus a quasipoisson distribution was applied to the final model to account
297 for the overdispersion. The GLM results identified that the number of microplastics ingested was
298 related to species and not to the other factors (weight, length or feeding mode). The GLM indicated
299 a significant negative relationship ($p = 0.0376$) between ingested microplastics offset by tissue
300 mass and *C. jeffreysianus*, indeed this species had a factor of 1.94 less microplastics than other
301 species, however it must be noted that only two individuals ingested microplastics. A positive
302 relationship was found between *O. lymani* and the number of microplastics ingested and the model
303 predicted a factor of 1 times more than in *C. jeffreysianus*, however this result was not significant
304 ($p = 0.2949$). The number of microplastics ingested by *H. pellucidus* was greater, by a factor of
305 1.67, for a given tissue weight, this positive relationship was significant at the 0.1 level ($p =$
306 0.0845).

307

308 **Visualisation of microplastics and quantification of surface area**

309 Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) imaging revealed microplastics extracted from deep-sea
310 invertebrates and water to be degraded, with much cracking, pitting, fraying and flaking apparent
311 on the microplastic surface, producing a highly rugose exterior. By comparison, pristine fibres
312 appeared to have a relatively smooth, uniform surface structure (Figure 4 and SI 3). These
313 discrepancies were corroborated by the quantification of fibre surface area. The mean ratio of
314 measured surface area relative to the baseline for pristine fibres was 1.792 ± 0.415 SE. Surface
315 area ratios for fibres extracted from deep-sea samples were more than double that of pristine
316 microplastics; 4.157 ± 0.921 SE and 4.331 ± 1.247 SE for fibres extracted from invertebrates and
317 deep-sea water respectively, this was significantly different from baseline values ($V(15) = 12$, $p =$
318 0.0021). Baseline surface area values were calculated for a rectangular object as fibres appeared
319 elongated and flattened. Acknowledgment is made that baseline values are only estimates, and
320 fibres are assumed to be analogous to rectangles, however cross-checking these results by
321 computing the ratio of surface area derived from a rectangular object to that of half a cylinder
322 results in $\pi / 2$ which is consistent with the values obtained for the pristine fibres. Therefore, no
323 difference was found if baseline values were calculated for a rectangle or half cylinder.

324

325 **DISCUSSION**

326 The presence of microplastics in deep-sea water and the benthic invertebrate community is clearly
327 demonstrated here, providing further evidence for the widespread distribution of anthropogenic
328 microplastics in the marine environment. Microplastics are heterogeneously distributed in surface
329 waters with concentrations ranging between $0.02 - > 100$ particles m^{-3} in the Northeast Atlantic
330 Ocean (reviewed in Lusher, 2015). The present study provides the first quantification of
331 microplastic pollution in deep ocean water and found the concentration to be on the same order as

332 in surface waters (70.8 particles m⁻³). While it is possible that microplastics may have been re-
333 suspended from the sediment during sampling, no sediment grains were found on the mesh used
334 to filter the seawater. The CTD was suspended 7 m from the seafloor limiting any potential seabed
335 disturbance and sampling of re-suspended microplastics, giving confidence that the microplastics
336 originated from and are contained within deep water. It is duly noted that this data is based on a
337 single sampling point and thus provides only an initial snapshot of microplastic content in deep
338 water. Many additional bottom water samples are required to more adequately assess the
339 abundance of microplastics present in the deep ocean and provide estimates of deep ocean
340 concentrations; however, this work still represents the first attempt to quantify microplastics in
341 this realm.

