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Abstract

Streams and rivers are highly susceptible to environmental degradation from agricultural activities, including the clearance of riparian vegetation and the runoff of chemical fertilizers and pesticides. These impacts are likely to increase in the future as agricultural practices intensify to meet the needs of an expanding human population. For example, pesticide application has considerably increased in the last 35 years, with an increased runoff to aquatic ecosystems. Importantly, intensive agriculture often entails the use of multiple pesticides for different purposes (e.g. control of different bacterial, fungal or insect pests). Prediction of the ecosystem effects of the application of multiple pesticides is complicated by the potential both for interactions among the pesticides themselves, and for the pesticides to alter interactions among different organism groups within trophic webs. I investigated the effects of two contrasting pesticides targeting two different organism groups (the insecticide Lindane and fungicide Azoxystrobin) on a stream detrital food web consisting of detritivores (Ispoda: *Asellus aquaticus*) - and microbes (an assemblage of fungal hyphomycetes) consuming leaf litter. I assessed effects of the stressors on ecosystem functioning, quantified as multiple ecosystem process rates. These included leaf decomposition, leaf processing efficiency and detritivore growth rate. Leaf decomposition is a key ecosystem process in the nutrient and energy budgets of forested streams worldwide. Additionally I quantified detritivore mortality and moulting characteristics (frequency and moulting period). Standardized discs of black alder leaves (*Alnus glutinosa* L.) were colonized with a fungal assemblage for use in a microcosm experiment. The fungal assemblage was sourced from a forested catchment characterized by mixed agricultural and forest landuse. Each microcosm contained 20 colonized leaf discs, and 50 mL of standardized artificial fresh water (“M7”). Four pesticide treatments were varied among the microcosms: (i) no presence of pesticides (i.e. controls), (ii) Lindane 5 µg/l (single stressor), (iii) Azoxystrobin 2600 µg/l (single stressor), and (iv) a mixture of Lindane 5 µg/l and Azoxystrobin 2600 µg/l (multiple stressors). Additionally, the presence and absence of the detritivore *Asellus aquaticus* (Isopoda) was varied among the microcosms, to assess the effect of pesticides across multiple trophic levels. I hypothesized that the fungicide and insecticide applied as single stressors will both negatively affect leaf decomposition through negative effects on microbe and detritivore-mediated
decomposition respectively, with additional “knock-on” effects of the fungicide on detritivore leaf processing efficiency and growth due to negative effects on microbial conditioning (microbial “softening” of the litter necessary for detritivore feeding). Consequently, I further hypothesized that two pesticides will interact synergistically negatively to affect leaf processing by the full detrital foodweb, with the strongest effects likely in the pesticide mixture treatment when the detritivores are present.

Pesticides affected ecosystem functioning in my laboratory microcosms, but these effects did not always correspond with expectations based on their target trophic level. The fungicide little affected decomposition mediated by microbes, and the insecticide did not have an overall affect on decomposition mediated by detritivores. However, an important interaction was apparent between the detritivore and pesticide treatments, with the fungicide and mixture treatments reducing decomposition only when the detritivore was present. This indicates the fungicide had significant knock-on effects on the performance of the detritivores, most likely reflecting the importance of microbial “conditioning” (leaf softening) of the detritus for the participation of *A. aquaticus* in the decomposition process. Synergistic interactions between the pesticides were also apparent, with detritivore leaf processing efficiency depressed most strongly when both pesticides were applied together. These effects were not reflected in identical responses for detritivore growth, which may be a consequence of the relatively short experimental period. The mortality rate was higher under the fungicide and mixture treatments, which may reflect reduced resource intake due to fungicide effects on microbial conditioning, toxic effects of the pesticide, or both. Finally, there was evidence that detritivore moulting period (time to first moult) was shortened under the pesticide treatments, which may indicate that detritivores have some capacity to adjust their moulting time to shed exoskeletons contaminated with toxins, particularly under repeated pulses of exposure. My results indicate that changed interactions within food webs can complicate prediction of pesticides effects on ecosystem functioning in streams, and highlight the potential for pesticides to disturb ecosystem structure and function in agricultural areas.

*Keywords: Stream ecosystem, decomposition process, leaf litter, Lindane, Azoxystrobin, Asellus aquaticus, aquatic microorganism.*
1 Introduction

Impacts of human activities on the world’s ecosystems have accelerated rapidly in recent decades, driven both by population growth and the increasing exploitation of natural resources (Vitousek, et al., 1997). This change is particularly evident in the clearance of forest lands for agriculture in many regions of the world, and the increasing use of “intensive” agricultural methods (FAO, 2001; Allen and Barnes, 1985; Simon and Garagorry, 2005). The development of the ‘‘Green revolution’’ during the 20th century dramatically raised agricultural production, through the extensive application of fertilizers and pesticides (Tilman, 1998). For example, pesticide application has considerably increased in the last 35 years (FAO, 2002) which in turn intensifies toxic impacts on both soil and water ecosystems (Tilman et al., 2002). Agricultural pesticides and fertilizers used in crop production typically transfer to the aquatic community through surface runoff (Richards and Baker, 1993), and leaching from soils, and ground water discharge (Majewski and Capel, 1995). As such, pesticides applied to terrestrial crops can easily contaminate adjacent aquatic environments, with potential consequences for both the structure and functioning of aquatic ecosystems, according to the strength of their affects on different trophic levels. This thesis presents results from an experimental study of the effects of multiple pesticide stressors (a fungicide and an insecticide) on the structure and function of aquatic detrital food webs.

