

Microplastics in the Southern Coastline of Cameroon

ABSTRACT

The study was designed to provide evidence of microplastic ingestion, abundance and composition in the catches of *Pseudotolithus senegalensis*, *Pseudotolithus typus* and *Ethmalosa fimbriata* in the dockyard of Londji and Mboa-manga on the Southern Coastline of Cameroon. The methodology involved visual observation and identification of anthropogenic particles in the stomach content (SC) and an extraction procedure involving hypochlorite digestion and isolation. In this study 45(18.37%) of a total 372 of the *E. fimbriata* and *Pseudotolithus sp* had ingested microplastics. We also found a majority abundance of 12 microplastic particle in four size classes [18-21] cm for *E. fimbriata*, and 20 and 23 microplastic particles in six size classes [40-45] cm and [35-39] cm for *P. senegalensis* and *P. typus* respectively. The average percentage composition of the microplastics included rope filaments (23%), fishing lines (47%), strings (13 %), pieces of plastic cloth (9%) and others (8%) with a colour diversity of white, red, yellow, grey and light blue. The results provided an improved evidence base to support policy and management decisions on measures to develop adaptation and mitigation strategies for plastic debris in the Southern coastline of Cameroon.

Keywords: Microplastics; marine debris; ichthyofauna; stomach content.

1. INTRODUCTION

World plastic production is estimated to be 299 megatons (Mt) in 2013, with 20 % contributed from European sources [1]. It is estimated that 10 % of this production ends up in the seas [2]. The North Atlantic Gyre is a dramatic example of plastic accumulation with a maximal concentration of 20,328 pieces per km² [3]. Among marine plastic debris, two size classes are commonly defined: macroplastics and microplastics.

Microplastics are defined as small plastic particles with an upper size limit of 5mm [4]. Primary microplastics, such as industrial pellets or nurdles are used as precursors in the manufacturing of larger plastic items [5,6,7] with accidental losses occurring mainly during their manufacture and transportation stages [5]. Granulated particles called "microbeads" are also classified as primary microplastics, with their incorporation in a number of industrial (air-blasting media) and household (hand-cleaners and facial scrubbers) products [5].

27 Originating from the fragmentation of larger plastic items are secondary microplastics, the
28 most common source of plastic pollution in the marine environment [6, 7]. In general,
29 microplastics fall into two categories: they are either produced intentionally (e.g.,
30 microbeads, plastic production pellets) and called “primary microplastics” or are degraded
31 from larger plastic to smaller pieces (e.g. fibres) and are called “secondary microplastics”
32 [6,8].

33
34 In Canada and globally, primary microplastics have been added to a variety of personal
35 care products, including toothpastes, shampoos, facial cleansers and moisturizers,
36 cosmetics, and shaving products for emulsion stabilization, viscosity regulation, and skin
37 conditioning [6,9]. It has been proposed that freshwater systems can become contaminated
38 by microplastics and the directional flow of these freshwater systems typically drives
39 microplastics to river and lake bottoms, and the oceans, which become sinks. It has been
40 estimated that approximately 80% of microplastics in oceans originate from land-based
41 sources, and another 18% from aquaculture or fishing industries [9,10].

42
43 Whilst it is apparent that microplastics have become both widespread and ubiquitous,
44 information on the biological impact of this pollutant on organisms in the marine environment
45 is only just emerging [5,11,12]. The possibility that microplastics pose a threat to biota, as
46 their small size makes them available to a wide range of marine organisms, is of increasing
47 scientific concern [9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. In addition to potential adverse effects from
48 ingesting the microplastics themselves, toxic responses could also result from (a) inherent
49 contaminants leaching from the microplastics, and (b) extraneous pollutants, adhered to the
50 disassociating microplastics.