342 Microplastics were identified in all three deep-sea benthic macroinvertebrate species from
343 the phylum Echinodermata and Mollusca examined in this study, with an incidence of ingestion
344 (number of individuals with microplastics / total number of individuals sampled) of 48 % across
345 all species; this, while lower than some coastal invertebrates (Devriese et al., 2015; Welden and
346 Cowie, 2016) is still within the range of incidence values documented for a number of inshore
347 species (Desforges et al., 2015; Foekema et al., 2013; Lusher et al., 2013). Taylor et al., (2016)
348 reported the presence of microplastics in species of deep-sea Echinodermata, Arthropoda and
349 Cnidaria from the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, however singularly sampled species precluded the
350 quantification of ingested microplastics. In the present study, proteolytic enzymes were used to
351 digest soft tissue and extract internalised microplastics without detrimentally impacting the
352 polymers present (Courtene-Jones et al., 2017), allowing for a thorough investigation of ingested
353 microplastics. The quantities enumerated from deep-sea fauna are on the same order as those
354 reported in wild coastal species from a range of taxa (Foekema et al., 2013; Van Cauwenberghe et

355 al., 2015; Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen, 2014). It is important to note that while visual sorting
356 found potential microplastics in all individuals except one *H. pellucidus* specimen, only a small
357 percentage of particles analysed (12 % for fauna and 22 % for the water sample) were positively
358 identified as synthetic polymers by ATR-FTIR spectrometry. Microplastic quantities presented
359 here are therefore likely to be under-reported, due to the small size of particles and the challenges
360 associated with current analytical methods (Löder and Gerdts, 2015). Technological developments
361 will allow for increased accuracy when investigating micro- and nano-sized plastics ingested by
362 wild fauna.

363 Microplastic ingestion is demonstrated to vary interspecifically, with significant
364 differences in microplastic abundance between *H. pellucidus* and *O. lymani* and between *H.*
365 *pellucidus* and *C. jeffreysianus*. The surface deposit feeder and facultative predator *O. lymani* (Iken
366 et al., 2001; Pearson and Gage, 1984) was identified to contain the greatest number of polymer
367 types, however the predatory sea star *H. pellucidus* (Wagstaff et al., 2014) contained the highest
368 median number of microplastics. Indeed, statistical modelling found *H. pellucidus* contained 1.67
369 times more microplastics per given tissue mass, while a factor of 1.94 less microplastics were
370 internalised by *C. jeffreysianus* than other species. Feeding mode has previously been shown to
371 influence microplastic ingestion in coastal species (Mizraji et al., 2017; Setälä et al., 2015);
372 however in this study the GLM only identified a relationship between species and ingested
373 microplastic quantities and not with feeding mode. It is not possible to speculate why these species
374 specific differences in microplastic levels occur; it is possible however that the small dataset may
375 have precluded any further relationships from being identified, or there may be some other, as yet
376 unidentified, factors involved in microplastic ingestion and retention in an individual's body.

377 It is important to note that while this study presents novel findings, small sample sizes of
378 benthic invertebrates, particularly for *C. jeffreysianus* and *H. pellucidus*, and deep ocean water
379 prevents robust estimates of microplastic pollution from being made. Numerous logistical and
380 methodological challenges and costs are associated with sampling the deep sea. This study utilised
381 the full number of samples collected during deep-sea operations in the time available during the
382 DY052 research cruise. Concurrent sediment cores were not within the scope of the research cruise
383 and thus prevented the quantification and subsequent comparison of microplastic levels between
384 all three potential deep-sea ‘reservoirs’. Additional sampling at this site and other regions within
385 the Rockall Trough, along with the inclusion of sediment cores would strengthen the dataset and
386 yield cross site and/or temporal replication not available during the DY052 cruise.

387 Close visual inspection of microplastics extracted from deep-sea samples showed high
388 levels of degradation, including surface cracks, pitting, flaking and fragmentation; producing a
389 mean surface area significantly different to baseline values and in excess of double that of pristine
390 fibres. The duration of microplastics in the environment and the associated degradation has a
391 number of consequences of biological concern. The large surface area to volume ratio, high surface
392 reactivity and small size of particles makes them dynamic in the environment (Mattsson et al.,
393 2015) and can increase toxicity (Jeong et al., 2016). Increased surface area of small degraded
394 particles provides a greater area for the establishment of biofilms which influence sinking velocity
395 (Lobelle and Cunliffe, 2011) and provides increased area for the colonisation of bacteria, including
396 pathogenic species (Kirstein et al., 2016; Zettler et al., 2013). Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
397 may accumulate in microplastics, and as polymers degrade chemical additives breakdown and
398 leach from the plastic (Engler, 2012), further increasing the toxic effects to organisms.