Ecosystem services provided by streams

Ecosystems can be characterized according to both structural and functional attributes (Odum, 1971; McDash, 2001). Ecosystem structure refers not only to characteristics of the physical habitat architecture of an ecosystem, but also to the composition and diversity of its biological communities (Risser, 1995; Myster, 2001). Ecosystem functioning refers to the efficiency with which an ecosystem processes energy and nutrients, both in production of plant and animal biomass and breakdown and transformation of detritus, and arises from interactions among the diversity of organisms and their environments (Schulze and Mooney, 1994). Functioning can be quantified as one or more ecosystem process rates, such as nutrient storage and recycling rates by aquatic biota (Vanni et al., 2002; Sterner et al., 1997), soil retention facilitated by interactions between plant roots and soil biota (Bardgett & McAlister
water clarification mediated by aquatic algae (Cardinale 2011), and leaf litter decomposition by aquatic microbes and detritivores (Gessner and Chauvet, 2002).

The ecosystem processes that comprise ecosystem functioning further underpin multiple ecological services of importance to humanity. Ecosystem services have been categorized within the framework of the Millennium ecosystem assessment (Ecosystem and Human well-being, 2003) according to supporting value, provisioning value, regulation value, and cultural value. Streams and rivers in particular provide multiple ecosystem goods and services to humanity. For example, supporting services provided by freshwaters include the cycling of nutrients, which underpin biomass production, while regulation services include water purification by microbial detoxification (Trevors, 1989; Okeke et al., 2002). Note that both supporting and regulating services can often be quantified directly as ecosystem process rates (e.g. nutrient uptake rates, chemical detoxification rates). Provisioning services provided by streams include fishing as source of food, and the supply of drinking water, while cultural services comprise the educational, recreational and spiritual values provided by lakes and rivers to humanity (Wilson and Carpenter 1999; Costanza et al., 1997).

Threats to ecosystem services arise from human perturbations that either impair underlying ecosystem processes directly (direct impacts on functioning), or else alter community biodiversity and/or composition (ecosystem structural effects) (Jonsson et al., 2002). Modifications to ecosystem structural components, whether habitat architecture or community composition, often have knock-on effects on ecosystem processes and services, reflecting the strong links between ecosystem structure and function (Tilman, 1997). However, sometimes function can be altered by human impacts even in the absence of structural changes (Bunn and Davies, 2000), where the impact is associated with sub-lethal effects on organisms that compromise their performance and capacity to contribute to ecosystem processes. Equally, changes in community composition may not affect functioning, if unaffected organisms are able to compensate for the roles played by negatively affected organisms in ecosystem processes (Nelson, 2000). This highlights the value of assessing human impacts on both structure and function simultaneously.
Stream detrital food-webs and the effects of pesticides on stream ecosystem functioning

Several studies have measured the integration between the function and structure of the ecosystem by using one or more ecological processes as functional indicators. For aquatic ecosystems, Gessner & Chauvet (2002) suggested that stream ecological integrity under anthropogenic pressure can be quantified both through the assessment of structural integrity (the composition of biological communities, e.g. fish, macroinvertebrates and microinvertebrates), and functional integrity. As a measure of functional integrity, Gessner & Chauvet (2002) suggest focusing on the ecosystem process of leaf litter decomposition. Leaf decomposition is a key ecosystem process in streams and rivers which is regulated by both microbes and invertebrate detritivores. The food webs of forested streams and rivers are based on the allochthonous organic matter inputs produced outside the aquatic community (Cummins, 1975; Wallace et al., 1997; Hall et al., 2000), such as autumn fallen leaves in temperate regions of the world. On entering a stream, autumn shed leaves are exposed to several processes (leaching, conditioning and fragmentation) that convert Coarse Particulate Organic Matter (CPOM) to Fine Particulate Organic Matter (FPOM) and Dissolved Organic Matter (DOM) (Gessner et al., 1999). The process of decomposition begins with the leaching of soluble compounds (Petersen and Cummins, 1974), followed by colonization of microbes, particularly the spores of aquatic hyphomycete fungi (Gessner et al., 1999; Gulis & Suberkropp, 2003). Microbial colonization facilitates leaf degradation through enzymatic release that converts organic matter to CO₂ and biomass (Cummins and Klug, 1979), (Cummins et al., 1980; Gessner et al., 2010). This process, known as “microbial conditioning”, also increases the palatability of the litter (reducing litter toughness and increasing nutritional richness) for detritivores. Invertebrate detritivores in streams are most commonly known as ”shredders”, and are responsible for the bulk of the physical fragmentation of leaves (Graca et al., 1993; 2001).

Due to the interconnected nature of the detrital food webs, pesticides affecting one trophic level have potential to have “knock-on” effects on other trophic levels. Processes within food webs are potentially structured according two models. In the “bottom-up” model, the diversity, composition and abundance of organisms at
intermediate and top trophic levels depend on characteristics of the bottom (producer) level (Polis and Strong, 1996), while in the ‘’top-down model”, top consumers, typically large bodied predators, strongly influence characteristics of lower levels, though not always through direct interactions e.g. where the consumer causes change in the abundance of lower trophic levels (Hairston et al., 1960; Polis et al., 1996). Similarly, pesticides have potential to have top-down or bottom-up effects on processes such as leaf decomposition. Fungicides affecting microbial populations may impair leaf conditioning (Chandrashekar & Kaveriappa, 1989), and hence detritivore feeding activity from the bottom up, whereas insecticides affecting detritivore abundance and feeding rate (Kreutzweiser, 1997) can affect the amount of leaf litter remaining top down. Consequences for ecosystem functioning in turn depend on the importance of the affected trophic level for key ecosystem processes. For example, a fungicide causing strong toxic effects on the microbe trophic level has great potential to be associated with further negative knock-on effects on detritivore leaf processing, due to impaired microbial conditioning (Graça et al., 2001; Bärlochar, 1985; Gessner et al., 1999). In contrast, while negative effects of an insecticide on detritivores are likely to impair their leaf-processing capacity, consequences for microbial leaf processing are difficult to predict. Indeed, given that detritivores themselves consume microbes, a negative effect on detritivore feeding activity may even favour greater microbial activity (Graça et al., 1993). The study of pesticides affecting different organism groups, and their consequences for ecosystem functioning, can give insight into the relative importance of the affected trophic levels for specific ecosystem processes.

