Impact assessment of a large panel of organic and inorganic micropollutants released by wastewater treatment plants at the scale of France

Quentin Aemig, Arnaud Hélias, Dominique Patureau

Impact assessment of a large panel of organic and inorganic micropollutants released by wastewater treatment plants at the scale of France

Quentin Aemig[a*], Arnaud Hélias[b,c], Dominique Patureau[a]

* corresponding author: q.aemig@gmail.com

a INRAE, Univ Montpellier, LBE, 102 Avenue des Etangs, 11100 Narbonne, France

b ITAP, Univ Montpellier, INRAE, Institut Agro, Montpellier, France

c ELSA, Research group for environmental life cycle sustainability assessment and ELSA-Pact industrial chair, Montpellier, France

Abstract

Micropollutants emitted by Human activities represent a potential threat to our health and aquatic environment. Thousands of active substances are used and go to WWTP through wastewaters. During water treatment, incomplete elimination occurs. Effluents released to the environment still contain part of the micropollutants present in the influents. Here, we studied the potential impacts on Human health and aquatic environment of the release of 261 organic micropollutants and 25 inorganic micropollutants at the scale of France. Data were gathered from national surveys, reports, papers and PhD works. The USEtox ® model was used to assess potential impacts. The impacts on Human health were estimated for 94 organic and 15 inorganic micropollutants and on aquatic environment for 88 organic and 19 inorganic micropollutants highlighting lack of concentration and toxicological data in literature. Some Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and pesticides as well as As and Zn showed highest potential impacts on Human health. Some pesticides, PCB 101, βE2, Al, Fe and Cu showed highest potential impacts on aquatic environment.

Keywords

Persistent compounds, trace metals, pharmaceuticals, human health, aquatic environment, WWTP effluents

1. Introduction

Micropollutants are unwanted substances which presence in the environment at very low concentrations (ng to µg/L in aquatic environment) is mainly due to Human activities (industrial processes, agricultural practices, daily life activities). Even at low concentrations, they can have negative effects on living organisms due to their toxicity, persistence and bioaccumulation in the food chain.

Wastewaters contain a huge variety of organic and inorganic micropollutants that are more or less eliminated from water during wastewater treatments (Besha et al., 2017; Choubert et al., 2011; Clara et al., 2005; Michael et al., 2013) by sorption to sludge, volatilization or physicochemical/biological transformation (Alvarino et al., 2018; Grandclément et al., 2017). As the elimination from water is not complete (Carballa et al., 2004), effluents still contain part of the micropollutants present in wastewaters. Those micropollutants are thus emitted to environment with effluents and can impact aquatic environment and Human health.

Organic micropollutants have known effects on living organisms and Human beings, like carcinogenicity, endocrine disruption (Ahmed et al., 2017). Inorganic micropollutants may also have different effects on health depending on their form (Gwenzi et al., 2018): carcinogenicity, nervous system degradation, gastric troubles, dermal pathologies, etc.

As WWTP are converging point and disseminate a huge diversity of micropollutants, it is important to know the risks or impacts associated to these compounds on human health and aquatic environment.

One way to prioritize chosen micropollutants is to use concentrations in effluents which allows determining quantities emitted to the aquatic environment but the simultaneous use of emitted quantities and toxicity of micropollutants shows sometimes a different prioritization of micropollutants as poorly concentrated substances can show high toxicity (Oldenkamp et al., 2018).

The risk is usually evaluated with risk quotient using PEC/PNEC or MEC/PNEC ratios (PEC: Predicted Environmental Concentration, MEC: Measured Environmental Concentration and PNEC: Predicted No Effect Concentration) (Brus and Perrodin, 2017; Gunnarsson et al., 2019; Oldenkamp et al., 2018; Škrbić et al., 2018; Verlicchi et al., 2012; Yang et al., 2017). If the quotient is superior to one, it is considered that the micropollutant represent a risk meaning that the predicted or measured concentration in the environment is superior to the concentration with no effect. Difficulties come from obtaining PEC, MEC and PNEC. PEC is obtained considering dilution of the emitted concentration in the aquatic environment thus it does not consider potential transformation and sorption to sediment that limit bioaccessibility of micropollutants. MEC considered the real concentration in the aquatic environment; it is thus necessary to have measure campaigns to obtain this concentration; MEC furthermore cannot allow identifying source of emission as it corresponds to a resultant of many emissions (WWTP, agriculture, industries, air deposit, etc.). PNEC considers chronic or acute EC10, EC50 or NOEC corrected with a factor (/10 or /1,000) that considers the most sensitive species which implies uncertainties as only one species is thus considered. This approach is limited by the fact that micropollutants are studied one by one and the overall risk of all micropollutants cannot be estimated.

Another way to study the burden of micropollutants on Human health or aquatic environment is to use Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) tools. LCA allows to estimate the potential impacts of one or a set of micropollutants. Muñoz et al. (2008) used LCA tools to assess the potential

impacts of micropollutants contained in influent and effluent of a WWTP. They showed that, over 98 micropollutants (Water Framework Directive substances and pharmaceuticals compounds), 15 (12 organic and 3 inorganic micropollutants) were identified with elevated risk in effluents for Human health, aquatic and terrestrial environments. More recently, Ortiz de García et al. (2017) used USEtox® characterization factors to evaluate the potential toxicological and ecotoxicological impacts of 49 pharmaceuticals and personal care products emitted by WWTP in Spain; contrary to risk assessment with PEC or MEC/PNEC ratios, they could give an impact score of the mixture of 49 compounds. Whatever the LCA model used to obtain characterization factors that convert emitted mass in potential impact, it considered a fate factor that takes into account transformation and sorption of micropollutants in aquatic environment and an exposure factor that gives the level at which humans and organisms are really exposed.

Here, we decided to use LCA tools to evaluate the potential impacts on Human health and aquatic environment of a mixture of micropollutants both organic and inorganic emitted by WWTP at the scale of France. The consensual USEtox® characterization factors were used. First, we selected a list of micropollutants according to the European Policy applied to France and we reviewed reports and papers on quantification of micropollutants, including pharmaceuticals, in French WWTP effluents. Then we evaluated the mean French concentrations of those substances in WWTP effluents with data collected in literature and given by industrial partners. Finally, potential impacts were evaluated by converting annual mass emitted in the environment with characterization factors obtained in USEtox® (Rosenbaum et al., 2008).

2. Material and methods

2.1 Micropollutants selection

The selection of reference lists was based on (i) European legislation applied to France that sets up monitoring of micropollutants in aquatic environments, (ii) studies that quantified all or part of these micropollutants and (iii) studies that highlighted hazards of emerging micropollutants which are not yet considered in legislation.

The European Water Framework Directive (WFD) and its modification set objectives for the preservation and restauration of the quality of surface water (freshwater and costal water) and groundwater. They give a list of substances and groups of substances that are priority substances or hazardous priority substances. For these substances, Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) set concentrations that cannot be exceeded in surface and groundwater. This implies the setting up of strategies to reduce or suppress emissions to the environment and the monitoring of these substances in aquatic environment.

In France, due to the WFD, an action of survey and reduction of hazardous substances in water (RSDE) started in 2002 with monitoring campaigns of emissions of 2,800 installations classified for the protection of the environment including wastewater treatment plants (WWTP). Results of this campaigns (INERIS, 2007) allowed to conclude that WWTP contributed in a non-negligible way and sometimes in significant way to the emission of priority substances and hazardous priority substances in aquatic environment. This first step lead to the setting up of a specific monitoring of WWTP effluents. Priority substances and hazardous priority substances were measured in the effluents of 760 WWTP with a nominal capacity equal or superior to 10,000 people equivalents (PE). Results confirmed previous emissions data.

Scientists also used the list of substances of the WFD for a quantification campaign of micropollutants in 15 WWTP effluents in France (Martin Ruel et al., 2012). They also add pharmaceutical compounds that were not considered in WFD, WWTP effluents being one of the main route of emission to the environment of such compounds.

We selected micropollutants listed in (i) the WFD (Directive 2008/105/CE, n.d.), (ii) the RSDE national action for survey and reduction of hazardous substances in water (INERIS, 2016) and (iii) the AMPERES French project in which micropollutants (WFD and pharmaceuticals) were analyzed in influents and effluents of 15 WWTP (Martin Ruel et al., 2012). Other micropollutants were selected according to the scientific expertise of industrial partners.

45 substances and families were identified as priority or hazardous priority substances in WFD. Individual substances were selected and substances included in families were added. Substances from the watch lists were also selected. Finally, 116 substances from the WFD and its watch lists were selected (112 organics and 4 inorganics).

94 substances came from the French RSDE survey; 35 new substances were added during the second stage of the action which was set up in August 2016, these micropollutants were also included in the list. Finally, as 66 substances were in common with the WFD, a list of 179 substances (134 organics and 15 inorganics) was selected.

128 substances were studied in the AMPERES project. 70 substances were in common with the previous list. A list of 237 substances was selected (212 organics and 25 inorganics).

