



An ecosystem service impact assessment framework applicable to any chemical pollutant

Sarah L. Roberts¹, Felicity Hayes², Thea Sletten³, Ece Ozdemiroglu³, Rob Tinch³, and David J. Spurgeon^{1,*}

¹UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, United Kingdom

²UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Bangor, United Kingdom

³eftec (Economics for the Environment Consultancy), London, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: David J. Spurgeon. Email: dasp@ceh.ac.uk

Abstract

This article outlines a generic and broadly applicable proof-of-concept framework linking ecosystem services to relative Environmental Risks and Impacts of Chemicals (ENRICH) to quantify the impacts of chemical pollution at a national level (United Kingdom). The ENRICH framework utilizes sources of chemical exposure and ecotoxicological data to establish the overall community and taxonomic group-level impacts of chemical pollution and the resulting effects on ecosystem processes and services. A proof-of-concept analysis is carried out for three case study chemicals that differ in their mode of action, usage, and data availability: Fipronil, copper, and perfluorohexanoic acid. The results indicate that each case study chemical has different predicted impacts on different taxa: Fipronil strongly affects arthropod groups, copper affects a wider range of taxa, and perfluorohexanoic acid mainly affects vertebrate species. These predicted taxa impacts are linked through logic chains to different ecosystem service provision consequences. The three case studies demonstrate the generalizability and value of the hazard, exposure, community, and ecosystem service impact assessment steps of the framework and highlight the remaining uncertainties and data gaps in its use. The ENRICH framework illustrates that, despite challenges, a chemical-agnostic approach to impact characterization supports prioritization of chemicals and the evaluation of ecosystem services benefits arising from chemical pollution management policies.

Keywords: exposure, hazard, prioritization, environmental impact, chemical management policy

Introduction

International conventions on biodiversity and ecosystem services, which are the benefits that humans derive from natural ecosystems, identify pollution as a major environmental threat, alongside climate change, habitat loss, unsustainable exploitation, and invasive species and diseases. Chemical pollution is currently recognized to exceed the planetary boundary safe operating space (Persson et al., 2022), reflecting that there is a vast number of substances that require evaluation, many of which remain poorly studied. Even when the potential for substances to cause adverse effects is well recognized, current or past uses may still lead to harmful effects on people and ecosystems (Slabe et al., 2022).

Understanding and valuing the environmental impact of chemicals and associated societal consequences is a priority for chemical regulation (European Chemicals Agency, 2023). Policy makers are faced with difficult decisions when determining which chemicals to monitor, evaluate, and regulate. A major challenge is to balance the benefits of chemical use against the health and environmental costs of the associated pollution. Challenges such as chemical diversity, data gaps, and the

absence of models linking ecotoxicological data to ecosystem service impacts have to date limited the development of pollution impact valuation frameworks (Faber et al., 2019). As a result, decisions on chemical management often have to rely on risk assessments that have high uncertainty and often poorly link substance effects to the intended ecological protection goals (Fairbrother & Bennett, 1999).

In seeking to develop a foundation for economic valuation of chemical pollution, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD; 2022) identified some major challenges for impact assessment framework development. These issues included data availability, incorporating species variation, linking taxa impacts to ecosystem changes, and undertaking economic valuations amid uncertainty. Past efforts to link chemical pollution to ecological impact have to date focused on quantitative relationships between “toxic pressure” and ecosystem services (Wang et al., 2021), pathways analyses (Hayes et al., 2018; Maltby et al., 2021), and mechanistic modeling (Forbes et al., 2017). However, despite progress, no broadly applicable comparative framework exists to support chemical prioritization and chemicals management. Here we propose a conceptual framework linking ecosystem services to relative

Received: September 5, 2025. **Revised:** March 4, 2026. **Accepted:** March 4, 2026

© The Author(s) 2026. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Environmental Risks and Impacts of Chemicals (ENRICH), which can be applied to any chemical and enables screening-level and standardized comparative analyses of ecological impacts to support pollution management policies.

The ENRICH framework integrates hazard, exposure, community impacts, ecological logic chains, and ecosystem services to characterize and link chemical pollution to ecosystem endpoint changes (Figure 1). The ENRICH framework assesses species impacts (proportion of taxonomic groups affected by chemical exposure) using hazard and exposure data, following the central tenet of chemical risk assessment. Unlike traditional risk assessment approaches, our method does not produce binary, absolute risk estimates—acceptable or unacceptable risks. Instead, it ranks chemical hazard and exposure relative to other chemicals, and each substance is assigned an eco-potency and an exposure group between 1 and 7. Substances within the 5th eco-potency percentile (representing the lowest hazard relative to all chemicals assessed) are assigned to Group 1, while those in the 95th percentile (representing the highest hazard) are assigned to Group 7. Exposure groups are assigned in a similar manner, where magnitude and occurrence of exposure to a chemical determines whether it is assigned to a high exposure group (Group 7, 95th percentile) or low one (Group 1, 5th percentile; see Figure 1 for the full group assignments). The eco-potency and exposure groupings assign a value to the proportion of species in a community likely to be affected at the prevailing level of exposure for a chemical of a given eco-potency. This extent of overall impact is then apportioned across different taxa based on the available species toxicity data. Ecosystem service logic chains connect these taxa effects to ecosystem service impacts,

which can be monetized. The current ENRICH framework is designed to assess impacts at a larger geographical scale—primarily at a national level—rather than a local one (e.g., point sources), such as the accidental release or unauthorized or inappropriate use of chemicals. This is due to scope restrictions of the project and does not prevent future adaptation to local pollution.

We apply the ecosystem service impact assessment framework at a U.K. national scale to three case study chemicals: Fipronil, copper (Cu), and perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA). We use these cases to illustrate how analysis conducted within the ENRICH framework can identify plausible pollution impacts on taxa and link these to plausible consequences on ecosystem processes and services. We also summarize the strengths, weaknesses, data limitations, and simplifying assumptions at each step of the ENRICH framework, as well as key research and knowledge gaps requiring refinement and development to support growing use (e.g., by regulators and policy makers).