399 While factors involved in the horizontal transport of microplastics near the sea surface are
400 relatively well documented (Law et al., 2014), the processes affecting vertical transport of
401 microplastics to the benthos are potentially more complex and not well understood. Sinking
402 velocities are influenced by a number of factors and microplastic behaviour in part is affected by
403 particle size, shape and polymer density (Ballent et al., 2012; Kowalski et al., 2016). The quantity
404 identified in deep-sea water by this study, akin to surface water concentrations indicates processes
405 distributing microplastics throughout the water column. The majority of polymers identified had
406 densities greater than seawater, such as polyester, acrylic and polyamide. Of note, is the presence
407 of positively buoyant polymers, such as polyethylene, which has a specific density of 0.91 - 0.94
408 g cm⁻³ (Andrady, 2015). In addition to physical properties, microplastic sinking rates are also
409 influenced by interactions with marine organisms, including biofouling (Fazey and Ryan, 2016;
410 Lobelle and Cunliffe, 2011), incorporation into faecal pellets (Cole et al., 2016) and marine
411 aggregates (Long et al., 2015; Ward and Kach, 2009; Wright et al., 2013b; Zhao et al., 2016).
412 These biological processes alter the settling velocity of microplastics by as much as an order of
413 magnitude (Clark et al., 2016; Long et al., 2015). Furthermore species of zooplankton undertake
414 diel vertical migrations (Williamson et al., 2011) which could further redistribute microplastics in
415 the oceans. It cannot be affirmed whether the microplastics isolated from the deep sea in this study
416 arise from the degradation and fragmentation of larger items already located in the deep ocean, or
417 are transported by physical and biological processes through the water column to the seafloor.

418

419 **Conclusion**

420 This study demonstrates the presence of microplastics in deep-sea benthic fauna and water in the
421 Rockall Trough. Further sampling of water and fauna, along with the addition of sediment cores
422 are necessary to assess ecosystem-wide microplastic pollution in this region and monitor temporal
423 changes. While this study focuses on the Northeast Atlantic Ocean, we hypothesize that
424 microplastics are present throughout the global deep-sea. Further attention and sampling efforts
425 should be directed to the deep oceans globally to establish the prevalence of microplastic pollution
426 in this remote and still largely unstudied ecosystem. The deep sea is vulnerable to a number of
427 anthropogenic pressures (Ahnert and Borowski, 2000; Glover and Smith, 2003; Puig et al., 2012)
428 and now microplastic pollution may be added to these threats, raising concern for ongoing
429 ecosystem functioning. Future steps must work towards understanding the susceptibility and
430 potential impacts of microplastic ingestion by deep-sea species assemblages, and elucidate spatial
431 and temporal vertical transport routes by which microplastics enter and are sequestered in the deep
432 sea.

433

434 **Acknowledgments**

435 Thanks are extended to Dr David Hughes and Martin Foley for assisting with deep-sea specimen
436 collection, along with the captain and crew from RRS Discovery research cruise DY052 for
437 enabling deep-sea operations. Dr. Ciaran Ewins for use of the ATR-FTIR and Fionn Murphy for
438 contributing to the polymer reference FTIR spectra. Also, Rory MacKinnon for graphical abstract
439 assistance.

440

441 **Funding Sources**

442 We are grateful for NERC National Capability funding grant R8-H12-85, for supporting the
443 Extended Ellett Line cruises and SFG; a NERC Services and Facilities capital equipment scheme
444 grant to the NERC National Facility for Scientific Diving for funding the software and hardware
445 used to generate photogrammetry models. WCJ was jointly funded through a PhD scholarship
446 awarded by the Scottish Association for Marine Science and the University of the Highlands and
447 Islands.