The expertise allowed to add 48 substances to the list (pharmaceuticals compounds and additional polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons of the US-EPA list not taken into account previously).

For imidaclopride, two forms were identified and quantified separately in studies. So, we decided to study the two forms thus it added one substance to the list.

Finally, a list of 286 substances was selected with 261 organic micropollutants and 25 inorganic micropollutants (the list is given in supporting information). This list included 87 pharmaceuticals (Pharma), 66 pesticides (Pest), 18 PolyChloroBiphenyls (PCB), 17

145 PolyChloroDibenzoDioxines and Furanes (PCDD and PCDF), 16 Polycyclic Aromatic
146 Hydrocarbons (PAH), 8 AlkylPhenols (AP), 8 halogenated volatile organic compounds
147 (HVOC), 8 HaloPhenols (HPh), 7 PolyBromoDiphenylEthers (PBDE), 4 BTEX (Benzene,
148 Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylenes), 5 HexaBromoCycloDoDecanes (HBCDD), 4 organotins
149 (OSn), 3 chlorobenzenes (ClBz) and 10 non classified substances (PFOS, bisphenol A,
150 chloroalkanes, etc.).

151 ## 2.2 Mass released in the aquatic environment

152 ### 2.2.1 Volume of water

153 The volume of water released in the environment with WWTP effluents was estimated using
154 daily flows arriving to WWTP considering that the amount of water arriving to WWTP was
155 the same as the one of effluent. Flows were obtained on official website of French WWTP
156 monitoring ("Portail d'informations sur l'assainissement communal - Accueil," n.d.). The
157 flows of all WWTP were added and multiplied by 365 days to obtain the annual water volume
158 discharged in the aquatic environment. We did not consider wet weather flows. The annual
159 volume of effluent was estimated at 5,000,000,000 m^3.

160 ### 2.2.2 Concentration and mass

161 Data were collected in the report of the French survey RSDE (INERIS, 2016), in the
162 published data of AMPERES project (Bruchet et al., 2015), in 30 articles dealing with
163 micropollutants in French WWTP effluents (Andreozzi et al., 2002; Bergé et al., 2012; Botta
164 et al., 2009; Cargouët et al., 2004; Cavalheiro et al., 2017; Chiffre et al., 2016; Dagnac et al.,
165 2005; Deycard et al., 2017; Dinh et al., 2017b, 2017a; Ferrari et al., 2004; Gabet-Giraud et al.,
166 2014, 2010; Grandcoin et al., 2017; Janex-Habibi et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2005; Labadie
167 and Budzinski, 2005; Leclercq et al., 2009; Li et al., 2013; Mailler et al., 2016, 2015; Miège et
168 al., 2009b, 2009a; Muller et al., 2008; Oberlé et al., 2012; Rabiet et al., 2006; Sablayrolles et

al., 2011; Tamtam et al., 2008; Thiebault et al., 2017; Togola and Budzinski, 2007; Tran et al., 2015; Wiest et al., 2018), in 6 PhD reports dealing with French WWTP (Cladière, 2012; Coetsier, 2009; Gilbert-Pawlik, 2011; Mailler, 2015; Pasquini, 2013; Pomiès, 2013) or given by WWTP stakeholders.

Wet weather data as well as data from tertiary treatment were excluded. Data inferior to limit of quantification were estimated at half of the quantification limit as usually applied in environmental studies (INERIS, 2016).

Data were highly variable from one study to another which is consistent with local usage. Moreover, in many papers and reports, no information was given on location or analysis time. But we have chosen to tackle with this diversity of data, characterize it and take into account of the uncertainties rather than work on a single source of data. In order to do so and to avoid giving to much weight to the highest concentrations, mean concentration was estimated using geometrical mean; instead of arithmetical mean.

Furthermore, confidence intervals at 95 % were estimated allowing to show the accuracy of data; indeed, the lowest was the interval, the lowest was the variation of data. Considering variability of data above time and location with geometrical mean and confidence interval allowed estimation of mean value for a year and at the scale of France. For most of the molecules, there was a factor 2 between mean values and interval confidence boundaries which was much lower than the error on characterization factors (1 or 2 log). In view of all the uncertainties of what was available, we can only wish for a greater sharing of measured and consolidated data from WWTP with, for example, open data.

For each substance, a reliability index was estimated. If the proportion of data inferior to the limit of quantification was higher than 90 %, the index was set at 0. For some substances, only one concentration was found in literature or given by WWTP stakeholders, in that case, if the concentration was superior to quantification limit, the index was set at 1 and the error on

194 the logarithm was estimated at 100 % (maximum error for substances with high number of
195 found concentrations). In all other cases, the index was set at 1. This index allowed to
196 eliminate data which were not reliable.

197 Considering that the estimated volume and the mean concentrations were representative of the
198 whole France, mass released annually in the aquatic environment was estimated by
199 multiplying each concentration by the volume. Mass was converted in kilograms or tons.

200 2.3 Impacts

201 Characterization factors were obtained from USEtox 2.1® (Hauschild et al., 2008; Henderson
202 et al., 2011; Rosenbaum et al., 2011, 2008). Model was set to Europe and characterization
203 factors were obtained for emissions in freshwater compartment. Characterization factors
204 (CFs) were calculated in USEtox 2.1® through the following formula: CF = FF x XF x EF.
205 FF was the fate factor indicating the residence time in the environment and was estimating
206 with physicochemical properties for organic micropollutants or speciation for inorganic
207 micropollutants. XF was the exposure factor *i.e.* the fraction of micropollutants in
208 environment that was available for organisms. EF was the effect factor corresponding to the
209 effect on aquatic environment (considering three trophic levels) or the effect on Human
210 health. For Human toxicity CFs, USEtox 2.1® calculated the intake fraction (iF) *i.e.* the
211 amount of micropollutants absorbed through air, water and food after emission in freshwater
212 compartment. iF was equal to XF x FF.

213 LCA tool was preferred to PEC/PNEC or MEC/PNEC approach as we wanted to estimate
214 potential impacts of each micropollutants and the overall impact of the mixture; furthermore,
215 the use of this method allowed us determining the impact linked to WWTP emissions only.

216 Potential impacts were estimated by multiplying the mass with the characterization factor.
217 According to USEtox® documentation (Fantke et al., 2017), impacts were different if there

was 1 or 2 log difference for respectively organic and inorganic substances. Only the error due to the variation of concentrations was plotted but USEtox® error on impacts was also considered for results interpretation.

For Human health, the impact was expressed in DALY (Disability Adjusted Life Year) which represented the number of years lost with illness, handicap or premature death. It considered both carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic effects.

For aquatic environment, the impact was expressed in PDF.m^3.d (Potentially Disappeared Fraction integrated with volume and time).

The total impact for Human health or aquatic environment was calculated by summing all the impacts. No agonist or antagonist effects were considered.

When summing concentrations, mass or impacts, geometrical mean values were added and considered as the total mean. The error for the total mean was the sum of 95 % confidence intervals limits.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Concentration and mass

3.1.1 Organic micropollutants

225/261 organic micropollutants (86 %) presented at least one concentration in literature and WWTP stakeholders' data. The 36 organic micropollutants without data were: (i) 17 PCDD/PCDF, (ii) heptabromodiphenylethers, (iii) 11 pesticides (methiocarbe, acetamipride, clothianidine, thiaclopride, thiametoxame, metaflumizone, triallate, cybutryne, DDT 24', DDD 44', DDE 44') and (iv) 7 pharmaceuticals (butylated hydroxytoluene, octyl methoxycinnamate, 4-epi-chlortetracycline, chlortetracycline, doxycycline, acetylsulfamethoxazole, azoxystrobine).

241 153/261 organic micropollutants (59 %) presented reliability index of 1: 123 had more than
242 one available data and 30 had only one available data. Mean concentrations and masses were
243 calculated for these 153 compounds. The reliability index allowed to eliminate substances
244 poorly quantified with high limit of quantification such as methanol or hydrazine.

245 Concentrations ranged from 0.1 ng.L^{-1} to around 5 µg.L^{-1} (Table I). This underlined the high
246 variety of concentrations. 75 % of the concentrations were below 0.1 µg.L^{-1}. Annual masses
247 ranged between 0.5 kg to 26 tons. 75 % of the annual mass were below 0.6 tons. 15
248 compounds had concentrations/mass higher than the 90th centile: (i) 9 pharmaceuticals
249 (valsartan, irbesartan, ranitidine, hydrochlorothiazide, chlordiazepoxide, sotalol, furosemide,
250 carbamazepine, atenolol) and (ii) NP1EC (nonylphenol ethoxyacetic acid), trichloromethane,
251 tetrachloroethylene, dichloromethane, AMPA (aminomethylphosphonic acid) and DEHP
252 (bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate). Pharmaceuticals concentrations in the French effluents were in
253 accordance with the data in Europe (Verlicchi et al., 2012). Results highlighted that some
254 pharmaceuticals have high emissions to the environment compared to other organic
255 micropollutants; these high mass may be due to (i) high concentrations in wastewaters, (ii)
256 low sorption to sludge, (iii) poor biodegradability, (iv) transformation in parent compounds of
257 conjugated forms or (v) combination of these hypotheses. DEHP is a plasticizer used in many
258 manufactured products (Wormuth et al., 2006). Tetrachloromethane, dichloromethane and
259 tetrachloroethylene are chemicals used in many industries. AMPA is a transformation product
260 of glyphosate and phosphonates present in washing powders and liquids (Grandcoin et al.,
261 2017). NP1EC is a transformation product of nonylphenol polyethoxylates which are common
262 surfactants used in many chemical products (Ying et al., 2002), and can no longer be used
263 without authorization since July 2019 (REACH UE n° 999/2017 and 2020/171 annex XIV).