Materials and methods

Step 1: Hazard ranking

Hazard ranking compares the eco-potency of the chemical of interest against a distribution of similar values for many other chemicals. The overall chemical eco-potency ranking was created with HC_{50} values (hazardous concentration for 50% of species) from 12,386 species sensitivity distributions (SSDs; Posthuma, van Gils, et al., 2019). These HC_{50} values are ranked from lowest (most eco-potent) to highest (least eco-potent). Eco-potency




Figure 1 Structure of the conceptual ecosystem service impact assessment framework. Step 1 quantifies the ecological hazard (eco-potency) of the chemical of concern relative to that of other chemicals. Step 2 assesses the frequency and severity of environmental exposure relative to other substances. Step 3 combines this relative eco-potency and exposure information to estimate overall community- and taxa-specific impacts. Step 4 links taxa effects to ecosystem services using logic chains. Step 5 (not included here) would seek to estimate monetary values for the changes identified in Step 4 using existing evidence on ecosystem service values. EC_{50} = half maximal effective concentration; HC_{50} = hazardous concentration for 50% of species; MoA = mode of action; SSD = species sensitivity distribution.

ranking percentile is determined by placing the most robust HC₅₀ available for the chemical of interest within this distribution. The SSD HC₅₀ values are used for this eco-potency assessment, as within an SSD, the HC₅₀ has the lowest uncertainty and is more robust than values in the tail of the SSD model, such as the HC₅. The SSDs from which we took the HC₅₀ to compare against the overall distribution were collected from several sources, with regulatory reviews considered the best and most reliable source, followed by SSD models from the research literature and then bespoke values generated from reported ecotoxicity data. The percentile eco-potency rank generated by comparing the substance-specific HC₅₀ against the overall distribution is used to assign the chemical to one of seven eco-potency groups, with Group 7 (percentile rank, 0 to ≤ 0.05) being that for the most potent substances and Group 1 (percentile rank, >0.95 to 1) the least potent (Figure 1).

To accommodate data-poor substances, the ecosystem service impact assessment framework allows alternative approaches when SSD generation is not possible, but some toxicity data exist. In such cases, the geometric mean of reported species half maximal effective concentration (EC₅₀) values for the chemical of interest can substitute an HC₅₀ value to assign a eco-potency rank. For chemicals lacking ecotoxicological data, predictive tools such as mode of action (MoA) or quantitative structure–activity relationship (QSAR) models could be used to provide an estimate of eco-potency. For instance, the commonly applied Verhaar classification scheme (Verhaar et al., 1992) could be used and mapped to the eco-potency categories in the ENRICH framework—for example, nonpolar narcotics = Category 7, polar narcotics = Category 6, reactive chemicals = Category 5, specifically acting chemicals = Categories 4 to 1, unknown MoA = Categories 4 to 1 depending on where MoA-specific structural alerts are also present. However, using such simple in silico tools introduces greater uncertainty due to the complexity of predicting MoAs across species. So having at least some measured hazard data or using multiple QSAR approaches is generally desirable to gain a better understanding of ecotoxicity eco-potency for ranking use.

The SSD and HC₅₀ catalog of Posthuma, van Gils, et al. (2019) was developed with apical toxicity data, such as effects on mortality, growth, reproduction, and population size. However, chemicals can also cause hazards through mechanisms not detected by these bioassays, including endocrine disruption, genotoxicity, and bioaccumulation leading to long-term effects (Baas et al., 2010). These hazards can be predicted by QSAR models to provide “structural alerts” (Pradeep et al., 2021) through mechanistic toxicology studies and in vitro assays or through MoA assignments (Kramer et al., 2024). Nonapical mechanisms of effect raise the hazard potential of chemicals. To integrate such hazards into the ecosystem service impact assessment framework, chemicals identified as endocrine disruptors or genotoxic are moved to a higher eco-potency group than indicated by their apical toxicity data alone (Figure 1). Highly bioaccumulative chemicals are also moved up one eco-potency rank due to their greater potential to cause hazard through their potential to cause long-term effects. Note that we chose to recognize the higher risk potential of bioaccumulative chemicals by raising their hazard rankings, rather than exposure rankings, due to their potential to have greater effects through long-term

bioaccumulation leading to higher internal exposure and trophic transfer. For genotoxic chemicals, eco-potency is raised one category for all species. For chemicals with endocrine effects or high bioaccumulation (e.g., bioconcentration factor $>2,000$), eco-potency for vertebrates is increased by one category but not for invertebrates, plants, or microbes due to uncertainties in the endocrine effects for these groups and their generally low trophic positions. Chemicals with genotoxicity and endocrine effects or bioaccumulation thus have their eco-potency increased by two levels for vertebrates and one for invertebrates.

Step 2: Exposure ranking

Exposure ranking follows a similar approach as for eco-potency, where chemicals are ranked relative to others via a frequency distribution (Figure 1). Developing an environmental concentration ranking requires large-scale monitoring datasets. National water quality programs provide inland surface water pollution measurements for England (Environment Agency Water Quality Archives dataset [EA WIMS]) and the United Kingdom (U.K. Water Industry Research Chemical Investigation Program [UKWIR CIP]). European-level data portals (e.g., Water Information System for Europe, NORMAN EXPODAT database) and datasets for marine waters (European Marine Observation Data Network chemistry portal) are also available. For any national-scale analysis, the use of country-relevant data is preferred where feasible, given how unique chemical use and hydrological/environmental conditions can shape chemical concentrations in different locations.

The EA WIMS database includes chemicals such as metals, polyaromatic hydrocarbons, pesticides, persistent organic pollutants, pharmaceuticals, industrial chemicals, solvents, per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), phthalates, and plastic polymers. Major cations and nutrients are excluded due to their high ecotoxicological thresholds, nontoxic effects (e.g., eutrophication), and role in modifying bioavailability rather than in causing direct toxicity. By using EA WIMS data—a holding that contains ~954,870 measurements between 2017 and 2022 for ~440 chemicals across ~8,500 sampling sites—chemicals can be ranked by measured concentration (according to 95th percentile values) and detection frequency. We used the 95th percentile exposure concentrations over median concentrations for ranking because the number of nondetects for many chemicals in the dataset limited the reliable calculation of many medians. For emerging chemicals or those with growing use, current monitoring data may not reflect future exposure. In such cases, multimedia fate models could be used as an alternative source of exposure information.

The 95th percentile measurement concentration and detection frequency for the chemical of interest are placed into the relevant frequency distributions for all chemicals derived from the monitoring data (in this case, the full EA WIMS dataset). The two percentile ranks are then averaged (Figure 1). This composite percentile ranking is then used to assign the chemical to one of seven exposure groups, with Group 7 (percentile rank, 0 to ≤ 0.05) for the highest-exposure substances and Group 1 (percentile rank, >0.95 to 1) the least. A total of seven percentile groups have been chosen to provide enough granularity and make the ecosystem service impact assessment framework tractable to implement. Chemicals with high persistence and

mobility pose particular concern, as they can remain in the environment and be widely transported after release. Therefore, chemicals with high persistence (e.g., half-life >60 days in water, >180 days in sediment, >120 days in soils) and high mobility (e.g., $\log K_{oc} < 3$) are considered of additional exposure concern (European Commission, 2022). Chemicals identified as persistent and mobile are therefore raised one exposure class within the assessment (Figure 1).