51
52 The presence and accumulation of microplastics in the marine environment is of
53 considerable concern for a variety of reasons, especially because they are ingested by
54 marine biota (Laist, 1997). Microplastics can absorb persistent bioaccumulative and toxic
55 compounds (PBT) from seawater [16] which include persistent organic pollutants [17,18,19].
56 and metals. Once ingested, the absorbed pollutants may be transferred to the respective
57 organisms [20]. However, while microplastics have been reported in a wide variety of marine
58 organisms, [21, 22, 23,24,25] the extent to which ingestion might present a toxicological
59 hazard to marine organisms and humans is not well-known. This is a common scenario with
60 Cameroon, where information on microplastic pollution is very scarce.

61 This research work is aimed at providing evidence of microplastic ingestion, abundance and
62 composition in the catches of *Pseudotolithus senegalensis*, *Pseudotolithus typus* and
63 *Ethmalosa fimbriata* in the dockyard of Londji and Mboa-manga on the Southern Coastline of
64 Cameroon. The results provided an improved evidence base to support policy and
65 management decisions on measures to develop adaptation and mitigation strategies for
66 plastic debris in the Southern coastline of Cameroon.

67 1.1 Abundance of microplastics in aquatic systems

68

69 Microplastics are ubiquitous in marine environments [26,27] and widespread contamination
70 of freshwater systems is likely inevitable [18]. Microplastics have been found in sediments,
71 throughout the water column, and in digestive systems, respiratory structures, and tissues of
72 marine organisms [10]. Quantitative reporting of global abundance of microplastics has been
73 limited by time and labour intensive sampling, remoteness of sites, and fine-scale analytical
74 processes [28, 29]. Microplastics will accumulate in coastal sediments, on the ocean floor,
75 and at the sea surface. Due to the relative ease of accessibility and sampling, beaches have
76 been most heavily surveyed and form the basis for much of the currently available
77 information regarding the distribution of microplastics [8].

78

79 1.2 Microplastic ingestion

80

81 Microplastics can be ingested by aquatic organisms, including coral, barnacles, sea
82 cucumbers, polychaete worms, zooplankton, rotifers, ciliates, crustaceans, amphipods,
83 molluscs and fish [6,22,23,30,31,32,33,34]. Once ingested, these particles can be
84 transferred to higher trophic levels [24,32,35]. Some species are capable of rapid excretion
85 or egestion, while others retain, accumulate, and/or mobilize microplastics into their
86 circulation. For example, *Gammarus pulex* and *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* (mudsnail)
87 allowed to graze on fluorescent microplastics for one week deposited particles into 96% and
88 83%, respectively, of feces produced, demonstrating ingestion and egestion [30].
89 *Eurytemora affinis* copepods also ingested microplastics within a 12 h exposure period [32].
90 Particles can be ingested by filter feeders directly from the water column or by benthic
91 organisms after the particles have settled on the sediments [36].

92 While many species are capable of ingesting microplastics, the effects of microplastics have
93 only been investigated to a limited extent in aquatic biota. Whether microplastics can have
94 effects on smaller aquatic organisms, consistent with effects caused by macroplastic
95 exposure in larger organisms (e.g., internal damage due to ingestion, choking hazard,
96 entanglement), is not known [18]. In addition to the potential for physical or toxicological

effects, microplastics introduce hard substrate into aquatic ecosystems, which can subsequently alter pelagic and bacterial communities [21, 37].

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Biological material

The biological material used in this study consists of the pelagic species *Ethmalosa fimbriata* (Clupeidae) and demersal species *Pseudotolithus senegalensis* and *Pseudotolithus typus* (Sciaenidae). They were chosen due to their high production and worldwide consumption [38]. The fish were sampled bi-monthly during the period July to December 2016 in the artisanal and semi-industrial fishing ports of Mboa-manga and Londji.

2.2 Technical material

The following instruments were used in data collection:

- A tape to measure fish length;
- A dissection kit;
- Two analytical balance of Sartorius Model: CP 4202S-0CE and QHAUS-CS with an accuracy of 0.01mg;
- A binocular microscope equipped with a ZEISS micrometer.

2.2.1 Fish sampling

Sampling was limited to demersal species (*Pseudotolithus sp*) and pelagic (*Ethmalosa fimbriata*). For each fish, morphometric parameters were analysed:

- Total length in millimeters (mm): this is the horizontal distance from the anterior end to the posterior end of the caudal fin;
- The weight in grams (g): the fish were weighed flat on the belly or on the side, resting on a stainless steel dish;
- The sex of the fish was determined (male, female, or immature).