264 For some of these highest concentrated organic micropollutants, EQS were available: 1,650,
265 452, 2.5, 2.5 and 1.3 µg.L^{-1} for dichloromethane, AMPA, carbamazepine, trichloromethane

and DEHP respectively. In this study, estimated concentrations in effluents were 3.01 (2.81 – 3.21 range from – 95 % to + 95 % confidence interval), 1.12 (0.59 – 2.14), 0.40 (0.29 – 0.54), 0.58 (0.55 – 0.61) and 0.73 (0.69 – 0.77) $\mu g.L^{-1}$ for dichloromethane, AMPA, carbamazepine, trichloromethane and DEHP respectively. In this case, all effluent concentrations were lower than EQS. In French survey, it is considered that a substance should be monitored if concentration in effluent was above ten times its EQS (consideration of a mean dilution factor of 10 in the aquatic environment). Applying this rule, none of these molecules should be monitored.

Concentrations in French rivers were also found (survey from 1st of January 2015 and 31st of December 2018, http://www.naiades.eaufrance.fr/ consulted the 20th and 23rd of September 2019) for these 15 organic micropollutants. Mean concentrations were calculated with all obtained data with the same hypotheses as for WWTP effluents. When quantification frequency was lower than 10 % no mean concentration was calculated. All the mean concentrations found in rivers remained below the effluent ones but the ratio between those concentrations (effluent/river) is variable depending on the compounds, underlying that considering a common dilution factor to predict the concentration in the river from the effluent one may contribute to calculation error of the risk quotient. DEHP, AMPA, furosemide, carbamazepine and atenolol had concentrations in effluent 2 to 4 times higher than mean concentrations in rivers; sotalol, hydrochlorothiazide and irbesartan had concentrations in effluent 7, 11 and 16 times higher respectively than mean concentrations in rivers. Thus, WWTP may contribute in a significant way to occurrences in rivers; indeed, except AMPA which can also be emitted by agricultural emissions, all cited micropollutants originate from urban activities.

Those 15 compounds (10 % of the compounds) represented 70 % of the total mass of the 153 organic micropollutants: 48 % for the 9 pharmaceuticals and 22 % for the other 6 compounds.

The total mass of the 153 organic micropollutants released in the environment by French WWTP was around 147 tons (between 107 and 223 tons considering confidence intervals).

3.1.2 Inorganic micropollutants

A concentration was estimated for 24/25 (96 %) inorganic compounds (Figure 1). Thallium was searched in effluents but never quantified; it was not therefore considered. Concentrations ranged from 0.01 $\mu g.L^{-1}$ (mercury) to 159 $\mu g.L^{-1}$ (iron). The total mass released in the environment was around 1,892 tons (range 1,382 to 3,005 tons). Main contributors to the total mass were, in decreasing order: iron (42 %), boron (17 %), aluminum (10 %), zinc (9 %) and manganese (7 %).

Most of organic micropollutants are synthetic substances produced by Human activities (PAH are also produced by natural sources such as forest fire) but inorganic micropollutants are naturally present in the environment and increase of concentrations in environment compartments is also linked to Human activities; natural presence in water and non-biodegradability can explain that concentrations of inorganic micropollutants are generally higher than those of organic micropollutants. Mean concentrations estimated in this study in the effluent are close to environmental concentration (Salpeteur and Angel, 2010) and above French drinking water limits.

As for organic micropollutants, concentrations were compared to EQS and mean rivers concentrations for the highest concentrations in WWTP effluents. Only zinc has EQS, stated at 7.8 or 3.1 $\mu g.L^{-1}$ depending on water alkalinity. For some rivers, zinc should be monitored as its mean concentration in effluents was 35 (33 – 37 range) $\mu g.L^{-1}$ thus superior to ten times the lowest EQS.

Aluminum concentration in effluents was half of the mean concentration in rivers; iron and manganese concentration in effluents were close to rivers concentration; boron and zinc

315 concentrations were respectively 6 and 20 times higher in WWTP effluents than in rivers
316 concentrations. WWTP might only be a major contributor of inorganic micropollutants for
317 boron and zinc which was in accordance with their use by human activities in urban areas.

318 3.2 Potential impacts of organic micropollutants

319 3.2.1 Human health

320 The impact on Human health of organic micropollutants was calculated with the 94
321 substances with characterization factors over the 261 selected organic micropollutants (36 %)
322 and over the 153 organic micropollutants with estimated concentrations (61%). This was due
323 to the lack of concentrations and/or characterization factors. Butylphenol, aspirin, ibuprofen,
324 cimetidine, hydrochlorothiazide, βE2, caffeine and theophylline had characterization factors
325 equal to 0. The impact on Human health was estimated with compounds representing 48 % of
326 the characterized organic micropollutants mass.

327 Impacts ranged from 0 to 2 DALY (Figure 2 A) with a total average impact of 6 DALY. Main
328 contributors were benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzo(k)fluoranthene, indomethacin, dicofol,
329 indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, pentabromodiphenylethers, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene and diclofenac
330 with respective contributions of 28, 16, 15, 13, 12, 6, 3 and 1 % of the total impact
331 (considering substances with at least 1 % contribution to the total impact). Those eight
332 compounds represented only 4 % of the 94 characterized organic micropollutants mass but 94
333 % of the total potential impact on Human health. It is thus important not only to consider the
334 mass released in the environment for prioritization but also toxicity as stated by Oldenkamp et
335 al. (2018). Among these 8 compounds, 4 are PAH that are produced by human activities and
336 natural sources and thus are ubiquist in environmental matrices. The 2 following compounds
337 are already banned of use: dicofol is an acaricide forbidden since 2010 in France and
338 pentabromodiphenylethers are a group of flame retardant forbidden since 2004 in France.
339 Their low residual presence in WWTP effluents is thus relied to illegal use or persistence in

340 the environment. Only indomethacin and diclofenac, both anti-inflammatory drugs are still
341 used in France. Compounds with the highest potential impacts to Human health corresponded
342 mainly to recognized carcinogenic ones (especially PAH and polybromodiphenylethers).

343 Muñoz et al. (2008) studied the impact on Human health of 98 micropollutants using a
344 scenario in which they were emitted to soil (use for agricultural crop irrigation) with
345 characterization factors coming from two different methods. First method, EDIP 97 (scores
346 expressed in m^3) highlighted two substances with the highest impact on Human health:
347 gemfibrozil and nicotine; 2^{nd} method, USES-LCA (scores expressed in kg-DCB-eq),
348 highlighted two others substances: 2,3,7,8-TCDD and hexachlorobenzene. In our study,
349 nicotine was not considered, 2,3,7,8-TCDD and hexachlorobenzene were first selected but not
350 taken into account due to non-available concentration data in French effluents. Gemfibrozil
351 was characterized for Human toxicity and showed only around 0.01 % contribution to the
352 total potential impact. Difference in results came from the LCA methods used for
353 characterization factors calculation and from the choice of compartment in which emission is
354 made and the exposure pathway via crops irrigated with treated effluent.

