
Evaluating polar pesticide pollution with a combined approach: a survey of agricultural practices and POCIS passive samplers in a Tunisian lagoon watershed

Mhadhbi Takoua ^{1,2,*}, Pringault Olivier ^{3,4}, Nouri Habiba ⁴, Spinelli Sylvie ¹, Beyrem Hamouda ², Gonzalez Catherine ¹

¹ Univ Montpellier, IMT Mines Ales, Lab Ind Environm Engn LGEI, Ales, France.

² Univ Carthage, Fac Sci Bizerte, Lab Environm Biomonitoring LBE, Ave Republ, Tunis, Tunisia.

³ Univ Montpellier, IFREMER, CNRS, UMR 9190, MARBEC, IRD, Montpellier, France.

⁴ Inst Rech Dev, Tunis, Tunisia.

* Corresponding author : Takoua Mhadhbi, email address : mhadhbitakoua@gmail.com

Abstract :

A study of pesticides in the Bizerte lagoon watershed on the Mediterranean coast of Tunisia showed that herbicides and fungicides are the most commonly used compounds. A survey was made of selected farmers. Pesticide contamination was monitored in the water column and sediments at four selected sampling sites (lagoon (A) and in three oueds Chegui (B), Garaa (C), and Tinja (D)). Polar organic chemical integrative samplers (POCIS) were used to assess pesticide contamination. Thirty-two pesticides were investigated; the total concentration of active ingredients ranged from 35.9ngL(-1) in Tinja oued to 1246ngL(-1) in Chegui oued. In the lagoon, the total concentration of pesticides was 67.7ngL(-1). In the sediments, the highest concentration was measured in Chegui oued in the spring (31ngg(-1) dw). The main compounds found in the analyzed sediments were prosulfocarb and tebuconazole molecules.

Keywords : Agriculture, Tunisian lagoon, Pesticides, POCIS, Sediments

1. Introduction

The impact of agricultural activities on the environments has strongly increased in the last decade. The use of pesticides improves crop productivity by reducing the adverse effects of pathogens (Ben Salem 2017), but their excess can be a major source of ecosystem pollution (Arellano-Aguilar et al. 2017). Monitoring of the contamination of water and sediments by pesticides is thus needed to evaluate the impact of human activities on ecosystems (ESF-Marine Board 2011).

Pesticides can reach aquatic ecosystems via direct applications, spray drift, aerial spraying, atmospheric fallout, soil erosion and runoff from agricultural land, discharge of industrial and domestic sewage, leaching, careless disposal of empty containers and equipment washing (Kaushik et al. 2010). Many of these compounds have been detected in different matrices, including surface water (De Gerónimo et al. 2014; Palma et al. 2014), sediments (Guo et al. 2014; Li et al. 2014), fish pulp (Zhang et al. 2012; Yohannes et al. 2014) and bivalves (Boonyatumanond et al. 2002; Khaled et al. 2004; Carro et al. 2014; Herceg-Romanić et al. 2014). Guidelines for concentrations of pesticides in waters are published by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) (Hamilton et al. 2003) and permissible limits are laid down in the European reports: 2008/105/EC (EU 2008) and 2013/39/EU (EU 2013).

In Tunisia, the use of pesticides has increased in recent years due to the expansion of agricultural activities. Although national legislation on their uses is scarce, their concentrations are regulated by the Stockholm convention (2004), with serious restrictions on the use of several compounds, including aldrin, chlordane, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor, hexachlorobenzene (HCB), mirex and toxaphene molecules (Ben Salem et al. 2016). In 2016,

1 668 commercial pesticides were approved for use by Tunisian legislation (Mezghani et al.
2 2016); these products have to be homologated before being sold to ensure that they do not
3 pose a risk to human health and the environment. Pesticides comprise 31% insecticides, 39%
4 fungicides, 20% herbicides and 8% other products (rodenticides, nematicides, etc.) (Mezghani
5 et al. 2016).

6 The Bizerte lagoon is one of the most important economic areas in Tunisia with farming,
7 fishing, ceramics, metallurgy, oil refineries and tire production (Barhoumi et al. 2014).
8 Agriculture represents a major activity in the zone with cereal crops accounting for 7,800 ha,
9 vegetables for 3,400 ha and tree crops for 500 ha (Barhoumi 2014). Large quantities of
10 fertilizers and pesticides are used to increase productivity (Necibi et al. 2015), and as a
11 consequence, the quality of the lagoon water might be affected by the discharge of effluents
12 (Macdonald et al. 2005; Botta et al. 2009). This environmental pollution is not only a concern
13 in Tunisia, but it has been the subject of studies worldwide in recent years (Comoretto and
14 Chiron 2005; Vryzas et al. 2009; Momplaisir et al. 2010; Palma et al. 2014). The protection of
15 coastal wetlands, including lagoons, in the Mediterranean region has become a priority in
16 resource conservation policies. Like other countries around the world, Tunisia reacted to
17 increasing anthropogenic pressures by developing several national regulations and
18 participating in several international Conventions; e.g., Ramsar Convention (FAO 2015) and
19 Stockholm Convention (UNEP 2001). In previous studies on the Bizerte lagoon, Barhoumi et
20 al. (2013) and Ben Salem et al. (2016) detected organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) in
21 sediments with total concentrations of 11.5 ng g⁻¹ dw and 574 ng g⁻¹ dw, respectively. Several
22 other authors also reported the presence of pollutants in the Bizerte lagoon, including
23 inorganic mercury, methyl-mercury (Mzoughi et al. 2002), organotin (Mzoughi et al. 2005)
24 and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (Mzoughi et al. 2002; Barhoumi et al. 2016). Necibi et

1 al (2015) found OCPs and polychlorinated-biphenyl (PCBs) in water samples collected from
2 the lagoon.