These scenarios become even more complex in the situation where multiple pesticides are applied together. Multiple stressors, including multiple pesticides, have the potential to interact and produce effects that differ from expectations based on the actions of single stressors in isolation (Vinebrooke et al., 2004). For example, microorganisms themselves can often decrease the toxicity level of chemicals by breaking them down or binding them up (DeLorenzo et al., 2001) or degradation in aerobic and anaerobic conditions through microbial utilization of pesticide carbon (Middeldorp et al., 1996), and the application of a fungicide might reduce the capacity of microbes to bind up or detoxify insecticide toxins, thereby increasing the overall impact of the insecticide. Folt et al. (1999) developed the *additive effect model*, which
categorizes interactions among stressors as either synergetic effect (increased in stress) or antagonistic effect (decreased in stress) of multiple toxicant pesticides with a similar mode of action. In this model the combination of multiple stressors is greater than (synergism) or less than (antagonism) the sum of individual stressors. Intensive agriculture often entails the use of multiple pesticides for different purposes (e.g. control of different bacterial, fungal or insect pests). The runoff of such a “pesticide cocktail” to streams and rivers may have effects on ecosystem functioning that are difficult to predict, depending both on direct interactions among the pesticides themselves, and the knock-on effects of those interactions within the trophic web.

**Microcosm experiment: Treatments & Hypotheses**

I investigated the effects of multiple pesticide stressors on stream detrital food webs in a laboratory microcosm experiment. Replicate microcosms, each containing leaf litter colonized with a Swedish fungal assemblage, were subjected to one of four pesticide treatments: (i) no pesticide stressor treatment, (ii) the presence of the fungicide Azoxystrobin or (iii) the presence of the insecticide Lindane (both single pesticide stressor treatments), and (iv) a multiple pesticide stressor treatment, with both pesticides applied together. Additionally, the presence of the detritivore Asellus aquaticus was varied among treatments. The insecticide was applied at a level that was sublethal for A. aquaticus and fungicide was applied at level that was high to microorganisms. I used four response variables to characterize the effects of our pesticide and food web manipulations on mortality and ecosystem functioning:

**A) Net Leaf litter decomposition**, as a measure of ecosystem functioning  

**B) Detritivore leaf processing efficiency**, characterizing the efficiency of detritivore leaf decomposition relative to detritivore biomass (McKie *et al.*, 2008)  

**C) Detritivore Mortality rate**, to assess variation in mortality under the various pesticide treatments  

**D) Detritivore Moulting rate**, as an additional measure of the stress imposed by pesticides on detritivores. The pesticides used in this study bind strongly to organic substrates (Novak *et al.*, 1995), and the detritivores may be able to respond by
increasing their moulting rate, to shed contaminated exoskeletons (Song et al., 1997). Alternatively, pesticides may alter moulting rates by directly interrupting the hormonal pathways which regulate the number or timing of moults (An Ghekiere, 2006).

E) **Detrivore Growth**, as a secondary measure of ecosystem functioning reflecting biomass accrual

Two further measures of ecosystem functioning will also be quantified: fungal biomass (via ergosterol measurement) and fungal spore production. Unfortunately these data were not available at the time of preparation of this thesis, due to circumstances beyond my control (lack of availability of key apparatus and reagents during autumn 2011), but will be included in a future publication.

My research aimed to, a) investigate the effects of two contrasting pesticides whose use is expanding in line with the global intensification of agriculture, on the key ecosystem process of leaf decomposition, and b) use the pesticide manipulations to help clarify the relative importance of top-down (detritivore mediated) and bottom up (microbial-mediated) pathways for the key process of decomposition in streams. I hypothesize that (H.1) the fungicide and insecticide applied as single stressors will both negatively affect leaf decomposition through negative effects on microbe- and detritivore-mediated decomposition respectively, (H.2) detritivore mortality rate will be affected by the presence of Lindane, and possibly also Azoxystrobin, (H.3) detritivore moulting rate will increase under the pesticide treatments, (H.4) detritivores leaf processing efficiency will be negatively affected by Lindane and (H.5) detritivore growth will be affected negatively by the both direct effects of Lindane on detritivore feeding rates, and indirect effects of the fungicide Azoxystrobin on microbial conditioning. Finally, I hypothesize (H.6) that additional “knock-on” effects of the fungicide on detritivore leaf processing efficiency and growth due to negative effects on microbial conditioning will cause the two pesticides to interact synergistically to negatively affect leaf processing by the full detrital foodweb, with the strongest effects likely in the pesticide mixture when the detritivores are present.
2 Materials and methods

**Microcosm set up and fungal colonization of the leaf litter**

The effects of the fungicide Azoxystrobin and insecticide Lindane on two trophic levels within the detrital food web were assessed in forty 120 ml glass microcosms within a controlled environment room (temperature 11-12 °C during May 2012). The presence of the two pesticides, both alone and together, was varied among the microcosms, with half additionally containing two individuals of the detritivore *A. aquaticus*. Each microcosm contained 50 ml of water and twenty Black alder (*Alnus glutinosa* L.) leaf discs, which had been pre-colonized with a fungal assemblage from a nearby stream. The experiment was terminated after thirteen days, with the pesticide treatments renewed half way through the study period.