355 Ortiz de García et al. (2017) using a similar methodology based on LCA only studied
356 pharmaceutical compounds. Over 49 substances, they were able to quantify the impact of 41
357 ones. The total impact, calculated considering their masses and characterization factors, was
358 36 cases which was 2 log higher than the 0.8 cases we found for our 94 substances (it was
359 only possible to convert our results in cases). The total mass emitted to the environment is an
360 explanation to the difference as it was 234 tons for their study and only 71 tons for ours.
361 Considering only pharmaceuticals compounds of our study (46 substances), the total impact
362 was 0.1 cases and the total mass was 37 tons confirming that the emitted mass is a critical
363 point for the impact on Human health ; in our study, characterized pharmaceuticals
364 represented 52 % of the total mass and around 14 % of the total impact meaning that other

365 less concentrated compounds had high impacts on Human health due to high toxicity. If we
366 considered only common pharmaceuticals compounds between both studies (16), their impact
367 was one log higher than ours (Figure 3 A). In terms of mass released to the environment, only
368 carbamazepine, diclofenac and sulfamethoxazole had same orders of magnitude; EE2 and
369 trimethoprim had mass higher in our study with one log difference; for others, masses were
370 lower in our study with one log difference for norfloxacine, azithromycine, ciprofloxacin,
371 naproxen, alprazolam, βE2, fluoxetine, clarithromycin and ibuprofen and with 2 logs
372 difference for acetaminophen and omeprazole. Those differences highlighted the need to
373 consider geographical difference between countries. Some characterization factors were
374 different between the two studies probably due to the update of USEtox® database except for
375 naproxen, ciprofloxacin, trimethoprim, acetaminophen, sulfamethoxazole and norfloxacin
376 with same order of magnitude. Trimethoprim and diclofenac had impact superior in our study
377 with one log difference; ciprofloxacin, sulfamethoxazole and naproxen had similar impacts in
378 both studies; for the other substances, impacts were lower in our study with 1, 2, 3 or 4 logs
379 difference. For βE2 and ibuprofen, our database gave null characterization factor avoiding
380 comparison. For substances with the same characterization factors, the difference between the
381 two studies came from the emitted mass in aquatic environment. In accordance with available
382 comparison, it meant that, probably due to difference in terms of use, pharmaceuticals'
383 potential impacts to Human health could be strongly impacted by the mass emitted to the
384 environment. Nevertheless, both studies showed low impact on Human health whatever the
385 considered micropollutants were.

386 Other studies only evaluated the risk linked to the presence of organic micropollutants in
387 drinking water. Hollender et al. (2018) searched more than 500 organic micropollutants in
388 drinking water. They found 123 substances with concentrations above quantification limits
389 and showed that there was no significant risk for the consumption of these water due to

organic micropollutants presence (comparison of the measured concentrations with a threshold value of 0.1 $\mu g.L^{-1}$ (Threshold of Toxicological Concern Approach)). Enault et al. (2015) compared the contribution of environmental micropollutants exposure (11 mineral elements and 73 organic micropollutants); they also showed a minor risk due to the consumption of drinking water due to poor exposure via water although some micropollutants (lead, non-dioxin-like polychlorobiphenyls, PFOA, PFOS) might have a non-negligible risk compared to air or food exposure. de Jesus Gaffney et al. (2015) showed with quotient risk analysis that 16 pharmaceuticals compounds (quantified over 31 searched ones) present in surface water, underground water and drinking water did not show an elevated risk to Human health. Although those studies concerned drinking water, it tended to confirm our results as contamination of drinking waters partly occurred because of WWTP emissions especially for compounds only used in everyday life such as pharmaceuticals.

In our study, the total impact of organic micropollutants released in aquatic environment through WWTP effluents on Human health was low due to (i) the absence of direct exposure to these molecules, (ii) the buffer role of the environment and (iii) the treatment steps before exposure (drinking water: ozonation, activated carbon treatments than can eliminate a huge part of organic micropollutants (Simazaki et al., 2015)).

3.2.2 Aquatic environment

Over the 153 organic micropollutants with estimated concentrations, 88 (58 %) had ecotoxicity characterization factors. The impact on aquatic environment was estimated with compounds representing 44 % of the organic micropollutants mass.

Impacts ranged from 13.10^3 to 49.10^9 $PDF.m^3.d$ (Figure 2 B). Main contributors to the total impact (61.10^9 $PDF.m^3.d$) were cypermethrin, PCB 101, βE2, amoxicillin and aclonifen with respective contributions of 82, 12, 2 and 1 %. As cypermethrin had a very high score, we also included in the list with the highest impacts 1,2,5,6,9,10-HBCDD, boscalid, dicofol, isodrin

415 and dichlorvos which had a least 1 % of the total impact calculated without cypermethrine;
416 those 10 compounds represented around 2 % of the 88 organic micropollutants mass but 99 %
417 of the total impact. Cypermethrin is a pesticide which use is limited in France. PCB 101 is an
418 ubiquist polychlorobiphenyl forbidden since 1987 in France but highly refractory to
419 degradation in the environment. βE2 is a natural hormone produced by humans and animals.
420 It is a well know endocrine disruptor and this estrogenic effect has already been observed
421 after discharged of treated water in river (Miège et al., 2009b); but this molecule presents also
422 high ecotoxicity for aquatic environment which implies a high effect factor and a high impact
423 calculated with our approach. By comparison, EE2, well-known to have higher endocrine
424 disruption effect than βE2 (Jobling et al., 2006) had a lower potential impact because its
425 ecotoxicity (expressed in the effect factor) was lower. Amoxicillin (beta-lactam from the
426 aminopenicillin family) is a well-used antibiotic in France. 1,2,5,6,9,10-HBCDD is a flame
427 retardant which use was progressively reduced since 2011 due to suspicion of endocrine
428 disruption effect. Dicofol, isodrine and dichlorvos are pesticides which uses are forbidden in
429 France; on the contrary, aclonifen and boscalid use is authorized in France (both pesticides).
430 Among those main contributors, suspected endocrine disruptors were present (PCB,
431 chlorinated pesticides, brominated flame retardant) (Matthiessen et al., 2018; Vilela et al.,
432 2018) even if this effect is not considered in the effect factor used to calculate the ecotoxicity
433 characterization factor.

434 For the ten compounds having the highest impacts on aquatic environment, we observed that
435 the exposure factor had low influence on the potential impact as it was close to 100 % for all
436 compounds. Thus, mass, fate factor and effect factor had the highest influence: the effect
437 factor had a great influence as its contribution to the impact was between 45 and 72 %; the
438 emitted mass and fate factor had similar contributions between 7 and 32 %. In that case,

toxicity of the substances had more effect than the quantity released to the environment or the degradation potency of those molecules.

Other studies used Life Cycle Assessment tools to determine potential impacts of micropollutants emitted by WWTP on aquatic environment. Muñoz et al. (2008), with the study of one WWTP in Spain, showed that fluoxetine, triclosan and ciprofloxacin had greatest potential impacts on aquatic environment with both models they used; with EDIP97 model 2,3,7,8-TCDD had high contribution to the impact whereas USES-LCA model highlighted ibuprofen. In our study, fluoxetine, triclosan, ciprofloxacin and ibuprofen ranked, in decreasing order of contribution, at the 49^{th}, 30^{th}, 43^{rd} and 82^{nd} positions respectively. In our case, the molecules with highest impacts were not considered in (Muñoz et al., 2008); ibuprofen had low contribution in our study due to the difference of emitted mass and/or evaluation of characterization factor (not the same models). 2,3,7,8-TCDD was in our initial list but not considered due to lack of French concentration data in WWTP effluents. Nevertheless, its USEtox® characterization factor was among the highest meaning that even with probably low concentration in effluent (highly hydrophobic compound) its impact should be among the highest.

Ortiz de García et al. (2017) only studied pharmaceutical compounds. The total impact on aquatic environment of their 45 characterized pharmaceuticals was in same order of magnitude of our 88 substances total impact (respectively $1.4.10^{10}$ and $6.1.10^{10}$ PDF.m^3.d). The huge difference was the mass as already shown for Human toxicity (236 tons and 64 tons for 45 pharmaceuticals and 88 substances respectively). It proved that substances with very low concentrations can have a great impact on aquatic environment; contrary to the potential impact on Human health, taking into account other substances than pharmaceuticals was of great concern. When considering only our 37 characterized pharmaceuticals (38 % of the mass and 4 % of the impact), emitted mass and impact had one log less than Ortiz de Garcia's

464 results; thus both results seemed consistent. It highlighted once more that geographical
465 situation was very important when estimating potential impacts. Among the 45 substances, we
466 had calculated the impact for the 19 substances in common (Figure 3 B). The total emitted
467 mass was 70 and 10 tons for their study and ours respectively and the total impact was
468 $1.3.10^{10}$ and $2.2.10^{9}$ PDF.m^3.d respectively. As already shown previously, mass emitted to the
469 environment were different except for salicylic acid, estrone and norfloxacin (same order of
470 magnitude). Contrary to toxicity characterization factors, only amoxicillin, clarithromycin,
471 estrone and venlafaxine characterization factors were not in the same order of magnitude.
472 Difference occurred for potential impacts on aquatic environment mainly due to the difference
473 of emitted mass. In both studies, βE2, azithromycin and clarithromycin had very high
474 potential impact. Hormone and antibiotics (macrolides) showed also high ecotoxicity.

475 Prediction of concentrations in aquatic environment crossed with estimation of ecotoxicity
476 allowed also to study potential impacts on aquatic environment (Lindim et al., 2019). In their
477 study, the bioavailable concentrations of 54 pharmaceuticals were predicted in different rivers
478 thanks to fugacity model STREAM-EU and their ecotoxicity effect was evaluated in
479 percentage of the total Potentially Affected Fraction (PAF) using EC_{50} of each substance. In
480 their study, some pharmaceuticals with highest contribution to predicted toxic pressure were
481 among the list of the most impacting pharmaceuticals in our study (diclofenac, EE2,
482 erythromycin, ciprofloxacin).