3 However, there is no published literature on the pollution of the lagoon ecosystem by polar
4 pesticides, mainly herbicides and fungicides. Water quality is usely monitored by spot (grab)
5 sampling, but due to the low concentrations of micro-pollutants (trace level), a large volume
6 has to be collected to enable detection of these molecules (Poulier et al. 2014). and this
7 sampling has to be repeated frequently to obtain a diagnosis of contamination over time
8 (Greenwood et al. 2007). Thanks to its ability to accumulate pollutants through time-weighted
9 average concentration (TWAC), in recent decades passive sampling has been widely used to
10 increase the representativeness of the contamination of different water bodies (surface water,
11 lakes, marine water, etc.) (Ahrens et al. 2015). Polar organic chemical integrative samplers
12 (POCIS) are widely used to investigate hydrophilic contaminants such as pesticides (Ibrahim
13 et al. 2013a; Lissalde et al. 2014; Poulier et al. 2014; Desgranges 2015). Due to its effective
14 exposed surface area, POCIS is particularly useful tool to determine the concentrations of
15 trace compounds (Liess et al. 1999; Miège et al. 2013; Martínez Bueno et al. 2014; Poulier et
16 al. 2015; Terzopoulou and Voutsas 2016).

17 The main goal of this work was to identify and quantify the common pesticides present in the
18 water and sediments of Bizerte lagoon by combining a survey of farmers in the region and
19 monitoring of water pollution using passive samplers. Both spot and POCIS sampling
20 techniques were used. This is the first time these techniques have been used in Tunisia to
21 identify contamination by polar pesticides.

22 **2. Material and methods**

23 2.1 Study area

24 The Bizerte lagoon is located in the southwestern Mediterranean Sea, on the northern coast of
25 Tunisia (37°8'–37°14' N, 9°46'–9°56' E; Fig. 1). Its surface area is 128 km² and its average

1 depth is 7 m (Béjaoui et al. 2008). A 7 km long channel (300 m wide and 12 m deep) connects
2 the lagoon to the Mediterranean Sea. The lagoon is supplied with fresh water from the
3 surrounding 384 km² watershed through seven oueds (M'razig, Garaa, Guenine, Ben Hassine,
4 Chegui, Gharek and Tinja) (Fig. 1). By definition, an oued is a stream whose size depends on
5 the quantity of rainfall. It can be a big river or a small stream (Ben Salem 2017). The
6 watershed receives waste from several anthropogenic activities (aquaculture waste, industrial
7 sewage, fertilizers and pesticides) (Ben Said et al. 2010). The Bizerte lagoon watershed is
8 surrounded by agricultural zones (Tinja, Menzel Bourguiba, and South of Bizerte) (Fig.1).
9 The smallest agricultural areas are located in the Tinja region, particularly around Tinja oued
10 (D). The area represents 39% of the total area. The majority of crops planted there are cereals
11 and fodder crops. One oued was selected in each of the three areas for sampling; Chegui oued
12 (B) (Menzel Bourguiba), Garaa oued (C) (South of Bizerte) and Tinja oued (D) (Tinja) (Fig.
13 1). The Chegui oued (B) is located in the downstream part of the Bizerte lagoon watershed,
14 with a high percentage of arable land. The two other oueds are situated in the upstream part of
15 the catchment with a smaller percentage of arable land. These surrounding oueds discharge
16 their effluents into the lagoon, and for this reason, a lagoon sampling site (A) was chosen to
17 study the impact of agricultural pesticides on this aquatic ecosystem. To combat fungal
18 diseases and weeds, farmers apply different pesticides depending on the season. Hence,
19 samples were collected in three sampling campaigns in October 2015 (autumn), March 2016
20 (spring) and June 2016 (summer).

21 2.2 Survey of pesticides used: methodology

22 Three zones (South of Bizerte, Tinja and Menzel Bourguiba) were chosen to investigate the
23 pesticides used. Data was first collected from the Regional Commissioner for Agricultural
24 Development (RCAD) and their representatives in delegations called Extension Territorial
25 Cells (ETC), to better understand the characteristics of the watershed. Representative samples

1 of the general population of farmers were interviewed (50 people), all of whom cultivate land
2 around the Bizerte lagoon (Fig.1). The farmers who were selected for the survey were those
3 whose land was located closest to the lagoon and to the oueds that feed the watershed. The
4 interview was semi-directive.

5 The interviews were structured in two parts: the first part collected general information (age,
6 gender, level of education), while the second part focused on farming (extent of arable land,
7 type of crops cultivated, disease frequency, pesticides used, period and frequency of
8 treatments). The field survey was carried out in February and March 2015.

9 A list of commercial pesticides with numerous active ingredients was drawn up based on the
10 data and on the information collected in the survey. For each commercial pesticide, the
11 suppliers provided the dose per gram and per hectare, and the dose of active ingredients per
12 hectare was determined according to the pesticide formula. The concentration of active
13 ingredients used by farmers was calculated based on the dilution and the volume of water
14 sprayed per hectare (applied dose $g\ ha^{-1}$). A list of active ingredients was selected and ranked
15 according to this dose ($g\ ha^{-1}$).

16 2.3 Water sampling procedures

17 Both passive and grab sampling was performed at the four sites (the lagoon ((A); $37^{\circ}10.957'N$
18 $9^{\circ}51.355'E$), Chegui oued ((B); $37^{\circ}9'20''\ N$ and $9^{\circ}54'13''\ E$)), Garaa oued ((C); $37^{\circ}13'34''\ N$
19 and $9^{\circ}44'29''\ E$) and Tinja oued ((D); $37^{\circ}11'18''\ N$ and $9^{\circ}46'54''E$) (Fig. 1). Three sampling
20 campaigns were conducted in October 2015 (autumn), March 2016 (spring) and June 2016
21 (summer). At each site, POCIS were deployed in triplicate ($n=3$) for a mean period of 21 days
22 (Ibrahim et al. 2013b). They were placed in cages and submerged vertically in the water
23 column. As quality control, a field blank was transported to the site and exposed to the air
24 each time the immersed samplers were retrieved from the water (Ibrahim et al. 2013b). On the
25 days of the deployment and retrieval of the POCIS samplers, grab water samples were

1 collected in clean amber glass bottles at the spot where each cage was immersed. The
2 retrieved POCIS were rinsed with ultrapure water, wrapped in aluminum foil and placed in a
3 plastic bag. Both grab and POCIS samples were stored in cool conditions during transport to
4 the laboratory and until extraction. During each sampling campaign, the physical parameters
5 (water column temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, and salinity) were determined using field
6 multi-parameter sensors.