Step 3: Community and taxa impact assessment

The eco-potency and exposure categories designated in Steps 1 and 2 are used to assign a level of expected community effect for the chemical. The impact values in this matrix are defined from evidence on the maximum effect of a chemical on communities at a national scale, with a logarithmic decrease for lower eco-potency and lower exposure (see [online supplementary material Table S7](#)). The maximum community effect of 20% at the national level is based on multiple lines of evidence: (a) A large-scale European study reported that, on average, 20% of aquatic species are at risk due to chemical pollution (Posthuma, Altenburger, et al., 2019); (b) Lemm et al. (2021) found an average 26% impact of chemical exposure on ecological status using a multisubstance potentially affected fraction approach; (c) Posthuma et al. (2020) concluded that rivers in “bad” ecological status had multisubstance potentially affected fractions up to ~0.5 for the chemical mixture, of which the most important chemical can be expected to contribute 40% to 80% of the mixture effect (Spurgeon et al., 2022a). The logarithmic factor of 3 used to calculate proportional effects from lower eco-potency and exposure group combinations is chosen as an intermediate value of concentration response slopes, which typically assumes a value between 0 and 5 (Ritz, 2010). The highest community effect of 20% is assigned to any chemical belonging to the highest eco-potency group (Group 7; most toxic 5% of chemicals) and highest exposure group (Group 7; top 5% of chemicals for the average of concentration and detection frequency rank). The proportion of species affected decreases with eco-potency and exposure group.

Ecosystem processes and services are delivered through the functional contributions of key taxa. To allocate the overall chemical effect to taxa, the percentage of species affected in a community is given from the combination of eco-potency and exposure groupings, apportioned across 17 groups of vertebrates (amphibians, birds, fish, mammals, and reptiles), invertebrates (annelids, crustaceans, insects, mollusks, nematodes, rotifers, and springtails), plants (algae and higher plants), and microbes (bacterial communities, fungi, and protozoa). For the assignment, the available chemical toxicological data (acute EC₅₀ values) for species in each group are collected from accessible resources (e.g., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] ECOTOX database and the peer-reviewed and gray literature). These data are used to calculate a taxon-specific geomean “sensitivity” value for all 17 taxa for which data are available. For unstudied taxa, a read-across approach is proposed to assign a sensitivity value to that group by using the geomean for the nearest related taxa, phylogenetically (for animals and plants) or ecophysiologically (for microbes; see [online](#)

[supplementary material Table S8](#)). The presence of a phylogenetic signature in the sensitivity of species to toxicants has been reported in correlative and mechanistic studies (Spurgeon et al., 2020). The presence of this relationship indicates that although chemicals do not always present a strong phylogenetic signature, phylogenetically close taxa are more likely to reflect the sensitivity of a given taxon than more distant ones, providing a justification for taxa read-across.

The assigned geomean sensitivity, derived directly or through read-across, is used to assign a relative sensitivity to each taxon, calculated as the minimum geomean taxon acute EC₅₀/specific taxon acute EC₅₀, with a value of 1 indicating the most sensitive taxon and a value closer to 0 the least sensitive. The sensitivity value for each taxon is next used to estimate the proportion of that taxonomic group affected by the chemical exposure, assuming that each species within a given taxonomic group is equally affected. This proportion is then used to estimate the number of species in each taxon affected for likely true communities at a national scale. This assessment is done by multiplying the affected proportion by the total number of species in each taxonomic group, using information on species numbers per taxon from the recorded national fauna of the country. The result provides an assessment of the numbers of species affected in each taxonomic group but not the identities.

Step 4: Ecosystem service impacts

Direct impacts from chemicals with a given eco-potency and exposure on taxa identified in Steps 1 to 3 are linked to community and ecosystem service consequences via a set of defined evidence-based logic chains. Each logic chain links one or more taxa to a role in the delivery of ecosystem processes and functions, which are themselves linked to the realization of provisioning, regulating, cultural, and supporting ecosystem services. Logic chain development followed the approach of Hayes et al. (2018), here expanded to include a wider range of ecosystems and a much wider range of primary impacts to account for the additional taxa potentially affected by the broader range of chemicals that the ecosystem service impact assessment framework is intended to cover. A total of eight ecosystem types are included, comprising terrestrial, freshwater, and coastal margin systems.

For each taxonomic group within each ecosystem, the consequences of a decline in species abundance and functions, in addition to the potential magnitude of change, were sourced from literature. These changes were then linked via logic chains to secondary and tertiary impacts on ecosystem processes and services. Where literature-based information was not available, expert judgement was used, following information from similar species and habitats. There were several assumptions and caveats in this process, including that changes were first order and occurred over a “snapshot in time.” As such, there was no accounting for any secondary effects or for consideration of the time taken for impacts to occur. No prey choice substitutions were made, and plant and algal growth was assumed to increase in the absence of herbivory.

Direct human health impacts and direct human welfare effects of ecosystem pollution (e.g., loss of recreation activity) were outside the ecosystem service impact assessment

framework scope, although both could be integrated in a future iteration. Human food impacts are considered reduced yields, not through quality effects on health. Some ecosystem service impacts directly affect people (e.g., reduced bird populations affect food provisioning and nature appreciation), while many occur indirectly through trophic networks or altered functions (e.g., decomposition, nutrient cycling).

The list of endpoints linked to taxa through the logic chains is intended to capture meaningful ecosystem features, with potential for extension. The final impacts are linked to the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services Version 5.1 (Haines-Young & Potschin-Young, 2018). Sample endpoints include impacts on bird and mammal populations, wild food, soil and water properties, air quality, and human-relevant services such as pollination and genetic resources (for a full list of endpoints, see [online supplementary material Tables S2, S4, and S6](#)). The Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and Their Service ecosystem classification (Burkhard et al., 2018) is used to support greater habitat resolution and international applicability. For each habitat, any defined ecosystem endpoint can be reached by multiple logic chains. The values resulting from each chain in conditions unaffected by the chemical hazard (i.e., normal functioning) are summed to give a number in arbitrary units for each ecosystem type. Similarly, values from each logic chain are calculated and summed by the reduction in functioning linked to the apportioned taxa effects of a chemical of specific eco-potency and exposure, as identified in Steps 1 to 3. A percentage reduction in the ecosystem endpoint is calculated by the ratio of these two numbers. The output values are in terms of the percentage of the ecosystem endpoint remaining, providing values that can be taken forward for further analysis (e.g., economic impact valuation).