483 Neale et al. (2015) coupled analytical tools and biological bioassays with mixture-toxicity
484 modeling to *in vitro* effects of micropollutants to detected organic micropollutants in water.
485 They showed that for some effect, few molecules contributed to a large amount of the impact
486 which was in accordance with our findings.

487 Johnson et al. (2019) studied the change of wastewater treatment process on the biodiversity
488 of macroinvertebrates in a river of the United Kingdom between 1970 and 2010. They studied

the evolution of BMWP index (Biological Monitoring Working Party) and the SPEAR indexes (Species at Risk) during time in the river flow. One carbon filter was set up between 2008 and 2014 as tertiary treatment; during this period no significant impact on macroinvertebrates was noticed due to the use of activated carbon; the observed improvement of biodiversity was related to the improvement of oxygen levels during the whole study. Authors estimated that, in this case, pollutants present in WWTP effluent were not a great threat compared to other emissions such as agricultural ones.

Other articles confirmed our results showing an impact on aquatic environment. Richmond et al. (2018) analyzed pharmaceutical compounds in 190 aquatic insects' larvae and other aquatic invertebrates and riparian spiders. They showed possible bioaccumulation in aquatic organisms such as brown trout and terrestrial organisms (spiders and platypus consuming insects' larvae and insects). No effect of bioaccumulation was studied. Ojemaye and Petrik (2019) analyzed 15 organic micropollutants (pharmaceutical compounds, perfluoroalkyl compounds and compounds from chemical industry) in fish caught near Cape Town. Eleven molecules were detected at least in one body part of each fish. With risk quotient, results showed that micropollutants present in fish represent a potential risk to fish and Humans that consume them. Our results are in accordance with a low but real risk of the presence of organic micropollutants in aquatic environment: bioaccumulation and risk for organisms. Remaining question is that neither our study nor literature show the deleterious effect, if any, of bioaccumulation in aquatic organisms. Other studies, using mixture of micropollutants, showed cocktail effects but these studies were made in lab-control conditions with concentrations generally higher than in real environment (Cizmas et al., 2015; Elisabete Silva et al., 2002; Rajapakse et al., 2001; Thrupp et al., 2018).

512 Verlicchi et al. (2012) showed high risk of some pharmaceuticals in aquatic environment
513 using PEC/PNEC method. Antibiotics (especially macrolides) in common in our studies were
514 shown to have great impact or risk on the aquatic environment.

515 Bioaccumulation, endocrine disruption, and toxicity of micropollutants had been already
516 observed and quantified in literature with different methods. Our results tended to confirm
517 negative effects of micropollutants released by WWTP in aquatic environment. Many studies
518 focused on emerging micropollutants such as pharmaceuticals. Here we highlighted potential
519 impacts of recalcitrant and persistent compound and pharmaceuticals. Furthermore, literature
520 and our study also proved that, whatever the method used to evaluate risk or impact, it is
521 necessary to cross released or environmental concentration and ecotoxicity effect to determine
522 negative effects of organic micropollutants on aquatic environment. High potential impacts of
523 both persistent and emerging compounds imply that both source reduction and addition of
524 tertiary treatment might have significant impact on the reduction of micropollutants burden to
525 the aquatic environment.

526 3.3 Potential impacts of inorganic micropollutants

527 3.3.1 Human health

528 Over the 24 inorganic micropollutants with estimated concentrations, 15 (63 %) had Human
529 toxicity characterization factors. Missing ones were for Fe, B, Al, Mn, Rb, Li, Ti, Co and U.
530 Sn and Se had null characterization factors. The impact on Human health was estimated with
531 compounds representing only 17 % of the inorganic micropollutants mass; indeed, highly
532 concentrated compounds in effluents such as Fe and Al were not characterized.

533 Impacts ranged from 0 (Sn and Se) to 503 (As) DALY. As and Zn were the main contributors
534 to the total impact of 818 DALY (Figure 4) with respective contributions of 62 and 29 %;

535 those two compounds represented 63 % of the 15 characterized inorganic micropollutants
536 mass.

537 3.3.2 Aquatic environment

538 Over the 24 inorganic micropollutants with estimated concentrations, 19 (79 %) had
539 ecotoxicity characterizations factors. Missing ones were for B, Rb, Li, Ti and U. The impact
540 on aquatic environment was estimated with compounds representing 76 % of the inorganic
541 micropollutants mass.

542 Impacts ranged from 1,595,278 (Hg) to 1,973,471,331,644 (Al) PDF.m^3.d. Al, Fe and Cu
543 were the main contributors to the total impact of 2,858,392,569,287 PDF.m^3.d. (Figure 5)
544 with respective contributions of 69, 15 and 12 %; those three compounds represented 69 % of
545 the 19 characterized inorganic micropollutants mass.

546 It is difficult to conclude on the potential impacts of inorganic micropollutants on Human
547 health and aquatic environment. Indeed, they are naturally present in the environment making
548 difficult to assess the real effects due to the release by WWTP on aquatic organisms and
549 Humans. If USEtox® provides characterizations factors for metals, they are considered as
550 "interim" and should be interpreted with caution, as they present a high degree of uncertainty
551 (Fantke et al., 2017).

552 **4. Conclusions**

553 286 substances were selected for this study and the potential impacts on Human Health and
554 Aquatic environment were estimated only with 1/3 of the molecules (Figure 6).

555 Total potential impacts on Human health varied between 3 to 14 and 761 to 904 DALY for
556 respectively organic and inorganic micropollutants. Total potential impacts on aquatic
557 environment varied between 18 to 22 and 2 408 to 3 407 billions PDF.m^3.d for respectively
558 organic and inorganic micropollutants. For toxicity and ecotoxicity, the potential impacts

559 were calculated with little number of molecules over the ones that had been selected. This
560 highlighted the lack of concentration data and characterization factors. The actual knowledge
561 of the effects of micropollutants on Human health and aquatic environment is limited.

562 Our studies raised question about the solution to reduce organic micropollutants impacts on
563 Human health and aquatic environment. Reduction or ban on using is preferred in France;
564 here, we highlighted that ubiquitous micropollutants (PAH), forbidden (PCB) or natural ones
565 (hormone) are still found in effluents and contributed to the calculated impact meaning that
566 this solution is not appropriate for all the micropollutants. Tertiary treatments are another way
567 to reduce amount release to the environment but we need to know if they are sufficient to
568 reduce micropollutants with highest impacts and studies to prove that degradation products, if
569 any, are not more toxic than parent compounds. Furthermore, we can also question the cost
570 implied by the addition of tertiary treatments: we need to know if the available tertiary
571 treatment options are effective to remove micropollutants and if they are cost-effective
572 considering their cost and the decrease of impact. Our results raised questions about the
573 impacts of inorganic micropollutants; indeed, they are naturally present in water, most of the
574 concentrations in WWTP effluents are closed to river concentrations but estimated impacts
575 showed high risk due to these substances.

576 USETox® is only based on chronic toxicity data and does not consider endocrine disrupting
577 effect. Moreover, effects of nanomaterials, microplastics, resistance genes, etc. were not
578 considered by this method but can represent a huge impact on human health and aquatic
579 environment. However, this method could be used to compare different scenarii: addition of
580 tertiary treatment, reduction of emission at the source, etc. Here, as a first step of potential
581 impacts estimation, we focus on mean mass values at the scale of France. We know that there
582 is a spatial and temporal variation of micropollutants emission (Lindim et al., 2019); one
583 perspective is to use this kind of method at the scale of catchment basin, considering other

584 emissions coming from agriculture or industries. Furthermore, other emissions on WWTP
585 (air, sludge) can be studied with this method and compared to effluent emissions.

586 **Acknowledgments**

587 We would like to thank Synteau (French National Union of water treatment enterprises) for
588 their financial and scientific support.