In the laboratory, the gastrointestinal tract of each fish was gutted and the stomach contents (SC) rinsed with distilled water in petri dishes. To prevent contamination of the specimens, the dissection table was cleaned with 90 ° alcohol as well as each technician wearing hand gloves. Each instrument was cleaned after evisceration. The nomenclature of each species of fish was confirmed from the research works of [39] and [40].

130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162

131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161

145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161

162

162 **Dissection** **SC extraction**

162	Dissection	SC extraction	SC digestion (NaClO)
-----	------------	---------------	----------------------



Filtration and observation SC digestion (NaClO+ HNO₃) Filtration

Fig.1. Summary diagram for anthropogenic particle isolation

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Microplastic ingestion

372 fish were collected from two dockyards belonging to two families and three species. *Pseudotolithus senegalensis*, *Pseudotolithus typus* (Sciaenidae) and *Ethmalosa fimbriata* (Clupeidae). Of the 45 (18.37%) SC with microplastics, 14.41% was found in *E. fimbriata*, 22.92% in *P. senegalensis* and 20.93% in *P. typus* (Table 1). The 18.37% is lower when compared to research results of [41], who indicated that 35% of fish in North Pacific had ingested microplastics. Notwithstanding, our results are in line with [42] and [43] who reported that 19-24% of fish sampled had ingested microplastics.

Table 1. Distribution of microplastic ingestion by fish species

Species of fish	Number of fish sampled	Full stomach with anthropogenic particles	Quantity of microplastics in stomach	% Microplastics in stomach
<i>E. fimbriata</i>	157	111	16	14.41
<i>P. senegalensis</i>	80	48	11	22.92
<i>P. typus</i>	135	86	18	20.93
Total	372	245	45	18.37

There was no significant difference ($P < 0.05$) in the quantity of microplastic particles per species as well as the mass or sizes of the microplastics ingested. However, it should be

184 noted that the adult fish had a significantly higher rate of ingestion of microplastics than
185 juveniles.

186

187 3.2 Abundance of microplastic

188

189 Of the 45 SC with microplastic particles, the abundance ranges from a minimum of 1 to a
190 maximum of 3 to 7 particles, with an average of 1.81 ± 0.91 for *E. fimbriata*, 3.27 ± 1.79 for
191 *P. senegalensis* and 2.27 ± 1.64 for *P. typus*. The average mass of the microplastic
192 registered was greater in *P. senegalensis*, 2.10 mg (± 1.10) and 1.61 mg (± 1.22) for *P.*
193 *typus* (Table 2).

194

195 **Table 2.** Abundance and average mass of recovered microplastics

196

	Abundance		Mass (mg)	
	Average	Standard deviation	Average	Standard deviation
<i>E. fimbriata</i>	1.81	0.91	1.21	0.84
<i>P. senegalensis</i>	3.27	1.79	2.10	1.10
<i>P. typus</i>	2.27	1.64	1.61	1.22
Total	2.53	1.55	1.60	1.10

197

198 The size class of the synthetic particles found in this study ranged from 0.12 to 5.02 mm with
199 an average of 1.50 ± 1.23 mm ($n = 114$). The largest particle was found in *P. senegalensis*
200 (5.02 mm) belonging to size class [35-39] cm.

201

202 In this study, 372 *E. fimbriata* and *Pseudolithus* sp were grouped into size classes of four
203 and six respectively (Figure 2&3). We found a majority abundance of 12 particles of
204 microplastics in four size classes [18-21] cm for *E. fimbriata*, and 20 and 23 particles of
205 microplastics in six size classes [40-45] cm and [35-39] cm for *P. senegalensis* and *P. typus*
206 respectively.




Fig. 2. Abundance of microplastics by size class of *E.fimbriata*




Fig. 3. Abundance of microplastics by size class of *Pseudotolithus sp*

3.3 Composition of ingested anthropogenic particles

Anthropogenic particles ingested by (*Pseudotolithus sp* and *E. fimbriata*) were classified into five categories: rope filaments (23%), fishing lines (47%), thongs (13 %), plastic cloths (9%) and others (8%) (Fig.2).