Parameterizing the framework for case study chemicals

To test the ecosystem service impact assessment framework, we select three case study chemical pollutants: The insecticide/veterinary medicine fipronil, the metal Cu, and the perfluoroalkyl substance PFHxA. These three represent substances from different pollutant classes that have different MoAs, usage profiles, and environmental fate, providing different scenarios for ENRICH framework testing. Fipronil (CAS 120068-37-3) is a neurotoxic insecticide with mainly domestic use and low to moderate persistence; Cu (CAS 7440-50-8) is an essential trace metal industrial pollutant and biocide; and PFHxA (307-24-4) is a perfluorinated compound of high environmental persistence used in industrial and consumer product applications. All are relatively well-studied chemicals, for which some ecotoxicity and chemical measurement data were available.

Fipronil is used mainly as an insecticide in pet flea and household insect control products. Through these distributed uses, fipronil can find its way into the environment through pet swimming, domestic wastewater effluent, or biosolid additions to land (Sadaria et al., 2019). Chemical prioritization and risk assessment studies have identified fipronil as a chemical of concern for its environmental impacts (Spurgeon et al., 2022b).

Copper is a relatively abundant trace element found naturally in the environment. However, Cu can also be toxic at high

concentrations (USEPA, 2007). Copper is widely used in construction, consumer, and industrial products, with a niche use as a biocide and pesticide. Current and legacy mining, metal processing, and product use all result in Cu releases to the environment from acid mine drainage, solid wastes, wastewater, and process emissions to air.

Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA) is a PFAS, a chemical group recognized as being of significant concern for its environmental effects (Ankley et al., 2021); PFHxA has been linked to effects in invertebrate and vertebrate species, including their metabolism and development (Labine et al., 2023). With a growing recognition of the widespread presence of PFAS in the environment and greater knowledge of the potential ecotoxicological effects, there is currently high interest in understanding the risks of PFHxA and PFAS more generally.

Results

Case Study 1: Fipronil

Existing information on fipronil hazard and exposure was collected from substance regulatory reviews and documentation, published literature, and ecotoxicity and environmental monitoring databases. A regulatory review (Environment Agency, 2022) reports apical endpoint EC₅₀ toxicity data for fipronil for 48 species across seven taxonomic groups. An SSD constructed with these data has an HC₅₀ of 29.5 µg/L (see [online supplementary material Figure S1](#)), placing fipronil at the 3rd percentile eco-potency among all chemical HC₅₀ values (Figure 2). In the ecosystem service impact assessment framework approach, this relative eco-potency places fipronil into the highest eco-potency group (Group 7). The OECD QSAR toolbox is used to identify any additional hazard mechanisms for fipronil. Available QSAR models identify structural alerts for fipronil for genotoxicity and bioaccumulation. Within the ENRICH framework, evidence of these additional mechanisms would normally raise the eco-potency group of a chemical. However, as fipronil is already in the highest eco-potency group, its hazard grouping cannot increase further.

Surface water measurements for fipronil in England are not available in the primary data source, the EA WIMS, but are available in an alternative source from the UKWIR CIP. The 95th percentile concentration and detection frequency in the UKWIR CIP dataset were used to determine the percentile placement of fipronil as compared with the exposure concentrations and detection frequencies of all other EA WIMS reported chemicals. Based on a 95th percentile concentration of 0.08 µg/L and 48% detection frequency (Figure 2), fipronil is at the 68th percentile for exposure and 62nd percentile for detection frequency of all substances. The average of these percentiles places fipronil in Exposure Group 5. Regulatory chemical mobility and persistence data indicate that in water-sediment systems, fipronil is persistent (half-life between 40 and 120 days; Environment Agency, 2022). Within the ENRICH framework, its long environmental half-life moves fipronil up one exposure group, ultimately placing it in Exposure Group 6.

The ecosystem service impact assessment framework predicts that a chemical in Eco-Potency Group 7 and Exposure Group 6 affects 12.2% of species in a community. To apportion this




Figure 2 (A–C) Frequency distribution of HC_{50} values from acute EC_{50} toxicity data for aquatic species for all chemicals in the species sensitivity distribution database of Posthuma, van Gils, et al. (2019). (D–F) Frequency distribution of 95th percentile exposure concentrations and (G–I) frequency distribution of detection frequency for fipronil, copper (Cu), and perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA). The dashed line in each plot indicates where the HC_{50} , 95th percentile concentration, or detection frequency for each chemical falls relative to the value for all other chemicals. EC_{50} = half maximal effective concentration; HC_{50} = hazardous concentration for 50% of species.

percentile effect to specific taxa, the available toxicity data are used to derive geomean EC_{50} values for all seven taxa for which one or more species measurements were available. For the remaining 10 of the 17 total taxa included in the ENRICH framework, we applied first-, second-, and third-level hierarchical read-across to assign geomean EC_{50} values to four, four, and two of the untested groups, respectively. The taxa-specific geomean EC_{50} values indicate that arthropods (insects, crustaceans, springtails), nematodes, and some microbes are most sensitive to fipronil. By taxa, 31.7% of insects, 31.7% of nematodes, 31.7% of

springtails, 7.0% of crustaceans, 6.0% of ciliates, 1.7% of microbes, and 1.7% of fungi are predicted to be affected by fipronil (see [online supplementary material Table S1](#)). Sensitivity of these groups is supported in multiple ecotoxicological studies (Wu et al., 2015).

The predicted effects are used to map fipronil taxon responses to impacts on relevant ecosystem functions for each habitat type as compared with the unpolluted state. Through its taxa-specific effects, logic chains indicate that fipronil may affect delivery of functions in each habitat (range, 0.12%–31.7%;

Figure 3). The greatest effects are on “pollination,” “food from wild animals (terrestrial) for nutritional purposes,” and “terrestrial game abundance.” These impacts are founded on

the role of invertebrates in pollination and provisioning exploitable game species. Ecosystem service reductions are greatest in forest, grassland, heathland and shrub, and sparsely vegetated




Figure 3 Ecosystem services impact across forest, wetland (bog and fen), and freshwater (river and lake) habitats arising due to pollution by fipronil, copper (Cu), and perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA).

land habitats as compared with freshwater and wetland habitats (see [online supplementary material Table S2](#)).