7 2.4 Sediment sampling procedure

8 Sediment samples were collected at the four selected sites in the Bizerte lagoon watershed
9 (the lagoon (A), Chegui oued (B), Garaa oued (C) and Tinja oued (D)) (Fig. 1), at three
10 sampling campaigns (autumn, spring, summer). Sediments were sampled using plexiglass
11 cylindrical cores (30 cm long, 3.6 cm diameter). Only the superficial sediment layer (less than
12 10 cm) was sampled. Three replicates were collected per sampling site then transferred to an
13 icebox in the dark. In the laboratory, the samples were kept in the freezer until extraction.
14 Before extraction, frozen samples were freeze-dried then passed through a stainless steel sieve
15 (200- μ m mesh) and stored at 4 °C until analysis (Barhoumi et al. 2013).

16 2.5 Analytical procedures

17 2.5.1 Chemicals and materials

18 Thirty-two targeted compounds, mainly herbicides and fungicides, were analyzed (Table1).
19 The compounds included 25 pesticides (Acetochlor, Alachlor, Atrazine, Azoxystrobin,
20 Carbendazim, Chlortoluron, Dimethomorph, Diuron, Epoxiconazole, Flazasulfuron,
21 Imidachlopid, Isoproturon, Linuron, Metalaxyl, Metholachlor, Oxadixyl, Penconazole,
22 Prochloraz, Propyzamide, Prosulfocarb, Pyrimethanil, Simazine, Tebuconazole,
23 Terbutylazine, Tetraconazole) and seven degradation products (DCPMU, DCPU, DEA,
24 DET, DIA, Simazine hydroxy, Terbutylazine hydroxy).

1 Analytical standards (purity > 99%) were purchased from Cluzeau Info Labo (Sainte Foy la
2 Grande, France). Deuterated-labeled compounds were atrazine-d5 (CAS: 163165-75-1) as
3 recovery control and simazine-d5 (CAS: 220621-41-0) as internal standard. High
4 performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) grade solvents used were acetonitrile from
5 Biosolve (Dieuze, France) and formic acid from Carlo Erba Reagents (Peypin, France).
6 Ultrapure water was generated with a MilliPore Synergy UV water purification system from
7 Merck Millipore (Billerica, US). Glass-fiber filters (GF/F) (0.7 μm pore size) purchased from
8 Whatman (Maidstone, UK) were used to filter the water samples. Oasis HLB[®] cartridges (60
9 μm , 6 cm^3 , 500 mg) were obtained from Waters Corporation (Milford, USA) and a Visiprep
10 Solid Phase Extraction (SPE) vacuum manifold from Supelco (Bellefonte, USA) was used for
11 SPE. POCIS were purchased from Expos Meter AB Company (Tavelsjö, Sweden) with the
12 pharmaceutical receiving phase comprised of approximately 230 mg of the solid adsorbent *N*-
13 vinylpyrrolidone-divinylbenzene (Oasis HLB[®]). The sampling area of the POCIS device was
14 41 cm^2 . The 3 mL polypropylene cartridges used to recover the POCIS receiving phases were
15 from Supelco (Bellefonte, USA).

16 2.5.2 POCIS and water sample extraction

17 Grab samples (500 mL) were filtered through GF/F filters to eliminate suspended matter,
18 spiked with 50 μL of atrazine d5 (1 $\text{ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1}$ acetone) and extracted by solid phase extraction
19 (SPE) using Oasis HLB[®] cartridges. Prior to extraction, the Oasis HLB[®] cartridges were
20 activated with 5 mL of acetonitrile under vacuum, followed by 5 mL of methanol (MeOH)
21 and 5 mL of ultrapure water (Ibrahim et al. 2013b). Before elution, they were dried under
22 vacuum for 1 hour. Analytes were recovered by eluting the cartridges with 8 mL of
23 acetonitrile at a flow rate of 1 mL min^{-1} .

24 After they were retrieved, the receiving phases of the POCIS were transferred into an empty
25 solid-phase extraction tube packed with polyethylene (SPE) frit, 20 μm porosity. The sorbents

1 were spiked with 50 μL of atrazine d5 (1 $\text{ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1}$ acetone) then eluted with 8 mL of
2 acetonitrile.

3 Both for Oasis HLB[®] cartridges and POCIS receiving phase elution, the extracts were
4 concentrated under a gentle stream of nitrogen to obtain a final extract of 1.5 mL. This final
5 extract were then spiked with 150 μL of the internal standard simazine d5 (1 $\text{ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1}$
6 acetonitrile) and analyzed by HPLC-MS/MS (Ibrahim et al. 2013).

7 2.5.3 Sediment extraction

8 The extraction was carried out using an Accelerated Solvent Extraction (ASE) system
9 (Dionex[®], France) with a hexane/acetone mixture of solvents (50/50, v/v). The parameters
10 used during the extraction procedure were as follows: temperature 120 °C, static time 5 min,
11 pressure 1500 psi, heating time 6 min, flush volume 60%, and purge time 100 s. Atrazine d5
12 recovery control (1 $\text{ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1}$ acetonitrile) was added to the sediment prior to the ASE step and
13 the resulting extracts (hexane/acetone) were cleaned on a Strata SAX[®] (8B-S008-JCH). To
14 recover analytes, elution was carried out with 3 mL of MeOH and 3 mL of dichloromethane
15 (CH_2Cl_2), respectively. Purified extracts were completely evaporated under a gentle stream of
16 nitrogen and then dissolved in 1.5 mL of acetonitrile (Barhoumi et al. 2013). Before analysis,
17 all sample extracts were spiked with 120 μL of the deuterated internal standard simazine d5 (1
18 $\text{ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1}$ acetonitrile) and then analyzed by HPLC-MS/MS.