589 References

590 Ahmed, M.B., Zhou, J.L., Ngo, H.H., Guo, W., Thomaidis, N.S., Xu, J., 2017. Progress in the
591 biological and chemical treatment technologies for emerging contaminant removal from
592 wastewater: A critical review. J. Hazard. Mater.
593 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.04.045

594 Alvarino, T., Suarez, S., Lema, J., Omil, F., 2018. Understanding the sorption and
595 biotransformation of organic micropollutants in innovative biological wastewater
596 treatment technologies. Sci. Total Environ.
597 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.09.278

598 Andreozzi, R., Marotta, R., Pinto, G., Pollio, A., 2002. Carbamazepine in water: persistence
599 in the environment, ozonation treatment and preliminary assessment on algal toxicity.
600 Water Res. 36, 2869–2877. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(01)00500-0

601 Bergé, A., Gasperi, J., Rocher, V., Coursimault, A., Moilleron, R., 2012. Phthalate and
602 alkylphenol removal within wastewater treatment plants using physicochemical lamellar
603 clarification and biofiltration. pp. 357–368. https://doi.org/10.2495/WP120311

604 Besha, A.T., Gebreyohannes, A.Y., Tufa, R.A., Bekele, D.N., Curcio, E., Giorno, L., 2017.
605 Removal of Emerging Micropollutants by Activated Sludge Process and Membrane
606 Bioreactors and the Effects of Micropollutants on Membrane Fouling: A Review. J.
607 Environ. Chem. Eng. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2017.04.027

608 Botta, F., Lavison, G., Couturier, G., Alliot, F., Moreau-Guigon, E., Fauchon, N., Guery, B.,
609 Chevreuil, M., Blanchoud, H., 2009. Transfer of glyphosate and its degradate AMPA to
610 surface waters through urban sewerage systems. Chemosphere 77, 133–139.
611 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2009.05.008

612 Bruchet, A., Martin, S., Coquery, M., 2015. Indicateurs chimiques d'efficacité de traitement
613 et d'influence des rejets de stations d'épuration sur le milieu récepteur. Tech. Sci.
614 Méthodes 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1051/tsm/201503015

615 Brus, A., Perrodin, Y., 2017. Identification, assessment and prioritization of ecotoxicological
616 risks on the scale of a territory: Application to WWTP discharges in a geographical area
617 located in northeast Lyon, France. Chemosphere 189, 340–348.
618 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2017.09.054

619 Carballa, M., Omil, F., Lema, J.M., Llompart, M.M., García-Jares, C., Rodríguez, I., Gómez,
620 M., Ternes, T., García-Jares, C., Rodríguez, I., Gómez, M., Ternes, T., 2004. Behavior of
621 pharmaceuticals, cosmetics and hormones in a sewage treatment plant. Water Res. 38,
622 2918–2926. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2004.03.029

623 Cargouët, M., Perdiz, D., Mouatassim-Souali, A., Tamisier-Karolak, S., Levi, Y., 2004.
624 Assessment of river contamination by estrogenic compounds in Paris area (France). Sci.
625 Total Environ. 324, 55–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2003.10.035

626 Cavalheiro, J., Zuloaga, O., Prieto, A., Preudhomme, H., Amouroux, D., Monperrus, M.,
627 2017. Occurrence and Fate of Organic and Organometallic Pollutants in Municipal
628 Wastewater Treatment Plants and Their Impact on Receiving Waters (Adour Estuary,
629 France). Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 73, 619–630. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-
630 017-0422-9

631 Chiffre, A., Degiorgi, F., Buleté, A., Spinner, L., Badot, P.-M., 2016. Occurrence of
632 pharmaceuticals in WWTP effluents and their impact in a karstic rural catchment of
633 Eastern France. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 23, 25427–25441.
634 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-7751-5

635 Choubert, J.-M., Martin-Ruel, S., Budzinski, H., Miège, C., Esperanza, M., Soulier, C.,
636 Lagarrigue, C., Coquery, M., 2011. Évaluer les rendements des stations d'épuration.
637 Tech. Sci. Méthodes 44–62. https://doi.org/10.1051/tsm/201101044

638 Cizmas, L., Sharma, V.K., Gray, C.M., McDonald, T.J., 2015. Pharmaceuticals and personal
639 care products in waters: occurrence, toxicity, and risk. Environ. Chem. Lett. 13, 381–
640 394. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10311-015-0524-4

641 Cladière, M., 2012. Sources, transfert et devenir des alkylphénols et du bisphénol A dans le
642 bassin amont de la Seine : cas de la région Île-de-France. Université Paris-Est.

643 Clara, M., Strenn, B., Gans, O., Martinez, E., Kreuzinger, N., Kroiss, H., 2005. Removal of
644 selected pharmaceuticals, fragrances and endocrine disrupting compounds in a
645 membrane bioreactor and conventional wastewater treatment plants. Water Res. 39,
646 4797–4807. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2005.09.015

647 Coetsier, C., 2009. Approche intégrée de la gestion environnementale des produits
648 pharmaceutiques dans des rejets de stations d'épuration urbaines et leur milieu
649 récepteur : occurrence, impact et traitements tertiaires d'élimination. Université de
650 Montpellier II.

651 Dagnac, T., Bristeau, S., Coton, C., Leroy, C., Fleury, N., Jeannot, R., 2005. Analyse de
652 polluants organiques et organométalliques dans l'environnement.

653 de Jesus Gaffney, V., Almeida, C.M.M., Rodrigues, A., Ferreira, E., Benoliel, M.J., Cardoso,
654 V.V., 2015. Occurrence of pharmaceuticals in a water supply system and related human
655 health risk assessment. Water Res. 72, 199–208.
656 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2014.10.027

657 Deycard, V.N., Schäfer, J., Petit, J.C.J., Coynel, A., Lanceleur, L., Dutruch, L., Bossy, C.,
658 Ventura, A., Blanc, G., 2017. Inputs, dynamics and potential impacts of silver (Ag) from
659 urban wastewater to a highly turbid estuary (SW France). Chemosphere 167, 501–511.
660 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2016.09.154

661 Dinh, Q.T., Moreau-Guigon, E., Labadie, P., Alliot, F., Teil, M.-J., Blanchard, M., Chevreuil,
662 M., 2017a. Occurrence of antibiotics in rural catchments. Chemosphere 168, 483–490.
663 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2016.10.106

664 Dinh, Q.T., Moreau-Guigon, E., Labadie, P., Alliot, F., Teil, M.-J., Blanchard, M., Eurin, J.,
665 Chevreuil, M., 2017b. Fate of antibiotics from hospital and domestic sources in a sewage
666 network. Sci. Total Environ. 575, 758–766.
667 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2016.09.118

668 Directive 2008/105/CE, n.d. Directive 2008/105/CE du 16/12/08 établissant des normes de
669 qualité environnementales dans le domaine de l'eau, modifiant et abrogeant les directives
670 du Conseil 82/176/CEE, 83/513/CEE, 84/156/CEE, 84/491/CEE, 86/280CEE et
671 modifiant la directive 2000/60/CE.

672 Elisabete Silva, Nissanka Rajapakse, and, Kortenkamp*, A., 2002. Something from
673 "Nothing" – Eight Weak Estrogenic Chemicals Combined at Concentrations below
674 NOECs Produce Significant Mixture Effects. https://doi.org/10.1021/ES0101227

675 Enault, J., Robert, S., Schlosser, O., de Thé, C., 2015. Drinking water, diet, indoor air:
676 Comparison of the contribution to environmental micropollutants exposure. Int. J. Hyg.
677 Environ. Health 218, 723–730. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2015.06.001

678 Fantke, P., Bijster, M., Guignard, C., Hauschild, M.Z., Huijbregts, M.A.J., Jolliet, O.,
679 Kounina, A., Magaud, V., Margni, M., McKone, T.E., Posthuma, L., Rosenbaum, R.K.,
680 van de Meent, D., van Zelm, R., 2017. USEtox 2.0 Documentation (Version 1).
681 https://doi.org/10.11581/DTU:00000011

682 Ferrari, B., Mons, R., Vollat, B., Fraysse, B., Paxéus, N., Lo Giudice, R., Pollio, A., Garric, J.,
683 2004. ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF SIX HUMAN
684 PHARMACEUTICALS: ARE THE CURRENT ENVIRONMENTAL RISK
685 ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES SUFFICIENT FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE
686 AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT? Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 23, 1344.
687 https://doi.org/10.1897/03-246

688 Gabet-Giraud, V., Miège, C., Choubert, J.M., Ruel, S.M., Coquery, M., 2010. Occurrence and
689 removal of estrogens and beta blockers by various processes in wastewater treatment
690 plants. Sci. Total Environ. 408, 4257–4269.
691 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2010.05.023

692 Gabet-Giraud, V., Miège, C., Jacquet, R., Coquery, M., 2014. Impact of wastewater treatment
693 plants on receiving surface waters and a tentative risk evaluation: the case of estrogens
694 and beta blockers. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 21, 1708–1722.
695 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-013-2037-7

696 Gilbert-Pawlik, S., 2011. Devenir des polybromodiphényléthers et des alkylphénols dans les
697 filières de traitement des eaux usées. Université Paris-Est.