Case Study 2: Cu

There are available EC_{50} toxicity data for apical endpoints (mortality, growth, and population size) for 43 species across eight taxa from a USEPA regulatory review (USEPA, 2007). The HC_{50} (117.1 $\mu\text{g/L}$) derived from an SSD fitted to these data (see [online supplementary material Figure S2](#)), as compared with the HC_{50} values for all other chemicals from the SSD database (Posthuma, van Gils, et al., 2019), places Cu in Eco-Potency Group 6 (Figure 2). Neither the regulatory report (USEPA, 2007) nor OECD QSAR toolbox identify structural alerts for bioaccumulation, genotoxicity, or endocrine disruption, retaining Cu in Eco-Potency Group 6.

Surface water measurements for Cu for England are available in EA WIMS. When compared with all chemicals, Cu is ranked at the 85th percentile for concentrations and 84th percentile for detection frequency (Figure 2). The average percentile of these values places Cu in Exposure Group 6. As a metal, Cu is inherently persistent; however, reported chemical mobility data show that Cu is unlikely to be highly mobile (Tipping et al., 2010). As an inorganic substance, Cu does not have a single K_{oc} value, although it is known to bind strongly to organic matter and clay minerals (Tipping et al., 2003). As Cu is persistent but not highly mobile, it remains in Exposure Group 6.

With placement in Eco-Potency Group 6 and Exposure Group 6, Cu is predicted to affect 7.5% of species in communities. A national assessment of the risks of Cu to soil organisms across >1,000 U.K. sites indicated that Cu concentrations exceeded the critical value to affect species at 20.1% of locations, providing support for the plausibility of Cu effects at this scale (Spurgeon et al., 2008). The toxicity data used for the SSD are used to calculate taxa-specific geomean EC_{50} values for eight directly measured taxa (algae, amphibians, annelids, crustaceans, fish, insects, macrophytes, and mollusks) and via Level 1, 2, and 3 read-across for one, three, and five others. This apportionment resulted in a predicted effect of Cu on 33.4% of crustaceans, 22.9% of ciliates, 22.9% of rotifers, 10.9% of mollusks, 9.2% of microbes, 6.8% of amphibians, and 6.3% of algae, with these groups contributing 67% of the affected species nationally (see [online supplementary material Table S3](#)). Consistent with this prediction, studies indicate reductions in amphibian, rotifer, and mollusk populations linked to Cu effects on endpoints such as juvenile survival and shell physiology (Schanz et al., 2021).

Logic chains are used to indicate taxa effects of Cu linked to changes in the delivery of ecosystem services in habitats as compared with the unpolluted state. The potential effects of Cu identified may manifest in impacts on multiple ecosystem services in different focus ecosystems. Most notably, substantive effects in freshwater habitats are identified—particularly via impacts on algae and by feedback through direct effects on and trophic links to crustaceans and fish, leading to changes in the availability of these taxa for food and recreation (Figure 3; see [online supplementary material Table S4](#)). The impacts on these taxa can result in changes in water clarity through changes linked to phenomena such as algal bloom frequency.

Case Study 3: PFHxA

A regulatory review of the ecotoxicity information on PFHxA identified available acute aquatic toxicity data for six species and chronic data for three (European Chemicals Agency, 2017). As this analysis contained fewer ecotoxicity data points for PFHxA than for fipronil or Cu, additional searches were carried out in the USEPA ECOTOX database and scientific literature. This effort identified a further nine acute and five chronic effect studies from studies considered reliable and relevant according to the Criteria for Reporting and Evaluating Ecotoxicity Data (Moermond et al., 2016). The consolidated dataset from the regulatory report and additional published studies provided toxicity data for 11 species from five taxa. These data are used to generate an SSD for PFHxA, which has an HC_{50} of 208,344 $\mu\text{g/L}$ (see [online supplementary material Figure S3](#)), placing it at the 84th percentile for eco-potency and so in Eco-Potency Group 2 (Figure 2). In the OECD QSAR toolbox, PFHxA does not have structural alerts for endocrine activity or genotoxicity but does have one for bioaccumulation. This alert elevates PFHxA to Eco-Potency Group 3 for vertebrates, while it remains in Eco-Potency Group 2 for nonvertebrates.

United Kingdom surface water monitoring data for PFHxA are available in the EA WIMS database, with a 95th percentile concentration of 0.001 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and detection frequency of 67% (Figure 2), placing it at the 13th percentile for concentration and 78th percentile for detection frequency. The average of these two values places PFHxA in Exposure Group 4. Typical of many PFAS, PFHxA has a half-life in environmental media that can extend to years or even decades. Furthermore, PFHxA has a reported $\log K_{oc} < 3$ (range, 1.3–3.6; European Commission, 2023), indicating that PFHxA is persistent and mobile. These characteristics move PFHxA up one level to Exposure Group 5.

Based on placement in Eco-Potency Group 3 for vertebrates and Group 2 for nonvertebrates and in Exposure Group 5, PFHxA is predicted to affect 0.96% of species in communities. To apportion this effect among taxa, the available toxicity data for six algae, one crustacean, one rotifer, two fish, and a bacteria are used to generate geomean EC_{50} values for these five taxa, with the remainder generated by Level 1 and 2 read-across for four and eight groups, respectively. Based on the available ecotoxicity data, fish are the most sensitive taxa. As the geomean EC_{50} for fish is used to read-across for the remaining untested vertebrates, highest impacts are predicted for these as compared with the other groups. Within the five vertebrate taxa (fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals), 9% of the species are predicted to be affected by PFHxA exposure (see [online supplementary material Table S5](#)).

Inputting the predicted species effects into logic chain models indicated minor impacts (<1% reductions) on a range of ecosystem services linked to the roles of vertebrates as food, game, and recreation (e.g., angling; Figure 3; see [online supplementary material Table S6](#)). Small effects are also predicted (<5%) on ecosystem services linked to the emblematic status of vertebrates, which support interest in nature and tourism at protected sites. Because some vertebrates play functional roles in terrestrial ecosystems, very small effects (~1%) are predicted for ecosystem services linked to soil functioning and organic carbon sequestration.