19 The percentage of finer grain size fractions ($< 63 \mu\text{m}$) of each sediment sample was
20 determined gravimetrically after wet sieving (Savinov 2000). Total organic carbon (TOC)
21 content was measured using the coulometry method in a 702 Coulomat, after decarbonization
22 of sediments with 2N HCl at 60 °C overnight (Ouertani et al. 2006).

23 2.5.4 Liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry (HPLC-MS/MS) analysis

24 The pesticide analysis was performed by HPLC-MS/MS using an Alliance HPLC system
25 (Waters Series 2695). The HPLC is equipped with a quaternary pump, a vacuum degasser and

1 an autosampler. Analytic separation was achieved with a Kinetex C18 analytical column (100
2 mm * 4.6 I.D * 260 Å, Phenomenex). The volume injected was 25 µL. Acetonitrile (A) and
3 ultrapure water (B), both with 0.05% formic acid, were used as mobile phases at a constant
4 flow rate of 0.4 mL min⁻¹. The linear gradient was started at 40% for 0.2 min, ramped to 80%
5 for 8 min, then to 100% for 1 min and finally back to the initial conditions for 2 min. A triple
6 quadrupole mass spectrometer (Micromass Quatromicro TM, Waters) equipped with an
7 electrospray ionization source (ESI) was used as the detector device. The spectrometer
8 operated in positive ESI mode under the following conditions: capillary voltage (3.5 kV),
9 source temperature (120 °C), desolvation temperature (300 °C), drying (600 L h⁻¹), and
10 nebulization gas (N₂) flow (30 L h⁻¹). Argon was used as the collision gas. For each
11 compound, acquisition was performed in the multiple reaction-monitoring modes (MRM).
12 Two transitions were retained: one was used for quantification and the other for confirmation
13 (Table S1: Supplementary materials).

14 2.5.5 Concentrations of pesticides in the water during POCIS deployment

15 The accumulation of contaminants by passive samplers typically follows first-order kinetics,
16 which includes an initial integrative phase, followed by curvilinear and equilibrium-
17 partitioning phases. In the linear region of the POCIS uptake, the amount of a chemical
18 accumulated in the sampler (M) is described by equation (1):

$$M = C_w \cdot R_s \cdot t \quad (1)$$

19 where R_s is the sampling rate (L day⁻¹), C_w is the time-weighted concentration of the
20 compound in water (ng L⁻¹) and t the exposure time (days).

21 For each pesticide, the sampling rate was determined by dividing the slope of the linear
22 regression curve by the mean aqueous concentration of the selected compounds over the 15
23 days of exposure time (Ibrahim et al. 2013b). POCIS sampling rates (Table 1) were

1 determined in laboratory conditions for each compound (Ibrahim et al. 2013b). Given that
2 they depend on environmental conditions such as flow, temperature, pH, organic matter and
3 biofouling (Charlestra et al. 2012; Yabuki et al. 2016), they allow the calculation of semi-
4 quantitative concentrations of pesticides in water and the comparison of the relative levels of
5 contamination between sites (Ibrahim et al. 2013b). Time-weighted averaged concentrations
6 (TWAC) in water were calculated with the equation proposed by Miège et al. 2013 (2):

$$C_{water} = C_{pocis} \cdot M_{pocis} / R_s \cdot t \quad (2)$$

7 where C_{water} is the mean concentration of the contaminant (over the sampling period) in the
8 ambient water ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$); C_{pocis} is the concentration in the POCIS ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$); M_{pocis} is the mass of
9 adsorbent phase in the POCIS (g); R_s is the sampling rate (L day^{-1}), which corresponds to the
10 volume of water purified per unit of time; and t is the total exposure time (days).

11 Among the 40 compounds inventoried in the survey, 15 were selected (Table 2) as being the
12 most representative, according to (i) the use rate per hectare; (ii) the type of crops grown in
13 the zone; (iii) the concentration of active ingredient in the commercial pesticide. For
14 analytical reasons, not all the selected active ingredients could be analyzed by the HPLC-
15 MS/MS method developed in our laboratory. In particular, glyphosate and 2,4 D were not
16 included in the final list of targeted pesticides. The final list of active ingredients comprised
17 32 compounds analyzed by liquid chromatography mass spectrometry (Table 1).

18 2.5.6 Quality assurance/control

19 The linearity, limits of detection (LODs) and limits of quantification (LOQs), precision and
20 accuracy of the analytical methods were carefully checked. The LODs were calculated as
21 $3S_y/x/b$ and the LOQs as $10S_y/x/b$, where S_y/x is the residual standard deviation and b is the
22 slope of the matrix calibration curves. The LODs and LOQs obtained by HPLC-MS/MS
23 (analytical LOD and LOQ expressed in $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) are listed in Table 1. The LODs and LOQs of

1 all the selected pesticides were determined from the calibration curves for each analytical
2 campaign in which $R^2 > 0.98$. The analytical limits of detection ranged from $0.10 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ to
3 $2.20 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ and the limits of quantification from $0.40 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ to $7.50 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. The LOQs of the
4 POCIS (which were calculated from the equation of (Poulier et al. 2014)), water and
5 sediment samples are also listed in Table 1.

6 Mean recovery from the synthetic water solution spiked with the 32 compounds was 63%, the
7 highest recovery being for simazine (101%) and the lowest for DCPU (8%). Flazasulfuron,
8 hydroxy-terbuthylazine and hydroxy-simazine were not recovered (Table 1).