448

449 **Appendix A. Supplementary data**

450

451 **REFERENCES**

452 Ahnert, A., Borowski, C., 2000. Environmental risk assessment of anthropogenic activity in the
453 deep-sea. *J. Aquat. Ecosyst. Stress Recover.* 7, 299–315. doi:10.1023/A:1009963912171

454 Amaral-Zettler, L.A., Zettler, E.R., Slikas, B., Boyd, G.D., Melvin, D.W., Morrall, C.E.,
455 Proskurowski, G., Mincer, T.J., 2015. The biogeography of the Plastisphere: Implications for
456 policy. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 13, 541–546. doi:10.1890/150017

457 Andrady, A.L., 2015. Persistence of Plastic Litter in the Oceans, in: Bergmann, M. (Ed.), *Marine*
458 *Anthropogenic Litter*. pp. 57–72. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3

459 Andrady, A.L., 2011. Microplastics in the marine environment. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 62, 1596–1605.
460 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.05.030

461 Arthur, C., Baker, J., Bamford, H., 2009. Proceedings of the International Research Workshop on
462 the Occurrence, Effects, and Fate of Microplastic Marine Debris. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOS-
463 OR&R-48 530.

464 Ballent, a., Purser, A., de Jesus Mendes, P., Pando, S., Thomsen, L., 2012. Physical transport
465 properties of marine microplastic pollution. *Biogeosciences Discuss.* 9, 18755–18798.
466 doi:10.5194/bgd-9-18755-2012

467 Browne, M.A., Dissanayake, A., Galloway, T.S., Lowe, D.M., Thompson, R.C., 2008. Ingested
468 microscopic plastic translocates to the circulatory system of the mussel, *Mytilus edulis* (L.).
469 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 42, 5026–5031. doi:10.1021/es800249a

470 Burns, J.H.R., Delparte, D., Gates, R.D., Takabayashi, M., 2015. Utilizing underwater three-
471 dimensional modeling to enhance ecological and biological studies of coral reefs. *Int. Arch.*
472 *Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spat. Inf. Sci. - ISPRS Arch.* 40, 61–66.
473 doi:10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-5-W5-61-2015

474 Clark, J.R., Cole, M., Lindeque, P.K., Fileman, E., Blackford, J., Lewis, C., Lenton, T.M.,
475 Galloway, T.S., 2016. Marine microplastic debris: a targeted plan for understanding and
476 quantifying interactions with marine life. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 14, 317–324.
477 doi:10.1002/fee.1297

478 Cole, M., Lindeque, P., Fileman, E., Halsband, C., Galloway, T.S., 2015. The impact of
479 polystyrene microplastics on feeding, function and fecundity in the marine copepod *Calanus*
480 *helgolandicus*. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 49, 1130–1137. doi:10.1021/es504525u

481 Cole, M., Lindeque, P.K., Fileman, E., Clark, J., Lewis, C., Halsband, C., Galloway, T.S., 2016.
482 Microplastics alter the properties and sinking rates of zooplankton faecal pellets. *Environ.*
483 *Sci. Technol.* 50, 3239–3246. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05905

484 Courtene-Jones, W., Quinn, B., Murphy, F., Gary, S.F., Narayanaswamy, B.E., 2017. Optimisation
485 of enzymatic digestion and validation of specimen preservation methods for the analysis of
486 ingested microplastics. *Anal. Methods* 9, 1437–1445. doi:10.1039/C6AY02343F

487 Cozar, A., Echevarria, F., Gonzalez-Gordillo, J.I., Irigoien, X., Ubeda, B., Hernandez-Leon, S.,
488 Palma, A.T., Navarro, S., Garcia-de-Lomas, J., Ruiz, A., Fernandez-de-Puelles, M.L., Duarte,
489 C.M., 2014. Plastic debris in the open ocean. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 111, 10239–10244.
490 doi:10.1073/pnas.1314705111

491 Desforges, J.W., Galbraith, M., Ross, P.S., 2015. Ingestion of Microplastics by Zooplankton in
492 the Northeast Pacific Ocean. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 3, 320–330.
493 doi:10.1007/s00244-015-0172-5