Discussion

Evidence-based decisions on chemical management have more credibility if they can be placed into a society-relevant context. There has been a long-standing interest in developing approaches to integrate chemical hazard and exposure information with ecosystem knowledge to generate meaningful regulatory impact assessments. Proposed frameworks have so far only considered pollution costs in generic terms (Maltby et al., 2021) or focused on specific aspects (Hayes et al., 2018; Forbes et al., 2017). Here, we outline a novel ecosystem service impact assessment framework designed to characterize, link, and assess chemical eco-potency, exposure, community impacts, ecological pathways, and impacts of any chemical pollutant on ecosystem services. Our approach is designed to be usable for any chemical (including data-poor substances), any ecosystem (freshwater, marine, terrestrial), and—with further development—a wider set of geographical areas (country, region, catchment). A key benefit of this standardized approach is that it can be used to assess chemicals for their potential ecosystem service impacts.

It is recognized that this is currently a developing ecosystem service impact assessment framework and that refinement will be needed for reliable use in regulatory impact assessments. However, the logic and basic structure provide a foundation to build on. To quantify chemical hazard, we draw on the most extensive database of SSDs currently available (Posthuma, van Gils, et al., 2019). Each of these SSDs provides an HC_{50} value for eco-potency ranking and a measure of model reliability that could be used in any future uncertainty analysis. To account for effects through other ecotoxicological MoAs, eco-potency ranking initially based on substance HC_{50} comparison with the overall distribution of values was modified for genotoxic, estrogen, androgen, and thyroid endocrine activity and for highly bioaccumulative substances given their potential to cause greater ecological impacts through continued uptake and trophic transfer. To refine the chemical eco-potency ranking, additional nonclassical MoAs could be incorporated, such as immunotoxicity, neurotoxicity, or nuclear hormone receptor activity identified through QSAR tools such as from the Vega platform, relevant assays, or database resources (Kramer et al., 2024). Although exposure profiling used U.K. monitoring data, other surface and marine water quality datasets could serve as alternative sources.

To assess ecosystem impacts, it was necessary to go beyond the “unacceptable risk/no unacceptable risk” approach of classical risk assessments and identify the scale and nature of potential effects. Effect scaling was based on an assumed increasing relationship of impacts with greater eco-potency and exposure groups up to a maximum of 20% effect (for the most potent chemicals at the highest exposure levels). This maximum effect was set by the potential for national-level effects, based on evidence from large-scale pollution monitoring studies (Lemm et al., 2021; Posthuma, Altenburger, et al., 2019; Posthuma et al., 2020). Further studies of the relationship among eco-potency, exposure, and ecosystem effects are necessary to verify this critical framework aspect—for example, via utilizing artificial intelligence and machine learning, analyses of national-scale biodiversity, and chemical use/exposure datasets.

The overall community-level effects attributed to the case study chemicals are apportioned across 17 taxa by using any

available ecotoxicological data and a phylogenetic read-across approach for unstudied groups. The principle for read-across was based on evidence from correlative and mechanistic studies following the assumption that, although not in all cases, closely related taxa are more likely to reflect the sensitivity of a given taxon than more distant ones (Spurgeon et al., 2020). Translation of taxa impacts to effects on functions and services was through logic chain analysis, as a tractable solution to species–ecosystem impact linkage (Hayes et al., 2018; Maltby et al., 2021). Logic chains represent ecosystem complexity in linear and simplified formats. Such simplicity may not reflect reality, as some functions and services depend on contributions from multiple species and modifications to one may not result in linear change, as is assumed in this framework. Improved ecological models have the potential to better represent the complexity of true taxa to influence connectivity. For example, by incorporating factors such as reduced predation and food requirements due to changing population sizes, interactions such as prey switching, behavioral plasticity in response to food and habitat availability, and nonlinearity of response functions, including tipping points, could be better integrated.

The geographical scope of the ecosystem service impact assessment framework is currently national with data focusing on the United Kingdom, including the use of countrywide monitoring data to define exposure, ascribing the maximum ecosystem effects from large-scale impact assessments, assessing species effects against country inventories, and using logic chains designed for broad habitat applications. Major chemical management decisions (e.g., restriction of a chemical) often take place nationally or pan-nationally, making this scale of analysis meaningful. However, decisions on chemical management can be regional or location specific (e.g., point source). To be useful at such scales, some modifications of the ENRICH framework would be needed. For example, high exposures from point sources could result in community effects well above the maximum 20% attributed at the national scale; specific communities may also be present at such sites that need integration into the ecological impact assessment.

The ecosystem service impact assessment framework is designed for impact assessment of single chemicals. Pollution is, however, often mixtures. Theories in mixture toxicology support additivity for effects based on either similar MoAs (concentration addition) or dissimilar ones (independent action; Jonker et al., 2005). Yet, under mechanistic uncertainty, these models can be viewed through their mathematical constructions as combined potencies for concentration addition and event probabilities for independent action. Framework calculations for a chemical of given eco-potency and exposure provide taxon-level effect probabilities, thus allowing mixture effects to be predicted using independent action model principles.

Current parameterization of the ecosystem service impact assessment framework, by necessity, draws on freshwater data. This focus reflects the bias in ecotoxicology and chemical monitoring toward aquatic, mainly freshwater, studies. A lack of available data currently hampers bespoke terrestrial analysis, marking read-across from freshwaters as the only viable approach for any attempt to attribute terrestrial pollution effects. The assumption of similar eco-potency among species from different habitats is supported by comparisons of species

sensitivities across habitats (Yanagihara et al., 2022), suggesting that broad rules of taxon sensitivity apply, based on shared toxicokinetic and toxicodynamic pathways (Spurgeon et al., 2020). Differences in chemical use would be expected to result in variations in the patterns of chemical exposure patterns in terrestrial, marine, and freshwater ecosystems. This makes use of freshwater monitoring data for assessing exposure in other ecosystems potentially problematic, potentially leading to misassigned impacts. For example, the focus of fipronil effects on terrestrial ecosystems (e.g., pollination services) may not be replicated if terrestrial rather than aquatic data were used for exposure ranking. Large-scale mandated monitoring of soil—for example, on the scale of that under the European Union Water Framework Directive—would be necessary to provide the needed exposure profiling for terrestrial ecosystems. Until such studies become available, bespoke terrestrial assessments will remain hampered by a lack of data. Ultimately, a large research effort is needed to consolidate the data on terrestrial and marine-specific chemical hazards and exposure building on existing SSD resources (Posthuma, van Gils, et al., 2019), MoA databases (Kramer et al., 2024), and exposure portals (www.norman-network.net) to better refine terrestrial ecosystem impact assessment.