**Leaf litter and fungal colonization**

*A. glutinosa* leaf litter was collected just prior to abscission by the river Fyrisån, SLU, during October 2010, and subsequently air dried at the laboratory. Prior to the microcosm experiment, these leaves were rewet, and leaf discs were cut using a cork borer (15 mm), ensuring a standardized leaf surface area. The central leaf vein, which is of low nutritional value, was excluded from all leaf discs.

Rather than colonize the leaf discs with hyphomycete fungal spores directly in the field, the discs were colonized from an additional set of pre-conditioned leaves in the laboratory. This was achieved via a two-stage protocol:

(i) An additional set of whole leaves were exposed in a local stream to allow colonization by local fungi. The field colonized litter was later transferred to laboratory aquaria.

(ii) The leaf discs were added to the aquaria, allowing colonization of the discs with spores from the field-conditioned litter.

Laboratory colonization of the leaf discs avoids variability in both fungal community composition and litter decay state potentially associated with microhabitat variability in the field. Thus, compared with colonizing the discs directly in the field, this two-
stage process ensures a greater standardization in the condition of the discs prior to the experiment (Ermold, 2009).

Hågaån stream was chosen as the source for the colonizing microbes. It is a sixth order stream located to the southwest of Uppsala at 59.80° 51′ 30″ N, 17.61° 39′ 0″ E (figure 2.1). The Hågaån catchment is characterized by mixed land use, including both forested and agricultural land, and is affected by enrichment of nutrients from the fertilizers from the surrounding organic farms (Bergfur, 2007). Hågaån was chosen as a colonization site for the high diversity and activity of its microbial assemblages, according to previous observations from Ermold (2009).

Figure 2.1 Map showing the location of Hågaån stream and the surrounding land covers. Sweden map was obtained from European topic center on spatial information and analysis (http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2000/countries/se/full), and Uppsala region map was obtained from Digitala kartbiblioteket (https://butiken.metria.se/digbib/index.php)
Fungal spore colonization of the experimental leaf discs occurred within a plastic aquarium containing the field colonized leaves. The leaf discs were evenly divided among four 15*15 cm polyamide mesh bags (210 discs per bag), with mesh size 0.5 mm, which were then immersed within the aquarium. The discs were left for fourteen days. In Ermold’s (2009) study, this period had been sufficient to achieve a diverse and abundant community of fungi on leaf discs colonized in an identical way from the Hågaån assemblage.

**Detritivore collection**

Aquatic sowbug (Isopoda: *Asellus aquaticus*) was used as a shredder, due to its status as a common detritivore in the agricultural streams of Europe, Russia and North America (Maltby, 1991; Monahan, 1996). *A. aquaticus* is also used as a water quality indicator for its high chemical pollution tolerance (Slooff, 1983). One week before starting the experiment, a kick sampling method was used for collecting 140 adult and juvenile individuals from the ditches of a pond found in the campus of Swedish university of agricultural Sciences, Uppsala. They were transported to the laboratory in temperature between 11-12 °C, where they were kept in a plastic aquarium (23 liter) filled with pond water and supplemented with a mixture of autumn shed litter, including *Alnus glutinosa, Fraxinus excelsior* and *Populus tremula*, as a natural organic food. Aeration was maintained by three air pumps to keep comfortable conditions for *A. aquaticus* until the starting date of the experiment.

**Chemical preparation**

Solutions of the two pesticides, the insecticide Lindane and fungicide Azoxystrobin, were prepared from commercially available products (called Gamma-HCH and Azoxystrobin respectively) in M7 medium. M7 medium is standardized water with a defined composition and quantity of elements that is commonly used in laboratory toxicity tests, and was prepared according to the recipe in OECD guideline (annex 2). Three different pesticide stock solutions were prepared, matching the three pesticide treatments applied in the experiment, with acetone (50 µg/mL) used as solvent in all cases (Lindane: 500 µg/ml; Azoxystrobin: 5200 µg/ml; and Combination of Lindane + Azoxystrobin: 500 + 5200 µg/ml). In a previous study (Ermold, 2009), acetone was
applied at a higher level (100 µg/ml) than in this study (50 µg/ml), and had no negative effects on the microbes or *A. aquaticus*.

**Purposes of Azoxystrobin and Lindane**

Pesticide Azoxystrobin commonly sold in Sweden (7.4 ton) and mostly used for agriculture and fruit trees (Kemikalieinspektionen 2010). The agricultural purpose of using Azoxystrobin is to prevent foliar diseases of vegetable and fruit crops by targeting pathogenic fungi (from Ascomycota, Deutermyctoa, Basidomycota and Oomycetes) that cause diseases such as powdery mildow, downy mildow, wheat leaf rust, haustorium (Bartlett et al., 2002). Fungicides from the strobilurin group affect electron transport systems in fungal mytochondira, and interrupt fungal development by disturbing the energy production for spore germination and zoospore motility (Bartlett et al., 2002). In a previous study (Ermold, 2009), Azoxystrobin was shown to have variable effects on microbial community structure and function, depending on characteristics of the source assemblage (Ermold, 2009). Fungal species richness and community composition was strongly affected by Azoxystrobin in a forest assemblage with no history of agricultural disturbance. In contrast, these parameters tended to be affected only at the highest pesticide doses, if at all, for assemblages from agricultural streams (Ermold, 2009). These finding may reflect the composition of the different assemblages, as the agricultural communities were characterized by taxa known to be tolerant of a range of environmental disturbances, though adaptation driven by previous pesticide exposure may also have played a role.