The color diversity ranges from white, red, yellow, grey and light blue (Table 3).

225

226 **Table 3.** Average percentage composition of colour for ingested microplastics

Ingested plastics	
Colour	Percentage (%)
Clear	41
White	32
Blue	10
Red	8
Yellow	4
Grey	2
Green	1
Rose	1

227

228

229

230 **4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

231 The present study confirms ingestion of anthropogenic particles by the ichthyofauna of
 232 Cameroonian waters. The results indicates no significant difference ($P < 0.05$) of microplastic
 233 abundance in the SC of the different fish species sampled. Of the 18.37% of the fish
 234 sampled that ingested microplastics, our analysis confirms that *E. fimbriata* is a
 235 planctophagous fish, where it grazes phytoplankton and zooplankton particles. The
 236 presence of microplastic of 14.41% in the SC suggests that these particles were found in the
 237 water column where they were swallowed by the fish during its feeding. This was the case
 238 of the occurrence of 22.92% and 20.93% respectively for *P. senegalensis* and *P. typus*
 239 which are typically predatory species. This suggests that the presence of microplastics in the
 240 SC was due to the consumption of prey having already ingested microplastics.

241

242 Previous studies have documented the ingestion of macroplastics and microplastics by
 243 planktophagous fish in the North Pacific Gyres with ingestion rates of 9.2% [25]. In a similar
 244 study [44] found ratios of 1/2 between plastic particles and zooplankton organisms in the
 245 Mediterranean (North-West). In light of this, it can be concluded that the contamination of
 246 ichthyofauna in Cameroonian marine waters by microplastics is a cause for concern. The
 247 ingestion of microplastic particles suggests contamination at all levels of the food web,
 248 bioaccumulation and biomagnification. In effect, the results highlight the deterioration of the
 249 ecological health of Cameroon's marine and coastal ecosystems, particularly in the Southern
 250 Coastline for which reason adaptation and mitigation strategies for plastic debris is
 251 inevitable.