9 A certificated reference material (WaRTM Pollution Nitrogen Pesticides, Lot No, P246-674)
10 purchased from the ERA Waters Company (Golden, USA) was used to determine pesticide
11 recoveries in water samples. The reference material was a water solution composed of 24
12 pesticides including six of the pesticides selected for our study (Alachlor, Atrazine, DEA,
13 DIA, Metolachlor and Simazine). The concentrations of pesticide in the reference material
14 ranged between $16.80 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ and $3.37 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. The global recovery yields were for atrazine
15 ($108 \pm 4\%$), for alachlor ($78 \pm 4\%$), for DEA ($61 \pm 3\%$), for DIA ($58 \pm 3\%$), for metolachlor
16 ($110 \pm 2\%$), for simazine ($79 \pm 2\%$) after solid phase extraction (Oasis HLB) and HPLC-MS/MS
17 analysis ($n=9$) with our laboratory method. The mean extraction recoveries with atrazine-d5
18 were $98 \pm 11\%$ and $92 \pm 12\%$ for the passive and grab samples, respectively ($n=36$ samples).
19 The relative standard deviation (RSD) obtained for the analysis of the internal standard
20 simazine-d5 was $17 \pm 6\%$ for all the HPLC-MS/MS injections ($n=108$ injections).

21 2.6 Statistical analyses

22 Triplicate analytical measurements were made for all the analyses and the data are reported as
23 mean \pm standard deviation. Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated to investigate
24 possible relationships between parameters. Statistical significance was set as $p < 0.05$. The

1 statistical treatment of the data was performed using the STATISTICA 6.0 Analysis System
2 version 5.

3 **3. Results and discussion**

4 3.1 Survey results

5 According to the farmers and engineers of Regional Commissioner for Agricultural
6 Development (RCAD), field crops (wheat, legumes and oats) occupy the largest percentage of
7 cultivated fields. Wheat accounts for 58% (i.e., 3.153 ha) of the total cultivable area, and
8 legumes and oats for 13% and 10%, respectively. The dominance of this type of crop could be
9 related to economic factors. Indeed, since the 1970s, Tunisia and other North African
10 countries have benefited from the support of ICARDA (International Center for Agricultural
11 Research in Arid Zones) to develop their cultivar production programs, with the objective of
12 intensifying the amount of cereal crops and legumes (Nefzaoui et al. 2012). This result is
13 consistent with those obtained in an investigation commissioned by the Tunisian Ministry of
14 Agriculture (DGEDA, 2006), which reported that the areas treated in Tunisia correspond to
15 low crops, which represent 73% of all cereals grown.

16 Our survey results showed that farmers use 47 commercial pesticides, mainly fungicides
17 (42.5%), herbicides (42.5%), and insecticides (15.0%). The prospected regions are wetlands,
18 where fungal diseases (Septoria, rust and mildew) develop easily, hence, intensive use of
19 fungicides by farmers was observed. Fungicides are used twice a year (at the end of March
20 and May) as preventive treatments. They are also used as a curative treatment for "rust"
21 whenever there is an outbreak of the disease. The survey also revealed high use of herbicides
22 to control the weeds that compete with crops for access to water, light and soil nutrients.
23 Herbicides are usually applied twice a year, in autumn (October) and spring (March).

24 Table 2 lists the most frequently used active ingredients based on our inventory of
25 commercial pesticides in the regions around the Bizerte lagoon surveyed. The active

1 ingredients are classified first according to the type of pesticide (herbicides, fungicides and
2 insecticides) then by the dose of the active ingredients applied per hectare (calculated according
3 to the dilution and the water volume sprayed per hectare) and by target crop, mainly field
4 crops (wheat, legumes, oats). The list contains 40 active ingredients (Table 2). Among these
5 compounds, 87.5% are approved for use in Tunisia (Mezghani et al. 2016). Our list of active
6 ingredients is in agreement with the results of a study by Ben Salem et al. (2016), who used
7 another approach to calculate the total quantities of active ingredients, i.e., the percentage use
8 of active ingredients was calculated by dividing the number of farmers who used the active
9 ingredient concerned by the total number of farmers surveyed (*100). Finally, the amount of
10 each active ingredient ($Q_{\text{substance}}$) is the product of the cultivated area (ha) divided by the
11 percentage of pesticide used by the assay of the active ingredient in the pesticide. Despite the
12 different methods of calculation used in the two studies, some of the ingredients we found
13 were also found by Ben Salem et al. (2016) including herbicides (e.g, Iodosulfuron,
14 Mesosulfuron, 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4 D), Glyphosate, and Fenoxaprops) and
15 fungicides (e.g, Tebuconazole, Epoxiconazole, Azoxystrobin). The study by Ben Salem et al.
16 (2016) revealed that insecticides are the least used, and only two pyrethroids were inventoried
17 (Deltamethrin and Bifenthrin).

18 For our study, based on the calculations of the dispersed dose (g ha^{-1}), the inventoried active
19 ingredients were ranked to obtain a list of 40 targeted compounds (Table 2). The survey
20 revealed that most of the pesticides were used on wheat, legumes and oats, which are the main
21 crops grown in the regions surveyed. A restricted list is thus proposed containing 15 active
22 ingredients of fungicides (Azoxystrobin, Chlorothalonil, Prochloraz, Tebuconazole,
23 Fluzilazole, Flutriafol, Propiconazole, Carbendazim, Prothioconazole, and Epoxiconazole)
24 and herbicides (Glyphosate, Simazine, Bentazone, Prosulfocarb, 2,4D). The estimated
25 concentrations of these compounds ranged from 200 g ha^{-1} for Azoxystrobin to 0.47 g h^{-1} for

1 Epoxiconazole. Despite their high dose per hectare, some pesticides were not included in this
2 list because they are not used to treat the field crops grown in the survey area, mainly wheat.
3 This is the case of Difenoconazole, Mancozeb, Maneb, Zineb, and Boscalid, which are used
4 to protect vines.

5 3.2 Surface water quality

6 3.2.1 Occurrence of pesticide in water

7 To study the occurrence of target pesticides, detection and quantification frequencies were
8 calculated, based on the results obtained by the two sampling techniques (grab and passive
9 sampler). By definition, the frequency of detection and quantification campaigns correspond
10 to the ratio of the number of times in which one compound was detected and quantified
11 divided by the total number of sites analyzed in the campaigns, respectively.