698 Grandclément, C., Seyssiecq, I., Piram, A., Wong-Wah-Chung, P., Vanot, G., Tiliacos, N.,
699 Roche, N., Doumenq, P., 2017. From the conventional biological wastewater treatment
700 to hybrid processes, the evaluation of organic micropollutant removal: A review. Water
701 Res. 111, 297–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2017.01.005

702 Grandcoin, A., Piel, S., Baurès, E., 2017. AminoMethylPhosphonic acid (AMPA) in natural
703 waters: Its sources, behavior and environmental fate. Water Res. 117, 187–197.
704 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2017.03.055

705 Gunnarsson, L., Snape, J.R., Verbruggen, B., Owen, S.F., Kristiansson, E., Margiotta-
706 Casaluci, L., Österlund, T., Hutchinson, K., Leverett, D., Marks, B., Tyler, C.R., 2019.
707 Pharmacology beyond the patient – The environmental risks of human drugs. Environ.
708 Int. 129, 320–332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.04.075

709 Gwenzi, W., Mangori, L., Danha, C., Chaukura, N., Dunjana, N., Sanganyado, E., 2018.
710 Sources, behaviour, and environmental and human health risks of high-technology rare
711 earth elements as emerging contaminants. Sci. Total Environ.
712 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.235

713 Hauschild, M.Z., Huijbregts, M., Jolliet, O., Macleod, M., Margni, M., van de Meent, D.,
714 Rosenbaum, R.K., McKone, T.E., 2008. Building a Model Based on Scientific
715 Consensus for Life Cycle Impact Assessment of Chemicals: The Search for Harmony
716 and Parsimony. Environ. Sci. Technol. 42, 7032–7037.
717 https://doi.org/10.1021/es703145t

718 Henderson, A.D., Hauschild, M.Z., van de Meent, D., Huijbregts, M.A.J., Larsen, H.F.,
719 Margni, M., McKone, T.E., Payet, J., Rosenbaum, R.K., Jolliet, O., 2011. USEtox fate
720 and ecotoxicity factors for comparative assessment of toxic emissions in life cycle
721 analysis: sensitivity to key chemical properties. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 16, 701–709.
722 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-011-0294-6

723 Hollender, J., Rothardt, J., Radny, D., Loos, M., Epting, J., Huggenberger, P., Borer, P.,
724 Singer, H., 2018. Comprehensive micropollutant screening using LC-HRMS/MS at three
725 riverbank filtration sites to assess natural attenuation and potential implications for
726 human health. Water Res. X 1, 100007. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WROA.2018.100007

727 INERIS, 2016. Les substances dangereuses pour le milieu aquatique dans les rejets des
728 stations de traitement des eaux usées urbaines - Action nationale de recherche et de
729 réduction des rejets de substances dangereuses dans l'eau par les stations de traitement
730 des eaux.

731 Janex-Habibi, M.-L., Huyard, A., Esperanza, M., Bruchet, A., 2009. Reduction of endocrine
732 disruptor emissions in the environment: The benefit of wastewater treatment. Water Res.
733 43, 1565–1576. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2008.12.051

734 Jobling, S., Williams, R., Johnson, A., Taylor, A., Gross-Sorokin, M., Nolan, M., Tyler, C.R.,
735 Van Aerle, R., Santos, E., Brighty, G., 2006. Predicted exposures to steroid estrogens in
736 U.K. Rivers correlate with widespread sexual disruption in wild fish populations.
737 Environ. Health Perspect. 114, 32–39. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.8050

738 Johnson, A.C., Aerni, H.-R., Gerritsen, A., Gibert, M., Giger, W., Hylland, K., Jürgens, M.,
739 Nakari, T., Pickering, A., Suter, M.J.-F., Svenson, A., Wettstein, F.E., 2005. Comparing
740 steroid estrogen, and nonylphenol content across a range of European sewage plants with
741 different treatment and management practices. Water Res. 39, 47–58.
742 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2004.07.025

743 Johnson, A.C., Jürgens, M.D., Edwards, F.K., Scarlett, P.M., Vincent, H.M., Ohe, P., 2019.
744 What Works? The Influence Of Changing Wastewater Treatment Type, Including
745 Tertiary Granular Activated Charcoal On Downstream Macroinvertebrate Biodiversity
746 Over Time. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 38, 1820–1832. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4460

747 Labadie, P., Budzinski, H., 2005. Determination of Steroidal Hormone Profiles along the Jalle
748 d'Eysines River (near Bordeaux, France). https://doi.org/10.1021/ES048443G

749 Leclercq, M., Mathieu, O., Gomez, E., Casellas, C., Fenet, H., Hillaire-Buys, D., 2009.
750 Presence and Fate of Carbamazepine, Oxcarbazepine, and Seven of Their Metabolites at
751 Wastewater Treatment Plants. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 56, 408–415.
752 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-008-9202-x

753 Li, Z., Gomez, E., Fenet, H., Chiron, S., 2013. Chiral signature of venlafaxine as a marker of
754 biological attenuation processes. Chemosphere 90, 1933–1938.
755 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2012.10.033

756 Lindim, C., de Zwart, D., Cousins, I.T., Kutsarova, S., Kühne, R., Schüürmann, G., 2019.
757 Exposure and ecotoxicological risk assessment of mixtures of top prescribed

758 pharmaceuticals in Swedish freshwaters. Chemosphere 220, 344–352.
759 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.12.118

760 Mailler, R., 2015. Devenir des micropolluants prioritaires et émergents dans les filières
761 conventionnelles de traitement des eaux résiduaires urbaines des grosses collectivité
762 (files eau et boues), et au cours du traitement tertiaire au charbon actif. Université Paris-
763 Est.

764 Mailler, R., Gasperi, J., Coquet, Y., Buleté, A., Vulliet, E., Deshayes, S., Zedek, S., Mirande-
765 Bret, C., Eudes, V., Bressy, A., Caupos, E., Moilleron, R., Chebbo, G., Rocher, V., 2016.
766 Removal of a wide range of emerging pollutants from wastewater treatment plant
767 discharges by micro-grain activated carbon in fluidized bed as tertiary treatment at large
768 pilot scale. Sci. Total Environ. 542, 983–996.
769 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2015.10.153

770 Mailler, R., Gasperi, J., Coquet, Y., Deshayes, S., Zedek, S., Cren-Olivé, C., Cartiser, N.,
771 Eudes, V., Bressy, A., Caupos, E., Moilleron, R., Chebbo, G., Rocher, V., 2015. Study of
772 a large scale powdered activated carbon pilot: Removals of a wide range of emerging
773 and priority micropollutants from wastewater treatment plant effluents. Water Res. 72,
774 315–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2014.10.047

775 Martin Ruel, S., Choubert, J.-M.M.J.-M., Budzinski, H., Miège, C., Esperanza, M., Coquery,
776 M., Mi??ge, C., Esperanza, M., Coquery, M., 2012. Occurrence and fate of relevant
777 substances in wastewater treatment plants regarding Water Framework Directive and
778 future legislations. Water Sci. Technol. 65, 1179–1189.
779 https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2012.943

780 Matthiessen, P., Wheeler, J.R., Weltje, L., 2018. A review of the evidence for endocrine
781 disrupting effects of current-use chemicals on wildlife populations. Crit. Rev. Toxicol.
782 48, 195–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408444.2017.1397099

783 Michael, I., Rizzo, L., McArdell, C.S., Manaia, C.M., Merlin, C., Schwartz, T., Dagot, C.,
784 Fatta-Kassinos, D., 2013. Urban wastewater treatment plants as hotspots for the release
785 of antibiotics in the environment: A review. Water Res. 47, 957–995.
786 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2012.11.027

787 Miège, C., Choubert, J.M., Ribeiro, L., Eusèbe, M., Coquery, M., 2009a. Fate of
788 pharmaceuticals and personal care products in wastewater treatment plants – Conception
789 of a database and first results. Environ. Pollut. 157, 1721–1726.
790 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVPOL.2008.11.045

791 Miège, C., Gabet, V., Coquery, M., Karolak, S., Jugan, M.-L., Oziol, L., Levi, Y., Chevreuil,
792 M., 2009b. Evaluation of estrogenic disrupting potency in aquatic environments and
793 urban wastewaters by combining chemical and biological analysis. TrAC Trends Anal.
794 Chem. 28, 186–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TRAC.2008.11.007

795 Muller, M., Rabenoelina, F., Balaguer, P., Patureau, D., Lemenach, K., Budzinski, H.,
796 Barceló, D., de Alda, M.L., Kuster, M., Delgenès, J.-P., Hernandez-Raquet, G., 2008.
797 CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF ENDOCRINE-DISRUPTING
798 HORMONES AND ESTROGENIC ACTIVITY IN AN ADVANCED SEWAGE
799 TREATMENT PLANT. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 27, 1649. https://doi.org/10.1897/07-
800 519.1

801 Muñoz, I., José Gómez, M., Molina-Díaz, A., Huijbregts, M.A.J., Fernández-Alba, A.R.,
802 García-Calvo, E., 2008. Ranking potential impacts of priority and emerging pollutants in
803 urban wastewater through life cycle impact assessment. Chemosphere 74, 37–44.

https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2008.09.029

Neale, P.A., Ait-Aissa, S., Brack, W., Creusot, N., Denison, M.S., Deutschmann, B., Hilscherová, K., Hollert, H., Krauss, M., Novák, J., Schulze, T., Seiler, T.-B., Serra, H., Shao, Y., Escher, B.I., 2015. Linking in Vitro Effects and Detected Organic Micropollutants in Surface Water Using Mixture-Toxicity Modeling. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 14614–14624. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b04083