252

253 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

254 No competing interest exists.

255

256 **REFERENCES**

- 257 1. Plastics Europe. Plastics—the Facts 2014/2015: an analysis of European plastics
258 production, demand and waste data; 2015. [http://](http://www.plasticseurope.org/Document/plastics-the-facts-20142015.aspx?Page=DOCUMENT&FolID=2)
259 [www.plasticseurope.org/Document/plastics-the-facts-20142015.](http://www.plasticseurope.org/Document/plastics-the-facts-20142015.aspx?Page=DOCUMENT&FolID=2)
260 [aspx?Page=DOCUMENT&FolID=2](http://www.plasticseurope.org/Document/plastics-the-facts-20142015.aspx?Page=DOCUMENT&FolID=2). Accessed 29 June 2015
- 261 2. Thompson R, Plastic debris in the marine environment: consequences and
262 solutions. In: Krause J, Von Nordheim H, Brager S (eds) Marine Nature
263 Conservation in Europe. Bundesamt für Naturschutz, Stralsund. 2006; pp 107–116.
- 264 3. Law K L, Moret-Ferguson S, Maximenko N A, Plastic accumulation in the North
265 Atlantic subtropical gyre. Science. 2010; 329:1185–1188.
266 doi:10.1126/science.1192321.
- 267 4. GESAMP, Sources, fate and effects of microplastics in the marine environment: a
268 global assessment. In: Kershaw P J, (Ed.), (IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/UNIDO/WMO/
269 IAEA/UN/UNEP/UNDP Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine
270 Environmental Protection). Rep. Stud. GESAMP No. 90 (96 pp) 2015.
- 271 5. Gregory M R. Plastic scrubbers in hand cleansers: a further (and minor) source for
272 marine pollution identified. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 1996; 32: 867–871.
- 273 6. Cole M, Lindeque P, Halsband C, Galloway T S. Microplastics as contaminants in
274 the marine environment: a review. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2011; 62:2588–2597.
- 275 7. Hidalgo-Ruz, Gutow L, Thompson C., Thiel M. Microplastics in the marine
276 environment: a review of the methods used for identification and quantification.
277 Environ.Sci. Technol. 2012; 46: 3060–3075.
- 278 8. Gilman N. E. Examining Spatial Concentrations of Marine Micro-plastics on
279 Shorelines in South Puget Sound. M.ES thesis. Evergreen State College,
280 Washington, 101; 2013.
- 281 9. Derraik J G B. The pollution of the marine environment by plastic debris: a review.
282 Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2002; 44: 842-852.
- 283 10. Andrady A L. Microplastics in the marine environment. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2011;62:
284 1596–1605.
- 285 11. Barnes D K A, Galgani F, Thompson R C, Barlaz M. Accumulation and
286 fragmentation of plastic debris in global environments. Philosophical Transactions of
287 the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2009; 364:1985–1998.
- 288 12. Ryan P G, Moore C J, van Franeker J A, Moloney C L. Monitoring the abundance of
289 plastic debris in the marine environment. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
290 Society B: Biological Sciences. 2009; 364: 1999–2012.
- 291 13. Fendall L S, Sewell M A. Contributing to marine pollution by washing your face:
292 Microplastics in facial cleansers. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 2009; 58: 1225–1228.
- 293 14. Lozano R L, Mouat J. Marine Litter in the North-East Atlantic Region: Assessment
294 and Priorities for Response, KIMO International; 2009.
- 295 15. Ng K L, Obbard J P. Prevalence of microplastics in Singapore's coastal marine
296 environment. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 2006; 52: 761–767.
- 297 16. Gouin T, Roche N, Lohmann R, Hodges G A. Thermodynamic approach for
298 assessing the environmental exposure of chemicals absorbed to microplastic.
299 Environ. Sci. Technol. 2011; 45: 1466–1472.

- 300 17. Mato Y, Isobe T, Takada H, Kanehiro H, Ohtake C, Kaminuma T. Plastic resin
301 pellets as a transport medium for toxic chemicals in the marine environment.
302 Environ. Sci. Technol. 2001; 353:18–324.
- 303 18. Ross P S, Morales-Caselles C. Out of sight, but no longer out of mind: microplastics
304 as a global pollutant. Integr. Environ. Assess. Manag. 2015; 11: (4) 719-728.
- 305 19. Ashton K, Holmes L, Turner A. Association of metals with plastic production pellets
306 in the marine environment. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2010; 60: 2050–2055.
- 307 20. Teuten E L, Saquing J M, Knappe R U, Barlaz M A, Jonsson S, Björn A, Rowland,
308 S J, Thompson R C, Galloway T S, Yamashita R, Ochi D, Watanuki Y, Moore C
309 Viet P H, Tana T S, Prudente M, Boonyatumanond R, Zakaria M, Pakkhavong K,
310 Ogata Y, Hirai H, Iwasa S, Mizukawa K, Hagino Y, Imamura A, Saha M, Takada
311 H. Transport and release of chemicals from plastics to the environment and to
312 wildlife. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. 2009; 364: 2027–2045.
- 313 21. Carpenter E J, Anderson S J, Harvey G R, Miklas H P, Peck B B. Polystyrene
314 spherules in coastal waters. Science. 1972; 178:749-750.
- 315 22. Thompson R C, Olsen Y, Mitchell R P, Davis A, Rowland S J, John A W G,
316 McGonigle D, Russell A E. Lost at sea: where is all the plastic? Science. 2004; 304:
317 838.
- 318 23. Browne M A. Ingested microscopic plastic translocates to the circulatory system of
319 the mussel *Mytilus edulis*. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2008. 42; 13: 5026-5031.
- 320 24. Murray F, Cowie P R. Plastic contamination in the decapod crustacean *Nephrops*
321 *norvegicus* (Linnaeus, 1758). Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2011; 62: 1207–1217.
- 322 25. Davison P, Asch R G. Plastic ingestion by mesopelagic fishes in the North Pacific
323 Subtropical Gyre. Mar. Ecol.: Prog. Ser. 2011; 432: 173–180.
- 324 26. Eriksen M, Lebreton L C M, Carson H S, Thiel M, Moore C J, Borerro J C, Galgani
325 F, Ryan P G, Reisser J. Plastic pollution in the world's oceans: more than 5 trillion
326 plastic pieces weighing over 250,000 tons afloat at sea. PLoS One 9; 2014.
327 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0111913>.
- 328 27. Norwegian Institute for Water Research. Microplastics in Marine Environments -
329 Occurrence, Distribution, and Effects, 73; 2014.
- 330 28. Graham E R, Thompson J T. Deposit and suspension-feeding sea cucumbers
331 (Echinodermata) ingest plastic fragments. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 2009; 368: 22-29.
- 332 29. Ballent A, Corcoran P L, Madden O, Helm P A, Longstaffe F J. Sources and sinks of
333 microplastics in Canadian Lake Ontario nearshore, tributary and beach sediments.
334 Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2016; 110: 383-395.
- 335 30. Imhof H K, Ivleva N P, Schmid J, Niessner R, Laforsch C. Contamination of beach
336 sediments of a subalpine lake with microplastic particles. Curr. Biol. 2013; 23: 867-
337 868.
- 338 31. Wright S L, Rowe D, Thompson R C, Galloway T S. Microplastic ingestion
339 decreases energy reserves in marine worms. Curr. Biol. 2013b; 23: R1031-R1033.
- 340 32. Setälä O, Fleming-Lehtinen V, Lehtiniemi M. Ingestion and transfer of microplastics
341 in the planktonic food web. Environ. Pollut. 2014; 185: 77-83.
- 342 33. Hall N M, Berry K L E, Rintoul L, Hoogenboom M O. Microplastic ingestion by
343 scleractinian corals. Mar. Biol. 2015; 162: 725-732. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-015-2619-7)
344 [015-2619-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-015-2619-7).