Insecticides from the organochlorine group have toxic effect on the organisms by causing inhibition in the nervous systems (DeLorenzo et al., 2001). Lindane is applied to a wide range of crops, targeting soil-dwelling insects and plant eating worms. Lindane has been banned in Sweden since 1980 (Persistent organic pollutants review committee, 2007), but still persists in Swedish waters as both a legacy of previous use, and resulting from new rainwater deposition arising in surrounding countries.

When applied together, the combination of insecticides and fungicides can have unpredictable effects on the aquatic community (Cuppen et al., 2002; Daam et al., 2010).
In this study, the application of both fungicide (Azoxystrobin) and insecticide Lindane are expected to have strong effects on leaf decomposition due to the simultaneous impairment on the two trophic levels, unless the pesticides interact antagonistically in their effects on functioning. For example, negative effects of Lindane on detritivore feeding might release microbes from detritivore grazing pressure, allowing some compensation for negative effects of Azoxystrobin on the microbial level.

**Experimental design & procedures**

Pesticide concentration was varied among the microcosms, with four levels of treatment:

1) A control, with M7 medium only, and no pesticides;  
2) 50 µl of the Lindane stock solution for a final concentration 5 µg/l;  
3) 50 µl of the Azoxystrobin stock solution for a final concentration 2600 µg/l;  
4) 50 µl of pesticide mixture for final concentration 5 µg/l + 2600 µg/l).

The four pesticide treatments were fully-crossed with two *A. aquaticus* presence treatments: absent (no *A.aquaticus* individuals) and present (two adult individuals). The concentrations of the pesticides were at sublethal levels for *A. aquaticus*. The toxic level of Azoxystrobin was determined based on a previous experiment (Ermold, 2009). The sublethal concentration of Lindane was first estimated based on the literature, and then confirmed in a pilot study (Appendix 1). Each pesticide x *A. aquaticus* treatment combination was replicated five times in a controlled environment room, within a temperature between 11 ⁰C and 12 ⁰C. The microcosms (20 colonized leaf discs/microcosm) were placed on a shaker table at an appropriate frequency (50 rpm) to provide aeration and stimulate sporulation (Webster, 1972). The animals had an initial and final photos captured on graphing paper using a 10-megapixel camera.

On the sixth day, the water was decanted from each microcosm and preserved in 50 ml centrifuge tubes in the presence of 2 ml of formalin; tubes were sealed with Parafilm® for later spore counting. The water was then replaced according to the pesticide treatments detailed above.
On the final day of the experiment, the water was decanted from each microcosm and preserved as described above. The leaf discs from each microcosm were randomly divided into two groups of 10. Ten leaf discs were dried in an oven at 50 °C for 3 days and the other ten leaf discs were preserved in freezer for fungal biomass (Ergosterol) analysis. The preserving of leaves and spore water were done for later analysis of fungal biomass and counting of spore production. The animals were preserved in small tubes filled with 70% ethanol.

**Measurements**

Microcosms containing *A. aquaticus* were checked daily. Dead animals were counted and then picked out and replaced with a new individual using soft forceps. Additionally, moulted exoskeletons were counted and removed daily. The total number of individuals moulting under each pesticide treatment over the experiment was recorded, as was the moulting period (time in the microcosms prior to moulting) for each individual.

The body length was measured for living and dead animals from the head part to the end of the tail part via image analysis software (Image J 1.44P, Wayne Rasband, National institutes of health, USA), and then these measurements were converted to body size via published length-mass relationship equations for Swedish *A. aquaticus* (Reiss *et al.*, 2011).

**Leaf mass loss, Leaf processing efficiency and Relative growth rate**

1. **Percent of leaf mass loss (LML %):** Initial mass (IM) of the leaf discs was determined based on a random subset of 38 leaf discs which were cut but not used in the experiment. Final leaf mass (FM) was measured directly for the 10 leaf discs per microcosm not allocated for ergosterol analysis. Both IM and FM were quantified on a scale to the nearest 0.01g LML % was then calculated using the following formula

   \[ \text{LML} \% = \frac{(\text{IM} - \text{FM})}{\text{IM}} \times 100 \]
2. **Leaf processing efficiency (LPE):** LPE quantifies the efficiency of detritivore leaf breakdown relative to detritivore biomass and percent of leaf mass loss imputable to detritivores \( (\text{LML}\_{\text{Detritivores}}\%) \). First, final *A. aquaticus* mass was calculated from the length measures using a published length-mass relationship (Reiss *et al.*, 2011), and then the LPE was measured according to the following calculation.

\[
\text{LPE} = \frac{\text{LML}_{\text{Detritivores}}\%}{\sum M_{\text{Detritivores}}}^{0.75}
\]

\( \text{LML}_{\text{Detritivores}} \) was estimated for each microcosm within each pesticide treatment by subtracting the microbial LML (the mean observed in the no-detritivore microcosms for each pesticide treatment) from the observed total LML value. The coefficient 0.75 to the power of M describes a relationship between body size and metabolic rate which applies across most groups of organisms (Brown *et al.*, 2004).

3. **Relative growth rate (RGR):** RGR was measured by using the following formula:

\[
\text{RGR} = \ln(W_2) - \ln(W_1)/(T_2 - T_1)
\]

\( W_1 \) is the initial weight, \( W_2 \) is the final weight, \( T_1 \) is the initial day and \( T_2 \) is the final day. The initial and final weight was measured for the two individuals that stayed alive for the longest period in each microcosms (in most cases > 75% of the study period). This excluded individuals from biomass and growth measurements that had only been present in the microcosms for a short time period before they died.