A future step in ecosystem service impact assessment framework development would be to improve the understanding of uncertainty. In the short term, efforts could focus on validating and refining where research would be beneficial, including integrating broader expert knowledge, ground-truthing assumptions, conducting sensitivity testing, and back-testing outputs. Special attention should be given to the most impactful assumptions, such as that of the 20% maximum community impact. Supplementing the available data with model outputs could benefit each quantitative step moving forward. For example, predictive ecotoxicology based on statistical or mechanistic models could be used to fill gaps on species sensitivity. Multimedia fate modeling can enhance the precision and applicability of the exposure assessment, especially for poorly studied chemicals, including terrestrial and marine ecosystems. The integration of ecological monitoring approaches may refine the mapping of taxa effects to ecosystem process and service impacts, potentially allowing the incorporation of second-order and subsequent impacts into the logic chain framework. Application of a spatial modeling approach could benefit future analyses by including ecological, environmental, and ecosystem services information to link the quantitative logic chain changes to area-relevant habitats.

Although there are remaining uncertainties, the ENRICH framework has the potential to underpin the assignment of monetary values to pollution cases within ecological regulatory impact assessment (Step 5). The current structure can already provide support in decision-making processes such as chemical prioritization and regulatory management. Thus, the developed approach could become a useful tool to quantify and monetize environmental impacts, ultimately supporting all stages of chemical policy and regulatory decision making.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online at *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*.

Data availability

The underlying data used in the Step 1 potency ranking and Step 2 exposure ranking are available within the supporting information linked to this article, as well as the template (with calculations) used in the Step 3 community impact assessment.

Author contributions

Sarah L. Roberts (Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing), Felicity Hayes (Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing), Thea Sletten (Funding acquisition, Project administration, Writing—review & editing), Ece Ozdemiroglu (Funding acquisition, Project administration, Writing—review & editing), Rob Tinch (Investigation, Methodology, Writing—review & editing), and David J. Spurgeon (Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing)

Funding

This study was funded by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra) under Project 10642: research into measuring and valuing the environmental impacts of chemical pollution in the United Kingdom.

Conflicts of interest

The authors confirm that they have no competing financial or nonfinancial interests.

Acknowledgments

We thank Julia Sussams and Ahamad Akbor for input to the project conception and delivery and Prof. Leo Posthuma, Prof. Matthew Heard, Dr. Lisa Golding, and Dr. Peter Simpson for contribution to the refinement of the concept and identification of datasets through a steering group meeting for the research project.

References

- Ankley, G. T., Cureton, P., Hoke, R. A., Houde, M., Kumar, A., Kurias, J., Lanno, R., McCarthy, C., Newsted, J., Salice, C. J., Sample, B. E., Sepulveda, M. S., Steevens, J., & Valsecchi, S. (2021). Assessing the ecological risks of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances: Current state-of-the science and a proposed path forward. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 40, 564–605. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4869>
- Baas, J., Jager, T., & Kooijman, B. (2010). Understanding toxicity as processes in time. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 408, 3735–3739. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.10.066>

- Burkhard, B., Santos-Martin, F., Nedkov, S., & Maes, J. (2018). An operational framework for integrated Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services (MAES). *One Ecosystem*, 3, e22831. <https://doi.org/10.3897/oneeco.3.e22831>
- Environment Agency. (2022). *Technical recommendation for an EQS for the insecticide fipronil in surface waters: Chief scientist's group report*. Environment Agency.
- European Chemicals Agency. (2017). *Hazard assessment outcome document for undecafluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)* (EC No. 206-196-6; CAS No. 307-24-4). European Chemicals Agency.
- European Chemicals Agency. (2023). *Key areas of regulatory challenge*. European Chemicals Agency.
- European Commission. (2022). *Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2023/707 amending Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 as regards hazard classes and criteria for the classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures*. European Commission.
- European Commission. (2023). *Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures, amending and repealing Directives 67/548/EEC and 1999/45/EC, and amending Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006, 1-1355*. European Commission.
- Faber, J. H., Marshall, S., van den Brink, P. J., & Maltby, L. (2019). Priorities and opportunities in the application of the ecosystem services concept in risk assessment for chemicals in the environment. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 651, 1067–1077. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.09.209>
- Fairbrother, A., & Bennett, R. S. (1999). Ecological risk assessment and the precautionary principle. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal*, 5, 943–949. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039991289220>
- Forbes, V. E., Salice, C. J., Birnir, B., Bruins, R. J. F., Calow, P., Ducrot, V., Galic, N., Garber, K., Harvey, B. C., Jager, H., Kanarek, A., Pastorok, R., Railsback, S. F., Rebarber, R., & Thorbek, P. (2017). A framework for predicting impacts on ecosystem services from (sub)organismal responses to chemicals. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 36, 845–859. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3720>
- Haines-Young, R., & Potschin-Young, M. B. (2018). Revision of the Common International Classification for Ecosystem Services (CICES V5.1): A policy brief. *One Ecosystem*, 3, e27108. <https://doi.org/10.3897/oneeco.3.e27108>
- Hayes, F., Spurgeon, D. J., Lofts, S., & Jones, L. (2018). Evidence-based logic chains demonstrate multiple impacts of trace metals on ecosystem services. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 223, 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.05.053>
- Jonker, M. J., Svendsen, C., Bedaux, J. J. M., Bongers, M., & Kammenga, J. E. (2005). Significance testing of synergistic/antagonistic, dose level-dependent, or dose ratio-dependent effects in mixture dose-response analysis. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 24, 2701–2713. <https://doi.org/10.1897/04-431r.1>
- Kramer, L., Schulze, T., Klüver, N., Altenburger, R., Hackermüller, J., Krauss, M., & Busch, W. (2024). Curated mode-of-action data and effect concentrations for chemicals relevant for the aquatic environment. *Scientific Data*, 11, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02904-7>
- Labine, L. M., Pereira, E. A. O., Kleywegt, S., Jobst, K. J., Simpson, A. J., & Simpson, M. J. (2023). Sublethal exposure of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances of varying chain length and polar functionality results in distinct metabolic responses in *Daphnia magna*. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 42, 242–256. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5517>
- Lemm, J. U., Venohr, M., Globevnik, L., Stefanidis, K., Panagopoulos, Y., van Gils, J., Posthuma, L., Kristensen, P., Feld, C. K., Mahnkopf, J., Hering, D., & Birk, S. (2021). Multiple stressors determine river ecological status at the European scale: Towards an integrated understanding of river status deterioration. *Global Change Biology*, 27, 1962–1975. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15504>
- Maltby, L., Brown, R., Faber, J. H., Galic, N., van den Brink, P. J., Warwick, O., & Marshall, S. (2021). Assessing chemical risk within an ecosystem services framework: Implementation and added value. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 791, 148631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148631>
- Moermond, C. T. A., Kase, R., Korkaric, M., & Ågerstrand, M. (2016). CRED: Criteria for Reporting and Evaluating Ecotoxicity Data. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 35, 1297–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3259>
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2022). *Valuing the impacts of chemicals on environmental endpoints: A scoping study*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Persson, L., Almroth, B. M. C., Collins, C. D., Cornell, S., de Wit, C. A., Diamond, M. L., Fantke, P., Hassellöv, M., MacLeod, M., Ryberg, M. W., Jorgensen, P. S., Villarrubia-Gómez, P., Wang, Z. Y., & Hauschild, M. Z. (2022). Outside the safe operating space of the planetary boundary for novel entities. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 56, 1510–1521. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04158>
- Posthuma, L., Altenburger, R., Backhaus, T., Kortenkamp, A., Müller, C., Focks, A., de Zwart, D., & Brack, W. (2019). Improved component-based methods for mixture risk assessment are key to characterize complex chemical pollution in surface waters. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 31, 70. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-019-0246-5>
- Posthuma, L., van Gils, J., Zijp, M. C., van de Meent, D., & de Zwart, D. (2019). Species sensitivity distributions for use in environmental protection, assessment, and management of aquatic ecosystems for 12 386 chemicals. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 38, 905–917. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4373>
- Posthuma, L., Zijp, M. C., de Zwart, D., van de Meent, D., Globevnik, L., Koprivsek, M., Focks, A., van Gils, J., & Birk, S. (2020). Chemical pollution imposes limitations to the ecological status of European surface waters. *Scientific Reports*, 10, 14825. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-71537-2>
- Pradeep, P., Judson, R., DeMarini, D. M., Keshava, N., Martin, T. M., Dean, J., Gibbons, C. F., Simha, A., Warren, S. H., Gwinn, M. R., & Patlewicz, G. (2021). An evaluation of existing QSAR models and structural alerts and development of new ensemble models for genotoxicity using a newly compiled experimental