494 Devriese, L.I., van der Meulen, M.D., Maes, T., Bekaert, K., Paul-pont, I., Frère, L., Robbens, J.,
495 Vethaak, A.D., 2015. Microplastic contamination in brown shrimp (*Crangon crangon*,
496 Linnaeus 1758) from coastal waters of the Southern North Sea and Channel area. *Mar. Pollut.*
497 *Bull.* 98, 179–187. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.06.051

498 Dinno, A., 2017. Dunn’s Test of Multiple Comparisons Using Rank Sums.

499 Engler, R.E., 2012. The complex interaction between marine debris and toxic chemicals in the
500 ocean. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 46, 12302–12315. doi:10.1021/es3027105

501 Eriksen, M., Lebreton, L.C.M., Carson, H.S., Thiel, M., Moore, C.J., Borerro, J.C., Galgani, F.,
502 Ryan, P.G., Reisser, J., 2014. Plastic pollution in the world’s oceans: more than 5 trillion
503 plastic pieces weighing over 250,000 tons afloat at sea. *PLoS One* 9, e111913.
504 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111913

505 Farrell, P., Nelson, K., 2013. Trophic level transfer of microplastic: *Mytilus edulis* (L.) to *Carcinus*
506 *maenas* (L.). *Environ. Pollut.* 177, 1–3. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.01.046

507 Fazey, F.M.C., Ryan, P.G., 2016. Biofouling on buoyant marine plastics: An experimental study
508 into the effect of size on surface longevity. *Environ. Pollut.* 210, 354–360.
509 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.01.026

510 Fischer, V., Elsner, N.O., Brenke, N., Schwabe, E., Brandt, A., 2015. Plastic pollution of the Kuril–
511 Kamchatka Trench area (NW pacific). *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.* 111, 399–
512 405. doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2014.08.012

513 Foekema, E.M., De Gruijter, C., Mergia, M.T., van Franeker, J.A., Murk, A.J., Koelmans, A. a,
514 2013. Plastic in north sea fish. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47, 8818–24. doi:10.1021/es400931b

515 GESAMP, 2015. Sources, fate and effects of microplastics in the marine environment: A global
516 assessment. *Reports Stud. GESAMP* 90, 96.

517 Glover, A.G., Smith, C.R., 2003. The deep-sea floor ecosystem: current status and prospects of
518 anthropogenic change by the year 2025. *Environ. Conserv.* 30, 219–241.
519 doi:10.1017/S0376892903000225

520 Halpern, B.S., Longo, C., Hardy, D., McLeod, K.L., Samhour, J.F., Katona, S.K., Kleisner, K.,
521 Lester, S.E., O’Leary, J., Ranelletti, M., Rosenberg, A.A., Scarborough, C., Selig, E.R., Best,
522 B.D., Brumbaugh, D.R., Chapin, F.S., Crowder, L.B., Daly, K.L., Doney, S.C., Elfes, C.,
523 Fogarty, M.J., Gaines, S.D., Jacobsen, K.I., Karrer, L.B., Leslie, H.M., Neeley, E., Pauly, D.,
524 Polasky, S., Ris, B., St Martin, K., Stone, G.S., Sumaila, U.R., Zeller, D., 2012. An index to
525 assess the health and benefits of the global ocean. *Nature* 488, 615–620.
526 doi:10.1038/nature11397

527 Hammer, J., Kraak, M.H.S., Parsons, J.R., 2012. Plastics in the Marine Environment: The Dark
528 Side of a Modern Gift, in: *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*. pp. 1–
529 44. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-3414-6

530 Iken, K., Brey, T., Wand, U., Voigt, J., Junghans, P., 2001. Food web structure of the benthic
531 community at the Porcupine Abyssal Plain (NE Atlantic): A stable isotope analysis. *Prog.*
532 *Oceanogr.* 50, 383–405. doi:10.1016/S0079-6611(01)00062-3

533 Jambeck, J.R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T.R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., Narayan, R., Law,
534 K.L., 2015. Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science* (80-.). 347, 768–771.