**Statistical analyses**

Univariate analysis in SPSS software (version SPSS® 17.0.0, IBM SPSS Inc., IL, USA) was used to assess the effects of the pesticides (four levels: control, Lindane, Azoxytrobin and mixture) and *Asellus* treatments (two levels: present vs. absent) on the response variables (mortality, moulting frequency, moulting period, percent of leaf
mass loss, LPE and RGR). For moulting period, there were not sufficient individuals in each pesticide category. Therefore, all individuals moulting under the Lindane, Azoxystrobin and mixture treatments were pooled together as one “pesticide” treatment, and their mean moulting time compared with that of those moulting in the control microcosms. Post-hoc test was performed for the comparison between the factors using Tukey’s HSD test.
3 Results

Pesticide effects on the mortality and moulting rates of *A. aquaticus*

Pesticides increased the mortality of *A. aquaticus* (ANOVA F$_{3,16} = 19.530$, P < 0.001), with greater mortality caused by the mixture and Azoxystrobin treatments than Lindane. There was no mortality in the control (table 3.2). The number of moulting individuals was not affected by pesticides (ANOVA F$_{3,16} = 1.867$, P = 0.176) (table 3.2). However, the time to the first moult was affected by the presence of pesticides (ANOVA F$_{1,10} = 7.839$, P = 0.019), with a shorter moulting period in the presence of pesticide (figure 3.1).

**Table 3.1** Analysis of variance of mortality, moulting and moulting period of *A. aquaticus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mortality number</th>
<th>Moulting number</th>
<th>Moulting period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.530</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2** Effect of different pesticides treatments on the number of mortality and moulting rate of *A. aquaticus* (mean ± standard error)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Total Mortality (#individuals)</th>
<th>Mortality/microcosm (mean ± SE)</th>
<th>Total moulting (#moults)</th>
<th>Mouling/microcosm (mean ± SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2 ±0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6 ±0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azoxystrobin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6±0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0±0.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.25±0.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6±0.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaf mass loss was not affected by pesticides at the 5% level of significance (ANOVA $F_{3,36} = 2.529$, $P= 0.075$), though a strong trend, significant at the 10% level of significance, was apparent for lower decomposition in the Azoxystrobin and mixture treatments (figure 3.2 A). Leaf mass loss was increased by the presence of $A. aquaticus$ (figure 3.2 B, $F_{1,38} = 10.52$, $p = 0.003$). Additionally, an interaction between $A. aquaticus$ and pesticides was apparent ($F_{3,34}= 3.07$, $P= 0.041$). There was no effect of pesticides on leaf mass loss in microcosms without $A. aquaticus$, but an effect was apparent in the presence of $A. aquaticus$, with reduced decompositon under the Azoxystrobin and mixture but not Lindane treatments (figure 3.2 B).

Leaf processing efficiency was affected by all three pesticide treatments (ANOVA $F_{3,16}= 4.195$, $P= 0.023$). LPE was lowered by the Lindane and Azoxystrobin treatments relative to the controls by approximately 50%, and was approximately 75% lower in the mixture treatment (figure 3.3). In contrast, relative growth rate of $A. aquaticus$ was not affected by the pesticide treatments (ANOVA $F_{3,16}= 1.381$, $P= 0.285$), averaging $0.003\pm0.0004$ overall (figure 3.4).
Table 3.3 Statistical analysis by using ANOVA model for the percent of Leaf mass loss representing the decomposition process then LPE and RGR of *A. aquaticus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Leaf mass loss</th>
<th>LPE</th>
<th>RGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asellus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As*Pest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.2 Percentage of Leaf mass loss (mean ± 1SE) for the four pesticides treatments. A) Total leaf mass loss for each pesticide treatment, pooling across detritivore treatments, B) effects of the pesticides separated according to the presence, (black bars) and absence, (grey bars) of *A. aquaticus.*
**Figure 3.3** Effect of the different pesticide treatments on (mean ± 1SE) detritivore leaf processing efficiency (LPE)

**Figure 3.4** Effect of the different pesticide treatments on (mean ± 1SE) relative growth rate (RGR)
Pesticides affected ecosystem functioning in my laboratory microcosms, but these effects did not match completely with expectations based on their target organism groups. Thus the fungicide Azoxystrobin little affected decomposition mediated by microbes, and the insecticide Lindane did not have an overall affect on decomposition mediated by detritivores. However, Azoxystrobin had important knock-on effects on the performance of the detritivores, with the result that leaf mass loss was reduced more overall by the fungicide than insecticide. Synergistic interactions between the pesticides were also apparent, with detritivore leaf processing efficiency depressed most strongly when both pesticides were applied together, supporting hypothesis H.6. The marked effects of Azoxystrobin, whether applied alone or in mixture with Lindane, most likely reflect the importance of microbial conditioning of detritus for the participation of *A. aquaticus* in the decomposition process. Overall, ecosystem functioning was more strongly affected by the stressor impacting the food web from the bottom up, rather than that applied from the top-down. These results indicate that changed interactions within food webs can complicate prediction of the effects of pesticide stressors on ecosystem functioning in streams