12 Of the 32 pesticides studied (Table 1), 23 were detected using passive sampling technique
13 (Fig. 2A), which represents 72% of the total studied pesticides. Whereas, 11 compounds were
14 quantified (34 %) with the same sampling technique (POCIS): Simazine, Chlortoluron, DIA,
15 Acetochlor, Alachlor, DCPU, Isoproturon, DET, Epoxiconazole, Tebuconazole,
16 Azoxystrobin (Fig. 2A). Among the detected compounds using POCIS, two fungicides
17 (Epoxiconazole and Tebuconazole) and one herbicide (Simazine) were detected at a
18 frequency of 100%. The accumulation of these compounds in the POCIS receiving phase
19 (OASIS HLB) is favored by their $\log K_{ow}$ values (3.30 for Epoxiconazole; 2.18 for Simazine;
20 3.70 for Tebuconazole) (Hijosa-Valsero et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2016). Grab sampling
21 allowed the detection of 44% of all target pesticides and the quantification of 31% (Fig.2B).

22 Acetochlor and Alachlor were only quantified by POCIS. Conversely, Prosulfocarb was not
23 quantified by POCIS, which can be attributed to the low sampling rate ($R_s= 0.071 \text{ L d}^{-1}$)
24 (Fig.2A). Retention of Prosulfocarb by POCIS is not favored and the concentration obtained
25 was lower than the analytical LOQ. It should be noted that DET, by-products of

1 terbuthylazine, was quantified only by the POCIS (5.00 ng L⁻¹, Table 3). Thus, passive
2 samplers could lead to a more representative level of contamination than that provided by
3 grab sampling and allowed us to measure low concentrations of pesticides (Lissalde et al.
4 2011; Poulhier et al. 2015; Van Metre et al. 2017).

5 The most frequently detected and quantified compounds at all the study sites, were two
6 herbicides (Simazine, Chlortoluron), and two fungicides (Epoconazole, Tebuconazole)
7 regardless of the sampling technique (Fig.2 A and B). The high level of detection and
8 quantification of these compounds at the different sites by passive sampling (Fig.3) can be
9 explained by their intensive use in the treatment of crops in the Bizerte lagoon watershed.
10 Indeed, Simazine is the active ingredient of "Agzoline", which is a pesticide sold in Tunisia
11 to treat weeds and field crops, particularly legumes, one of the main crops cultivated in our
12 survey areas. Epoconazole and Tebuconazole are the active ingredients most widely used by
13 farmers to treat crops. Both are applied to wheat, barley and oats. They are used to control
14 powdery mildew, helminthosporiosis, septoria and brown rust. Even if Chlortoluron is not
15 inventoried in the list of active ingredients used for crops in the watershed, this substance was
16 one of the major compounds detected during the sampling campaigns (up to 60%). This
17 compound is one of the active ingredients of two commercial products, "Dicuran 500" and
18 "Tolurex 50" that are used to treat weeds and wild oats in wheat and barley fields; probably,
19 it was used by farmers who were not interviewed in our survey.

20 3.2.2 Space and time variations in concentrations of pesticides in water

21 The total amount of pesticides (\sum pesticides), obtained by passive sampling and present at
22 each sampling site, was used to assess the impact of the agricultural activity. The sum of
23 pesticides (\sum pesticides) measured for all the seasons vary according to sites (Table 3). The
24 highest concentration of \sum pesticides was measured in Chegui oued (B): 1,246 ng L⁻¹, and the
25 lowest in Tinja oued (D): 35.9 ng L⁻¹ (Table 3). The total concentrations of pollutants in Garaa

1 oued (C) were close to 202.6 ng L⁻¹. Among the oued sites, the least impacted sites were Tinja
2 (D) and Garaa (C) oueds. This may be due to the fact they are located in the downstream part
3 of the Bizerte lagoon watershed, and to the lesser presence of large agricultural areas around
4 them. Total pesticide concentrations in the lagoon itself were only 68 ng L⁻¹; this low
5 concentration compared to the concentration in Chegui oued can be explained by the dilution
6 of the oued water in the lagoon (Carafa et al. 2007).

7 The intensity of agricultural activities is another argument to justify the high concentration of
8 target compounds in Chegui oued. According to the survey, wheat accounts for 60% of crops
9 grown at this site and legumes for 65%. These crops are treated with herbicides and
10 fungicides, mainly Simazine and Tebuconazole. Our results are in agreement with the results
11 of previous studies showing that the highest concentrations of pesticides are generally
12 measured at sampling sites located in areas with a high proportion of arable land (Zhang et al.
13 2016).

14 Variations over time showed that the concentrations of \sum pesticides vary with the season (Fig.
15 4). The high concentrations measured in the Chegui oued (B) compared to concentrations at
16 the other sites can be explained by its geographical and hydrological properties. Chegui oued
17 is located on the upstream side of the Bizerte lagoon catchment, the highest concentrations
18 were found in Chegui oued in summer (B) (832.5 ng L⁻¹); this could be due to the transport of
19 pollutants from agricultural lands into the oued because of the rains, which drain the
20 pesticides from crops to the sampling sites. Whereas, value of 413.8 ng L⁻¹ was found in the
21 spring season (Fig. 4). Concerning Garaa oued (C), the highest concentration was observed in
22 spring (194.1 ng L⁻¹). For site (A) and (D), the \sum pesticides was very low regardless the season
23 (e.g. concentrations were 20.8 ng L⁻¹ in the spring in sites (A) and (D)). These results can be
24 explained by the environmental conditions in these areas (solar radiation and water
25 temperatures) (Bondarenko et al. 2004; Navarro et al. 2004; Carafa et al. 2007; Carvalho et al.

1 2009). Temperature can affect the sorption rate of pollutants onto suspended matter and
2 organic matter (Wu and Gschwend 1986). When temperatures increase, the solubility of the
3 compounds increases, and biodegradation and photodegradation are favored (Eriksson et al.
4 2003).