535 Jeong, C.-B., Won, E.-J., Kang, H.-M., Lee, M.-C., Hwang, D.-S., Hwang, U.-K., Zhou, B.,
536 Souissi, S., Lee, S.-J., Lee, J.-S., 2016. Microplastic size-dependent toxicity, oxidative stress
537 induction, and p-JNK and p-P38 activation in the monogonont rotifer (*Brachionus koreanus*).
538 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 8849–8857. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b01441

539 Kirstein, I. V., Kirmizi, S., Wichels, A., Garin-Fernandez, A., Erler, R., Löder, M., Gerdt, G.,
540 2016. Dangerous hitchhikers? Evidence for potentially pathogenic *Vibrio* spp. on
541 microplastic particles. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 120, 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2016.07.004

542 Kleiber, C., Zeileis, A., 2017. *Applied Econometrics with R*.

543 Koelmans, A.A., 2015. Modeling the role of microplastics in bioaccumulation of organic
544 chemicals to marine aquatic organisms. A critical review, in: Bergmann, M. (Ed.), *Marine*
545 *Anthropogenic Litter*. pp. 309–324. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3

546 Kosyan, A.R., 2007. Morphological features , ecology, and distribution of poorly studied

547 molluscan genera of the Colinae subfamily (Gastropoda , Buccinidae) from the far eastern
548 seas of Russia. *Oceanology* 47, 571–576. doi:10.1134/S0001437007040108

549 Kowalski, N., Reichardt, A.M., Waniek, J.J., 2016. Sinking rates of microplastics and potential
550 implications of their alteration by physical, biological, and chemical factors. *Mar. Pollut.*
551 *Bull.* 109, 310–319. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.05.064

552 Law, K.L., Morét-Ferguson, S.E., Goodwin, D.S., Zettler, E.R., Deforce, E., Kukulka, T.,
553 Proskurowski, G., 2014. Distribution of surface plastic debris in the eastern pacific ocean
554 from an 11-year data set. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 4732–4738. doi:10.1021/es4053076

555 Lin, D., 2015. VIF Regression: A Fast Regression Algorithm For Large Data.

556 Lobelle, D., Cunliffe, M., 2011. Early microbial biofilm formation on marine plastic debris. *Mar.*
557 *Pollut. Bull.* 62, 197–200. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.10.013

558 Löder, M.G.J., Gerdts, G., 2015. Methodology Used for the Detection and Identification of
559 Microplastics—A Critical Appraisal, in: *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. pp. 201–227.
560 doi:10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3

561 Long, M., Moriceau, B., Gallinari, M., Lambert, C., Huvet, A., Raffray, J., Soudant, P., 2015.
562 Interactions between microplastics and phytoplankton aggregates: Impact on their respective
563 fates. *Mar. Chem.* 175, 39–46. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2015.04.003

564 Lusher, A., 2015. Microplastics in the marine environment: Distribution, interactions and effects,
565 in: Bergmann, M. (Ed.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*. pp. 245–307. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-
566 16510-3

567 Lusher, a. L., McHugh, M., Thompson, R.C., 2013. Occurrence of microplastics in the
568 gastrointestinal tract of pelagic and demersal fish from the English Channel. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*
569 67, 94–99. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.11.028

570 Mattsson, K., Hansson, L.-A., Cedervall, T., 2015. Nano-plastics in the aquatic environment.
571 *Environ. Sci. Process. Impacts* 17, 1712–1721. doi:10.1039/C5EM00227C

572 Mizraji, R., Ahrendt, C., Perez-Venegas, D., Vargas, J., Pulgar, J., Aldana, M., Ojeda, F.P., Duarte,
573 C., Galban-Malagon, C., 2017. Is the feeding type related with the content of microplastics
574 in intertidal fish gut? *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* doi:10.1016/j.orgel.2006.09.004

575 Murray, F., Cowie, P.R., 2011. Plastic contamination in the decapod crustacean *Nephrops*
576 *norvegicus* (Linnaeus, 1758). *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 62, 1207–17.
577 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.03.032

578 Pearson, M., Gage, J.D., 1984. Diets of some deep-sea brittle stars in the Rockall Trough. *Mar.*
579 *Biol.* 82, 247–258.