*Responses of leaf decomposition process under pesticide treatments*

In the absence of pesticides, *Asellus aquaticus* almost doubled decomposition rates compared with the microbe-only controls, reflecting the key role of detritivores in driving bulk fragmentation of leaf litter. Correspondingly, the pesticides had their strongest effects on leaf mass loss when *A. aquaticus* was present, but counterintuitively, these effects were driven more by the fungicide Azoxystrobin than by the insecticide Lindane. The effects of microbes on decomposition is two-fold: (i) the secretion of leaf digestive enzymes converts leaf mass to soluble compounds and fine organic particles directly and (ii) microbes soften and enrich (improve nutrient status) the leaf litter in a process known as “conditioning”, enhancing subsequent feeding activity by detritivores (Graça *et al.* 2001; Gessner *et al.* 1999; Bärlocher 1985).
In this study, Azoxystrobin evidently impaired microbial conditioning, indicated by its negative effects on leaf decomposition in the presence of detritivores, and its negative effect on detritivore leaf processing efficiency (supporting hypothesis H.1). It thus seems surprising that no strong direct effects of Azoxystrobin on microbially-mediated decomposition in the absence of detritivores were apparent. Such effects have been observed in previous studies. For example, Ermold (2009) found reductions in leaf decomposition rate with increasing Azoxystrobin concentration, even in the absence of detritivores, and Dijksterhuis (2011) also observed effects on non-target aquatic fungi, related to variation in their sensitivity to fungicide toxicity levels.

Several factors could help in explaining why I did not find a significant negative effect of Azoxystrobin on decomposition mediated by microbes, in the absence of A. aquaticus. Most likely is that the experimental time period was insufficient for effects of the fungicide on microbial performance to be reflected in significantly slowed decomposition rates, though there was an overall non-significant trend for reduced decomposition in the Azoxystrobin treatment relative to the control. It is notable that overall decomposition rates were higher in the study by Ermold (2009), which was run for 5 days longer than mine, and which found significant differences between the Azoxystrobin and control treatments. This suggests that, given more time, my Azoxystrobin and control treatments might have differentiated more clearly. Additionally, other factors may have been less optimal for stimulating microbial activity, and hence hindering a stronger differentiation in the effects of the pesticide treatments. For example greater water nutrients (N and P) and temperatures can stimulate greater microbial activity, and one or both of these parameters were higher in previous studies (Ermold, 2009, Grattan II & Suberkropp, 2001; Sridhar and Bärlocher, 2000; Chauvet and Suberkropp, 1998).

However, I also cannot rule out the possibility that the fungicide would never have affected leaf decomposition rates, even if the study had been run for longer. In a previous study (Ermold 2009), fungal assemblages with a previous exposure to agricultural stressors were found to be more resistant to pesticides than those with none. Whilst Hågaån is not an intensively farmed catchment, it does experience agricultural runoff (Bergfur, 2007), and this may have favoured tolerant microbes more resistant to Azoxystrobin. In that case, the effect of Azoxystrobin on A.
*aquaticus* LPE might have arisen from direct toxicity, or a simple aversion to litter with the deposited pesticide, rather than impaired microbial conditioning.

However, it is notable that effects of Azoxystrobin in Ermold’s (2009) study were observed at the concentration used in my study, even for impacted agricultural assemblages. Parameters awaiting laboratory analysis from my experiments, namely the sporulation rates and fungal biomass analyses, will help to resolve the question of whether Azoxystrobin truly had no effect on microbial communities, or whether it did affect microbial activity (which would be seen in reduced sporulation and/or biomass), with the experiment simply not long enough to detect an effect on overall decomposition rates.

Lindane strongly affected detritivore LPE which supporting H.4, providing evidence of a sublethal effect on the efficiency of detritivore feeding, relative to their biomass. This effect could arise from several different mechanisms. Lindane binds strongly to organic substrates and biological membranes (Lee et al., 1997). Absorption of Lindane to the body of *A. aquaticus* may well have caused sublethal effects, i.e. the animals to feel less physically fit, impairing resource intake rates. Alternatively, sorption of Lindane to leaves (Bell and Tsezos, 1987) might have reduced leaf palatability, further reducing leaf processing efficiency. Interestingly, a synergistic interaction between Lindane and Azoxystrobin was apparent in their effects on leaf processing efficiency: the reduction in LPE was greater when both pesticides were applied together than when either was applied in isolation. The most likely explanation is that the joint application of Lindane and Azoxystrobin directly affected *A. aquaticus* feeding performance through a combined effect of reduction of microbial conditioning and sublethal toxicity of one or both pesticides on the detritivores’ physiological condition, unless the potential sublethal effects of both pesticides were strong enough to induce a change in feeding performance even without an effect on microbial conditioning.

The negative effects of Lindane on detritivore LPE were not reflected in corresponding effects on overall decomposition. This may indicate that microbes were able to compensate for the negative effect on detritivore LPE (Suberkropp *et al.*, 1983).
Given that *A. aquaticus* feeds by scraping at fungal growths on leaf surfaces (Graça *et al.*, 1993), a negative effect of Lindane on *A. aquaticus* feeding would free the microbes from such grazing pressure (Bärlocher, 1980; Graça *et al.*, 2001). Additionally, meiofauna also can influence decomposition by preying on microbes, and any negative effects of Lindane on the meiofauna might also have reduced grazing pressure on the microbes (Ribblett, Palmer & Coats 2005).

**Detritivore Mortality rate**

The lack of a mortality effect of Lindane is not surprising, given I chose a sublethal concentration, which had been confirmed as sublethal in a pilot study. More surprisingly, mortality of *A. aquaticus* was significantly increased in the Azoxystrobin treatment, as well as in the mixture. This could reflect either (i) a direct effect of Azoxystrobin on *A. aquaticus* mortality, (ii) an indirect effect of reduced feeding due either to impaired leaf conditioning or an aversion of *A. aquaticus* for litter with deposited pesticide. Previous studies did not provide sufficient information about the mortality of aquatic invertebrates by Azoxystrobin action. However, another study of a similar fungicide, Carbendazim, reported a decrease in Isopoda abundance at a relatively low dose of 330 µg/l (Cuppen *et al.* 2000), demonstrating that fungicides can induce mortality in Crustacea. Alternatively, assuming the reduction in LPE reflects an overall decrease in resource intake, then the animals may simply have starved to death. The combination of Azoxystrobin and Lindane together may thus have increased the level of toxic stress on *A. aquaticus*, perhaps in combination with dietary stress caused by retarded microbial conditioning, both contributing to elevated *A. aquaticus* mortality rate in mixture treatment.