5 In the Mediterranean basin, the annual average global solar radiation reaching the surface is
6 168 W/m² (Chelbi et al. 2015). In Bizerte city (located in the study area), the annual average
7 global solar radiation is 208 W/m² (Ben Othman et al. 2018).

8 The most frequently measured compounds with high concentrations were Simazine and
9 Tebuconazole in the spring and summer in Chegui oued (B) (Table 3). This result is not
10 surprising as these pesticides are mostly used to treat the wheat and legumes grown around
11 this study site. The concentrations of Simazine found in spring and summer by passive
12 sampling were 168 ng L⁻¹ and 431.6 ng L⁻¹, respectively (Table 3). The concentrations of
13 Tebuconazole were 142 ng L⁻¹ and 190.5 ng L⁻¹ in spring and summer (Table 3). Moreover,
14 the significant concentrations of fungicides (Tebuconazole, Epoxiconazole) in the spring can
15 be explained by their application in April and May to protect wheat against fungal diseases
16 such as septoria and rust.

17 The results suggest significant variations in concentrations as a function of the agricultural
18 seasons. For example, herbicides are widely applied to field crops, particularly legumes and
19 wheat, in spring and autumn. This explains the abundance of herbicides at the study sites
20 during these periods and a few months after they were sprayed in the fields (Zhang et al.
21 2016).

22 Pesticide concentrations (obtained by grab sampling) (Table 4) are in agreement with those
23 obtained by POCIS (Table 3). Indeed, the highest concentration of DIA, Simazine,
24 Tebuconazole, and Epoxiconazole were observed in spring even for Chegui oued (B), Garaa
25 oued (C).

1 Simazine was mainly found in spring in Chegui oued (B), Garaa oued (C) and Tinja oued (D)
2 with concentrations of 730.9 ng L⁻¹, 56.9 ng L⁻¹ and 32.5 ng L⁻¹, respectively (Table 4). These
3 values are below than those of the existing Quality Standards in Directive 2013/39 / EU of the
4 European Parliament and the Council of 12 August 2013 (1 µg L⁻¹) (EU 2013). The
5 concentrations of Tebuconazole in the same season and at the same sites were 500.3 ng L⁻¹,
6 178.4 ng L⁻¹ and 56.5 ng L⁻¹, respectively (Table 4). According to previous studies, for a
7 representative diagnosis of pesticide occurrence, POCIS and spot sampling should be used as
8 a complement to grab sampling (Poulier et al. 2014; Miège et al. 2015, Branchet et al. 2018).
9 Passive sampling is recommended by water policy in the European Commission Guidance
10 Document (EC Guidance document n°19) and in Directive 2013/39/EU (EU 2013).

11 Additionally, the results of monitoring of the water column by passive and grab sampling
12 confirmed those of the survey (Table 3, Table 4). Indeed, screening revealed some pesticides
13 identified during the survey, including Simazine, Tebuconazole, Prosulfocarb, and
14 Epoxiconazole. These are among the compounds most widely used by farmers to treat wheat.

15 3.3 Occurrence and variations in pesticide concentrations in sediments in space and over time

16 3.3.1 Occurrence of pesticides in sediments

17 Studying the composition of coastal sediments is one of the main ways used to identify the
18 level and source of contamination of marine ecosystems (Zaghden et al. 2017). Indeed,
19 sediments are known to trap hydrophobic contaminants, particularly non-polar pesticides like
20 chlorinated compounds (Meakins et al. 1995). Consequently, sediments were also
21 investigated to complete the diagnosis of the contamination of the Bizerte lagoon watershed
22 by agricultural pesticides. The detection and quantification frequencies of the targeted
23 compounds during the three campaigns and at the four study sites are summarized in Fig. 5.
24 No compounds were quantified in Tinja oued (D). The most impacted sediments were those
25 of Chegui oued (B) and Garaa oued (C). The majority of the targeted compounds, e.g.

1 Alachlor, Acetochlor, Metolachlor, were detected at a frequency of 34%. Prosulfocarb,
2 Epoxiconazole and Tebuconazole were detected at a frequency of 100% in the Chegui and
3 Garaa oueds. These compounds were also quantified at these two sites (B and C). Indeed,
4 Prosulfocarb was quantified at frequencies of 100% and 34% in Garaa oued (C) and Chegui
5 oued (B), respectively. However, Tebuconazole and Epoxionazole were quantified at
6 frequencies of 100% and 68% in Chegui oued (B) and Garaa oued (C), respectively.

7 3.3.2 Space and time variations in the concentration of pesticide in sediments

8 The sum of pesticides (Σ pesticides) in the sediments of the watershed of the Bizerte lagoon
9 ranged from 9.8 ng g⁻¹ dw in the lagoon (A) to 53 ng g⁻¹ dw in the Chegui oued (C) (Table 5).

10 Particle size is an important parameter to consider when analyzing sediment samples
11 (Ackermann 2008). In the present study, the percentage of fine particles (< 63 μ m) in the
12 sediments differed at each site, varying from 12% to 69% in the lagoon (A), from 62% to
13 77% in Chegui oued (B), from 94% to 100% in Garaa oued, and from 11% to 57% in Tinja
14 oued (D) (Table 5). In spring saison, the higher total concentration of pesticides in Chegui
15 oued sediments (31.1 ng g⁻¹), can be explained by the higher content of fine particles; the
16 large surface area available (per unit of mass) of the small particles increases the adsorption of
17 pollutants onto the grains (Gao et al. 1998). Additionally, fine sediment particles may
18 accumulate pesticides due to their mineral compounds (e.g, silicate, goethite and hematite,
19 montmorillonite, iron oxides, manganese oxides, illite, etc). No apparent relationship was
20 found between TOC and grain size (< 63 μ m) at the sites analyzed ($p > 0.05$, $n=12$). In
21 addition, no significant correlations were found between TOC content, grain size (< 63 μ m)
22 and the majority of compounds analyzed. This implies that the distributions and
23 concentrations of pesticides are not only determined by sedimentary characteristics such as
24 TOC and grain size (Mai et al. 2005), but probably by other factors such as sources, transport,
25 mixing, and deposition that were not analyzed in this study.