580 Pohlert, T., 2014. The Pairwise Multiple Comparison of Mean Ranks Package (PMCMR). R
581 package.

582 Puig, P., Canals, M., Company, J.B., Martín, J., Amblas, D., Lastras, G., Palanques, A., Calafat,
583 A.M., 2012. Ploughing the deep sea floor. *Nature* 489, 286–289. doi:10.1038/nature11410

584 R Core Team, 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
585 Statistical Computing.

586 Setälä, O., Fleming-Lehtinen, V., Lehtiniemi, M., 2014. Ingestion and transfer of microplastics in
587 the planktonic food web. *Environ. Pollut.* 185, 77–83. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.10.013

588 Setälä, O., Norkko, J., Lehtiniemi, M., 2015. Feeding type affects microplastic ingestion in a
589 coastal invertebrate community. *MPB* 102, 95–101. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.053

590 Taylor, M.L., Gwinnet, C., Robinson, L.F., Woodall, L.C., 2016. Plastic microfibre ingestion by
591 deep-sea organisms. *Sci. Rep.* 6. doi:10.1038/srep33997

592 ter Halle, A., Ladirat, L., Gendre, X., Goudouneche, D., Pusineri, C., Routaboul, C., Tenailleau,
593 C., Duployer, B., Perez, E., Goudounèche, D., Pusineri, C., Routaboul, C., Tenailleau, C.,
594 Duployer, B., Perez, E., 2016. Understanding the Fragmentation Pattern of Marine Plastic
595 Debris. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 5668–5675. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b00594

596 Thompson, R.C., Swan, S.H., Moore, C.J., vom Saal, F.S., 2009. Our plastic age. *Philos. Trans.*

- 597 R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci. 364, 1973–1976. doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0054
- 598 Van Cauwenberghe, L., Claessens, M., Vandegehuchte, M.B., Janssen, C.R., 2015. Microplastics
599 are taken up by mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) and lugworms (*Arenicola marine*) living in natural
600 habitats. *Environ. Pollut.* 199, 10–17. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.01.008
- 601 Van Cauwenberghe, L., Janssen, C.R., 2014. Microplastics in bivalves cultured for human
602 consumption. *Environ. Pollut.* 193, 65–70. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2014.06.010
- 603 Van Cauwenberghe, L., Vanreusel, A., Mees, J., Janssen, C.R., 2013. Microplastic pollution in
604 deep-sea sediments. *Environ. Pollut.* 182, 495–499. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.08.013
- 605 Wagstaff, M.C., Howell, K.L., Bett, B.J., Billett, D.S.M., Brault, S., Stuart, C.T., Rex, M.A., 2014.
606 β -diversity of deep-sea holothurians and asteroids along a bathymetric gradient (NE Atlantic).
607 *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 508, 177–185. doi:10.3354/meps10877
- 608 Ward, J.E., Kach, D.J., 2009. Marine aggregates facilitate ingestion of nanoparticles by
609 suspension-feeding bivalves. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 68, 137–142.
610 doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2009.05.002
- 611 Welden, N.A.C., Cowie, P.R., 2016. Environment and gut morphology influence microplastic
612 retention in langoustine, *Nephrops norvegicus*. *Environ. Pollut.* 214, 859–865.
613 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.03.067
- 614 Williamson, C.E., Fischer, J.M., Bollens, S.M., Overholt, E.P., Breckenridge, J.K., 2011. Towards
615 a more comprehensive theory of zooplankton diel vertical migration: Integrating ultraviolet
616 radiation and water transparency into the biotic paradigm. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 56, 1603–1623.
617 doi:10.4319/lo.2011.56.5.1603
- 618 Woodall, L.C., Sanchez-Vidal, A., Canals, M., Paterson, G.L.J., Coppock, R., Sleight, V., Calafat,
619 A., Rogers, a. D., Narayanaswamy, B.E., Thompson, R.C., 2014. The deep sea is a major
620 sink for microplastic debris. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* 1, 140317.
- 621 Wright, S.L., Rowe, D., Thompson, R.C., Galloway, T.S., 2013a. Microplastic ingestion decreases
622 energy reserves in marine worms. *Curr. Biol.* 23, R1031–R1033.