Oberlé, K., Capdeville, M.-J., Berthe, T., Budzinski, H., Petit, F., 2012. Evidence for a Complex Relationship between Antibiotics and Antibiotic-Resistant *Escherichia Coli* : From Medical Center Patients to a Receiving Environment. Environ. Sci. Technol. 46, 1859–1868. https://doi.org/10.1021/es203399h

Ojemaye, C.Y., Petrik, L., 2019. Occurrences, levels and risk assessment studies of emerging pollutants (pharmaceuticals, perfluoroalkyl and endocrine disrupting compounds) in fish samples from Kalk Bay harbour, South Africa. Environ. Pollut. 252, 562–572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.091

Oldenkamp, R., Hoeks, S., Čengić, M., Barbarossa, V., Burns, E.E., Boxall, A.B.A., Ragas, A.M.J., 2018. A High-Resolution Spatial Model to Predict Exposure to Pharmaceuticals in European Surface Waters: EPiE. Environ. Sci. Technol. 52, 12494–12503. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b03862

Ortiz de García, S., García-Encina, P.A., Irusta-Mata, R., 2017. The potential ecotoxicological impact of pharmaceutical and personal care products on humans and freshwater, based on USEtox^{TM} characterization factors. A Spanish case study of toxicity impact scores. Sci. Total Environ. 609, 429–445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.07.148

Pasquini, L., 2013. Micropolluants issus de l'activité domestique dans les eaux urbaines et leur devenir en station d'épuration. Université de Lorraine.

Pomiès, M., 2013. Etude et modélisation dynamique de l'élimination de micropolluants prioritaires et émergents au sein du procédé à boues activées. Université de Montpellier I.

Portail d'informations sur l'assainissement communal - Accueil [WWW Document], n.d. URL http://assainissement.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/ (accessed 5.4.20).

Rabiet, M., Togola, A., Brissaud, F., Seidel, J.-L., Budzinski, H., Elbaz-Poulichet, F., 2006. Consequences of Treated Water Recycling as Regards Pharmaceuticals and Drugs in Surface and Ground Waters of a Medium-sized Mediterranean Catchment. https://doi.org/10.1021/ES060528P

Rajapakse, N., Ong, D., Kortenkamp, A., 2001. Defining the Impact of Weakly Estrogenic Chemicals on the Action of Steroidal Estrogens. Toxicol. Sci. 60, 296–304. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/60.2.296

Richmond, E.K., Rosi, E.J., Walters, D.M., Fick, J., Hamilton, S.K., Brodin, T., Sundelin, A., Grace, M.R., 2018. A diverse suite of pharmaceuticals contaminates stream and riparian food webs. Nat. Commun. 9, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06822-w

Rosenbaum, R.K., Bachmann, T.M., Gold, L.S., Huijbregts, M.A.J., Jolliet, O., Juraske, R., Koehler, A., Larsen, H.F., MacLeod, M., Margni, M., McKone, T.E., Payet, J., Schuhmacher, M., van de Meent, D., Hauschild, M.Z., 2008. USEtox—the UNEP-SETAC toxicity model: recommended characterisation factors for human toxicity and freshwater ecotoxicity in life cycle impact assessment. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 13, 532–546. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-008-0038-4

Rosenbaum, R.K., Huijbregts, M.A.J., Henderson, A.D., Margni, M., McKone, T.E., van de Meent, D., Hauschild, M.Z., Shaked, S., Li, D.S., Gold, L.S., Jolliet, O., 2011. USEtox human exposure and toxicity factors for comparative assessment of toxic emissions in life cycle analysis: sensitivity to key chemical properties. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 16, 710–727. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-011-0316-4

Sablayrolles, C., Breton, A., Vialle, C., Vignoles, C., Montréjaud-Vignoles, M., 2011. Priority organic pollutants in the urban water cycle (Toulouse, France). Water Sci. Technol. 64, 541–556. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2011.580

Salpeteur, I., Angel, J.-M., 2010. Geochemical baseline data for trace elements in surface water and active sediment from French rivers collected by the FOREGS Geochemical Atlas of Europe (I). Environnement, Risques & Santé 9, 121–135. https://doi.org/10.1684/ERS.2010.0332

Simazaki, D., Kubota, R., Suzuki, T., Akiba, M., Nishimura, T., Kunikane, S., 2015. Occurrence of selected pharmaceuticals at drinking water purification plants in Japan and implications for human health. Water Res. 76, 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WATRES.2015.02.059

Škrbić, B.D., Kadokami, K., Antić, I., 2018. Survey on the micro-pollutants presence in surface water system of northern Serbia and environmental and health risk assessment. Environ. Res. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.05.034

Tamtam, F., Mercier, F., Le Bot, B., Eurin, J., Tuc Dinh, Q., Clément, M., Chevreuil, M., 2008. Occurrence and fate of antibiotics in the Seine River in various hydrological conditions. Sci. Total Environ. 393, 84–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2007.12.009

Thiebault, T., Boussafir, M., Le Milbeau, C., 2017. Occurrence and removal efficiency of pharmaceuticals in an urban wastewater treatment plant: Mass balance, fate and consumption assessment. J. Environ. Chem. Eng. 5, 2894–2902. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JECE.2017.05.039

Thrupp, T.J., Runnalls, T.J., Scholze, M., Kugathas, S., Kortenkamp, A., Sumpter, J.P., 2018. The consequences of exposure to mixtures of chemicals: Something from 'nothing' and 'a lot from a little' when fish are exposed to steroid hormones. Sci. Total Environ. 619–620, 1482–1492. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.11.081

Togola, A., Budzinski, H., 2007. Analytical development for analysis of pharmaceuticals in water samples by SPE and GC–MS. Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 388, 627–635. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-007-1251-x

Tran, B.C., Teil, M.J., Blanchard, M., Alliot, F., Chevreuil, M., 2015. BPA and phthalate fate in a sewage network and an elementary river of France. Influence of hydroclimatic conditions. Chemosphere 119, 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2014.04.036

Verlicchi, P., Al Aukidy, M., Zambello, E., 2012. Occurrence of pharmaceutical compounds in urban wastewater: Removal, mass load and environmental risk after a secondary treatment—A review. Sci. Total Environ. 429, 123–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2012.04.028

Vilela, C.L.S., Bassin, J.P., Peixoto, R.S., 2018. Water contamination by endocrine disruptors: Impacts, microbiological aspects and trends for environmental protection. Environ. Pollut. 235, 546–559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.12.098

Wiest, L., Chonova, T., Bergé, A., Baudot, R., Bessueille-Barbier, F., Ayouni-Derouiche, L., Vulliet, E., 2018. Two-year survey of specific hospital wastewater treatment and its impact on pharmaceutical discharges. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 25, 9207–9218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-9662-5

Wormuth, M., Scheringer, M., Vollenweider, M., Hungerbuhler, K., 2006. What Are the Sources of Exposure to Eight Frequently Used Phthalic Acid Esters in Europeans? Risk Anal. 26, 803–824. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2006.00770.x

Yang, Y., Ok, Y.S., Kim, K.-H., Kwon, E.E., Tsang, Y.F., 2017. Occurrences and removal of pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs) in drinking water and water/sewage treatment plants: A review. Sci. Total Environ. 596–597, 303–320. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.04.102

Ying, G.-G., Williams, B., Kookana, R., 2002. Environmental fate of alkylphenols and alkylphenol ethoxylates—a review. Environ. Int. 28, 215–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-4120(02)00017-X



Figure 1. Concentration (left axis) and corresponding emitted mass in the environment calculated by multiplying the concentration with the one-year volume (right axis) of inorganic micropollutants in WWTP



Figure 2. Distribution of the potential impacts on A) Human health of the 94/153 organic micropollutants with toxicity characterization factors and B) aquatic environment of the 88/153 organic micropollutants with ecotoxicity characterization factors; maximum (max), 95th percentile (p95), 90th percentile (p90), 3rd quartile, median (med), 1st quartile, 10th percentile (p10), 5th percentile (p5) and minimum are represented; DALY min and p5 are not represented because they are null and the data are represented in log scale



Figure 3. Comparison of masses and potential impacts for common pharmaceuticals of our study and Ortiz et al., 2019 study for A) Human health and B) aquatic environment



Figure 4. Potential impacts on Human health of the 15/24 inorganic micropollutants



Figure 5. Potential impacts on aquatic environment of the 19/24 inorganic micropollutants



Figure 6. Synthesis of the study in number of molecules

Table I. Distribution of average concentrations and masses for the 153 organic micropollutants with measured concentrations in WWTP effluents

	Max	95th centile	90th centile	75th centile	50th centile	25th centile	10th centile	5th centile	Min
Concentration ($\mu g.L^{-1}$)	5,2	0,8	0,3	0,1	0,05	0,01	0,002	0,001	0,0001
Annual mass (tons)	26,1	3,9	1,5	0,6	0,27	0,04	0,010	0,006	0,0005

Graphical abstract