34. Hall N M, Berry K L E, Rintoul L, Hoogenboom M O. Microplastic ingestion by scleractinian corals. Mar. Biol. 2015; 162: 725-732. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-015-2619-7>.
35. Farrell P, Nelson K. Trophic level transfer of microplastic: *Mytilus edulis* (L.) to *Carcinus maenas* (L.). Environ. Pollut. 2013; 177: 1-3.
36. Arthur C, Bamford H, Baker J. The Occurrence, Effects and Fate of Small Plastic Debris in the Oceans, 16; 2008b. Available online: <http://savetheplasticbag.com/uploadedfiles/noaa%20white%20paper.pdf>.
37. Goldstein M C, Rosenberg M, Cheng L. Increased oceanic microplastic debris enhances oviposition in an endemic pelagic insect. Biol. Lett. 2012; 8: 817-820.
38. Schneider W. Field guide to the commercial marine resources of the Gulf of Guinea. FAO, Rome, 1990, 227pp.
39. Edwards A J, Anthony C G, Abohweyere P O, A revision of Irvine's marine fishes of tropical West Africa. Darwin Initiative Report 2, 2001; Ref.162/7/451: p. 157.
40. Boerger C M, Lattin G L, Moore S L, Moore C J. Plastic ingestion by planktivorous fishes in the North Pacific Central Gyre. Marine Pollution Bulletin. 2010; 60: 2275-2278.
41. Jantz. Ingestion of plastic marine debris by longnose lancefish (*Alepisaurus ferox*) in the Hawaii base shallow-set longline fishery. Master of Sciences, The university of Hawaii at Manoa, Hawaii; 2012, 100pp.
42. Choy C, Drazen J. Plastic for dinner? Observations of frequent debris ingestion by pelagic predatory fishes from the central North Pacific. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 2013; 485: 155–163. doi:10.3354/meps10342.
43. Collignon A, Hecq J H, Glagani F, Voisin P, Collard F & Goffart A. Neustonic microplastic and zooplankton in the North Western Mediterranean Sea. Marine pollution bulletin. 2012; 64(4): 861-864.