623 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2013.10.068

624 Wright, S.L., Thompson, R.C., Galloway, T.S., 2013b. The physical impacts of microplastics on
625 marine organisms: A review. *Environ. Pollut.* 178, 483–492.
626 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.02.031

627 Zettler, E.R., Mincer, T.J., Amaral-Zettler, L.A., 2013. Life in the “Plastisphere”: microbial
628 communities on plastic marine debris. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47, 7137–7146.

629 Zhao, S., Danley, M., Ward, J.E., Li, D., Mincer, T.J., 2016. An approach for extraction,
630 characterization and quantitation of microplastic in natural marine snow using Raman
631 microscopy. *Anal. Methods* 1359–1366. doi:10.1039/C5AY03217B

632 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common
633 statistical problems. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 1, 3–14. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2009.00001.x

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643


644

645



646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665

Figure 1. Map showing the deep-sea sampling locations to the west of the United Kingdom (U.K) and Northern Ireland (N.I). The CTD deep water sampling location (blue circle) and four epibenthic sled trawls (red tracks) are shown around the regular monitoring site ‘Gage Station M’ (green triangle) to the east of Anton Dohrn (A.D.) Seamount in the Rockall Trough. Area within the dashed line box is shown in more detail in the adjacent panel. Bathymetry is contoured at 500 m intervals from depths of 500 m to 3500 m (MATLAB R2015b using GEBCO_2014 bathymetry data).



666

667 **Figure 2.** Example microplastic fibres found in (a & b) deep sea water and (c & d) extracted from benthic
 668 invertebrates, along with the proportion, as a percentage, of polymer (e) fibres identified in deep-sea water
 669 (n = 17); (f) fibres (n = 39) and (g) fragments (n = 6) extracted from deep-sea benthic macroinvertebrates.
 670 Differences in relative abundance and polymer diversity are observed between water and invertebrates;
 671 polyester is the dominant polymer in deep-sea water, while acrylic accounts for the majority of ingested
 672 microplastics by benthic fauna.

673

674

675

676


677

678

679

680

681



682

683 **Figure 3.** Number of microplastic particles standardized per gram of w.w. tissue ingested by each of the
684 three invertebrate species. Thick black line indicates median value, boxes depict the first and third quartiles
685 and the whiskers show the interquartile range. Outliers are shown by the open points and letters denotes
686 significant differences between species groups.

687

688


689

690

691

692

693



695 **Figure 4.** SEM images of pristine fibres and those isolated from deep-sea water and benthic
 696 macroinvertebrates. Fibres from the deep sea show visible surface cracking, pitting, flaking and
 697 fragmentation when compared to pristine fibres which are smooth and uniform in appearance.

699 **Table 1.** Number of individuals (ind.) sampled and with microplastics internalised, weights and feeding
700 mode for each invertebrate species, along with the mean number of microplastics extracted g⁻¹ of wet weight
701 (w. w.) tissue and the total number of polymers ingested.

Species	No. of ind sampled / No. of ind. with microplastics	w.w. tissue mass range (g)	Specimen mass range (g)	Feeding mode	Mean microplastics g⁻¹ w.w. tissue	No. polymers ingested
<i>Ophiomusium lymani</i>	40 / 16	0.532 – 2.503	4.296 - 7.050	Deposit feeder/ facultative predator (Iken et al., 2001)	1.153 ± 0.278 SE	9
<i>Hymenaster pellucidus</i>	19 / 14	0.267 - 3.441	0.691 – 12.533	Predator: benthic invertebrates and planktonic fallout (Wagstaff et al., 2014)	1.582 ± 0.448 SE	6
<i>Colus jeffreysianus</i>	7 / 2	1.385 – 3.076	3.129 – 6.980	Predator: burrowing amphipods and bivalves (Kosyan, 2007)	0.678 ± 0.044 SE	2

702

703