**Detritivore growth rate**

Detritivore growth rates should be correlated with their rates of resource intake, or in this case, leaf processing efficiency (McKie *et al.*, 2009). However, in this study the strong effects of the pesticides on leaf processing efficiency were not matched by effects on growth, which was not different among pesticide treatments and did not support my hypothesis (H.5). This might reflect the fact that standardization of growth period was difficult to achieve because of the high *A. aquaticus* mortality under the Azoxystrobin and mixture treatments, generating substantial noise in the data. In addition, the short period of the study might not have been sufficient for
marked differences in the growth rate to become apparent. In the longer term, impaired feeding by *A. aquaticus* should be expected to impair growth.

*Detritivore moulting rate*

Even in the absence of mortality, it can be expected that elimination and absorption of the pesticides by *A. aquaticus* will lead to some physiological stress (Thybaud & LeBras 1988). I hypothesized that this might alter detritivore moulting behavior (H.3), if moulting provides a means for eliminating the pesticides (Eijsackers *et al.*, 1978). There was no evidence for an effect of the pesticides on overall skin moulting frequencies. However, of those animals that did moult, the time to first moulting was substantially shortened in the presence of pesticides. This earlier moulting in the presence of pesticides might allow liberation from toxic molecules that attached to the outer body surface. Interestingly, not all animals exposed to pesticides moulted, which may indicate a physiological constraint to this potential stress response. Invertebrate moulting is a complex process controlled by hormonal activity, and varying according to several life history factors, including mating processes, life stage, sex, and animal history. The lack of any moulting response to pesticides among some individuals may indicate that those animals simply were not at a point in their moulting cycle where they could accelerate the moulting process.

*Implications and conclusions*

This study highlights the potential for pesticides developed to control terrestrial fungal and invertebrate pests to affect non-target organisms in aquatic environments, with knock-on effects on ecosystem functioning. However, this result also highlights the extent to which interactions within affected food webs can complicate the prediction of these effects. In real stream ecosystems, the picture can look even more complicated due to the presence of further food-web connections. For example, few aquatic shredders are obligate leaf feeders, and can switch to alternative food sources (e.g. diatoms) if necessary (Moore, 1975). As such, a negative effect on microbial conditioning in a real stream might not overly compromise survival of detritivores, if alternative resources are available. On the other hand, the negative effect of the pesticides on the ecosystem process (leaf decomposition mediated by detritivores) would remain, and even be strengthened, reflecting both suppression of microbial activity, and switching of the detritivores to an alternative food source.
Such scenarios demonstrate that human disturbances may not always affect ecosystem structure and functioning to the same extent (Dunne et al., 2002).

Additionally, the concentration of pesticides in streams and their effects on ecosystem functioning can vary according to several factors not possible to simulate in the microcosm experiment. These include the amount of pesticide applied to the catchment, the extent of runoff to stream channels, and residence times in the streams. Additionally, geographical location, size of the stream, the amount of leaf litter and other organic substrates, aquatic biodiversity, sediment type, and hydrological cycle all can control the time and the strength of pesticide effect on ecosystem functioning.

Overall, the pesticide having the most consistent effects in this study appeared to be associated with the bottom-up stressor, Azoxystrobin. It is not yet entirely clear that this reflects negative effects on microbial conditioning, but this is the most likely explanation, and will be clarified when data on microbial activity (fungal biomass and sporulation) become available. Assuming these results do relate to reduced microbial conditioning, they highlight the fundamental importance of microbes to the decomposition process because of their role in improvement of the leaf litter for detritivores, even when they do not contribute a large proportion to bulk decomposition.

Finally, results from this study further highlight the threat posed by the intensification of agricultural practices for stream ecosystems. In particular, this study reveals the potential for agricultural to affect the flow of nutrients and energy in streams and rivers, as seen in the effects on leaf decomposition in this study. An impairment of decomposition could cause an increasing in the accumulation of leaf litter at the bed of streams and rivers, and reduce the flow of nutrients from the litter to other organisms, including large predators (Fishes) (Cummins, 1974, Gessner et al., 2010). The potential for pesticides to contribute to further degradation of aquatic ecosystems, impair functioning and threaten services provided by streams and rivers (such as fishing) requires further attention from both scientists and policy makers.
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Appendix:

Appendix 1: Pre-test of Lindane on Asellus aquaticus mortality

In a controlled environment room maintained at 11 °C, twelve microcosms (6 microcosms with Lindane and 6 microcosms without Lindane) were placed on a shaker table (50 rpm) for three days, with each microcosm containing:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M7 medium</td>
<td>50 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf discs colonized by microbes</td>
<td>10 leaf discs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lindane/ 6 absence</td>
<td>5 µg/l / 0 µg/l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asellus aquaticus</td>
<td>2 individuls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Asellus* individuals in the pesticide treatments were more sluggish, and consistently moved less when disturbed in their microcosms as part of a daily behavioral observation, indicating a sublethal effect on their behavior. However, at the end of the study period, there was no difference in mortality between the controls and Lindane microcosms, and the overall absence of mortality not allowed for statistical analysis.

The target sublethal concentration of Lindane was calculated based on the literature by Professor Willem Goedkoop (Goedkoop and Peterson, 2003).