- dataset. *Computational Toxicology*, 18, 100167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comtox.2021.100167>
- Ritz, C. (2010). Toward a unified approach to dose-response modeling in ecotoxicology. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 29, 220–229. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.7>
- Sadaria, A. M., Labban, C. W., Steele, J. C., Maurer, M. M., & Halden, R. U. (2019). Retrospective nationwide occurrence of fipronil and its degradates in US wastewater and sewage sludge from 2001–2016. *Water Research*, 155, 465–473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.02.045>
- Schanz, F. R., Sommer, S., Lami, A., Fontaneto, D., & Ozgul, A. (2021). Life-history responses of a freshwater rotifer to copper pollution. *Ecology and Evolution*, 11, 10947–10955. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.7877>
- Slabe, V. A., Anderson, J. T., Millsap, B. A., Cooper, J. L., Harmata, A. R., Restani, M., Crandall, R. H., Bodenstein, B., Bloom, P. H., Booms, T., Buchweitz, J., Culver, R., Dickerson, K., Domenech, R., Dominguez-Villegas, E., Driscoll, D., Smith, B. W., Lockhart, M. J., McRuer, D., ... Katzner, T. E. (2022). Demographic implications of lead poisoning for eagles across North America. *Science*, 375, 779–782. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj3068>
- Spurgeon, D., Lahive, E., Robinson, A., Short, S., & Kille, P. (2020). Species sensitivity to toxic substances: Evolution, ecology and applications. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 8, 588380. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2020.588380>
- Spurgeon, D., Wilkinson, H., Civil, W., Hutt, L., Armenise, E., Kieboom, N., Sims, K., & Besien, T. (2022a). Proportional contributions to organic chemical mixture effects in groundwater and surface water. *Water Research*, 220, 118641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118641>
- Spurgeon, D., Wilkinson, H., Civil, W., Hutt, L., Armenise, E., Kieboom, N., Sims, K., & Besien, T. (2022b). Worst-case ranking of organic chemicals detected in groundwaters and surface waters in England. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 835, 155101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155101>
- Spurgeon, D. J., Rowland, P., Ainsworth, G., Rothery, P., Long, S., & Black, H. I. J. (2008). Geographical and pedological drivers of distribution and risks to soil fauna of seven metals (Cd, Cu, Cr, Ni, Pb, V and Zn) in British soils. *Environmental Pollution*, 153, 273–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2007.08.027>
- Tipping, E., Rieuwerts, J., Pan, G., Ashmore, M. R., Lofts, S., Hill, M. T. R., Farago, M. E., & Thornton, I. (2003). The solid-solution partitioning of heavy metals (Cu, Zn, Cd, Pb) in upland soils of England and Wales. *Environmental Pollution*, 125, 213–225. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0269-7491\(03\)00058-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0269-7491(03)00058-7)
- Tipping, E., Rothwell, J. J., Shotbolt, L., & Lawlor, A. J. (2010). Dynamic modelling of atmospherically-deposited Ni, Cu, Zn, Cd and Pb in Pennine catchments (northern England). *Environmental Pollution*, 158, 1521–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2009.12.026>
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2007). *Aquatic life ambient freshwater quality criteria—Copper*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- Verhaar, H. J. M., Vanleeuwen, C. J., & Hermens, J. L. M. (1992). Classifying environmental pollutants. 1. Structure-activity relationships for prediction of aquatic toxicity. *Chemosphere*, 25, 471–491.
- Wang, J. Q., Lautz, L. S., Nolte, T. M., Posthuma, L., Koopman, K. R., Leuven, R., & Hendriks, A. J. (2021). Towards a systematic method for assessing the impact of chemical pollution on ecosystem services of water systems. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 281, 111873. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111873>
- Wu, J., Lu, J., Lu, H., Lin, Y. J., & Wilson, P. C. (2015). Occurrence and ecological risks from fipronil in aquatic environments located within residential landscapes. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 518–519, 139–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.12.103>
- Yanagihara, M., Hiki, K., & Iwasaki, Y. (2022). Can chemical toxicity in saltwater be predicted from toxicity in freshwater? A comprehensive evaluation using species sensitivity distributions. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 41, 2021–2027. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5354>