1 Table 5 reports the individual concentration of pesticides, the highest concentration of
2 Tebuconazole was found in Chegui oued (B) in spring (31.1 ng g⁻¹, dw) (Table 5). The
3 highest concentration of Prosulfocarb (6.3 ng g⁻¹ dw) was measured in Garaa oued (C) in
4 autumn. A relatively high *log K_{ow}* (octanol/water coefficient) means that pollutants can be
5 strongly adsorbed onto sediments particules and organic matter (PAPP 2010). For
6 Tebuconazole and Prosulfocarb, *log K_{ow}* values were 3.70 and 4.48, respectively (INERIS
7 2011, 2013), these values indicate that Tebuconazole and Prosulfocarb are sorbed to
8 sediments (Chamberlain et al. 1996; Čadková et al. 2013).

9 3.4 Space time variations in pesticide concentrations in the Bizerte lagoon watershed

10 These results reveal a space-time variation in pesticide concentrations in the water column
11 and in the sediments in the Bizerte lagoon watershed. These results show that among the
12 pesticides found in the sediments and water, 60% are approved for use in Tunisia (20%
13 herbicides, 36% fungicides, 4% insecticides).

14 These results are in agreement with those of Jiménez et al. (1999), who showed that pesticide
15 concentrations in water and sediments were subject to seasonal variations in 27 Mediterranean
16 lakes. Moreover, the presence and distribution of pesticides in the water and/or in the
17 sediments depends on the physical-chemical properties of the compounds (*log K_{ow}* and water
18 solubility). Some of the pesticides (e.g, Atrazine, Diuron) found in the water at the sites we
19 investigated are not yet approved for use in Tunisia. These herbicides (Atrazine, Diuron) pose
20 a serious risk for aquatic ecosystems as well as for the environment (Moncada 2004; Ralston-
21 Hooper et al. 2009).

22 Literature on levels of polar pesticides in samples of water is scarce (in particular on
23 fungicides and herbicides), making it difficult to compare our results with those obtained
24 elsewhere in the world. In sediments, the studied pesticides are mainly the organochlorines
25 (Barhoumi 2014; Ben Salem et al. 2016). The concentrations of total pesticides in water and

1 sediments in the lagoon and oueds were lower than those measured in Mondego River Estuary
2 in Portugal (Cruzeiro et al. 2016), Ria Formosa lagoon in Portugal (Cruzeiro et al. 2015),
3 Tagus River basin in Greece (Papadakis et al. 2015), in a river basin in Costa Rica (Carazo-
4 Rojas et al. 2018) and in Méfou watershed in Cameroon (Branchet et al. 2018). However, the
5 concentrations we measured were higher than those measured in the Arade River estuary in
6 Portugal (Gonzalez-Rey et al. 2015), in the River Ugie in Scotland (Zhang et al. 2016) and in
7 the Marque River in France (Criquet et al. 2017).

8 The concentrations of total pesticides in the lagoon and oued sediments studied here are lower
9 than those reported in Mediterranean coastal lagoons in SE Spain (Moreno-González and
10 León 2017).

11 **4. Conclusion**

12 This study highlights a worrying issue that affects the majority of Mediterranean lagoons:
13 human pressure, especially agricultural pollution. The Bizerte lagoon is one of the most
14 affected by this anthropization in particular by agriculture activities, justifying our
15 investigation of the occurrence of herbicides and fungicides. This study confirmed
16 contamination by polar pesticides (herbicides and fungicides) in the watershed and in the
17 lagoon ecosystem. Analyses of samples from the four sampling sites revealed the highest
18 contaminations in the water and sediments of Chegui oued. The results of our analyses are in
19 agreement with survey data: several molecules (including Simazine, Tebuconazole and
20 Prosulfocarb) were found at the target sites. Simazine and Tebuconazole molecules, the most
21 significant species present in the water samples, were identified by passive sampling at a
22 maximum concentration of 431.6 ng L⁻¹ and 190.5 ng L⁻¹ in the Chegui oued, respectively.
23 The molecule found at the highest concentrations in the sediments was Tebuconazole (31.1 ng
24 g⁻¹, dw) and although Prosulfocarb was detected in trace amounts in the water samples, a
25 concentration of 6.3 ng g⁻¹ dw was found in the sediments of the Garaa oued. The POCIS

1 technique was used for the first time in Tunisia and was shown to improve the analysis of the
2 trace concentrations of polar pollutants. The results of this work support the hypothesis that
3 the ability of passive samplers (POCIS) to integrate the contaminant concentrations over a
4 period of exposure enables better quantification of contamination at low concentrations.

5 **Acknowledgements**

6 This study was financed by LMI Cosy-MED (IRD), *Institut Mines Télécom Mines Alès* and
7 the Tunisian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (Carthage University),
8 The authors would like to thank the Tunisian farmers and fishermen of Bizerte for their kind
9 assistance in the monitoring studies.

10 **References**

- 11 (FAO) F and AO (2015) Mediterranean coastal lagoons: sustainable management and
12 interactions among aquaculture, capture fisheries and the environment
13 (UNEP) UNEP (2001) Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). Secr
14 Stock Conv Persistent Org Pollut 56
15 Ackermann F (2008) A procedure for correcting the grain size effect in heavy metal analyses
16 of estuarine and coastal sediments A PROCEDURE FOR CORRECTING THE GRAIN
17 SIZE EFFECT IN HEAVY METAL ANALYSES OF. 37–41
18 Ahrens L, Daneshvar A, Lau AE, Kreuger J (2015) Characterization of five passive sampling
19 devices for monitoring of pesticides in water. *J Chromatogr A* 1405:1–11. doi:
20 10.1016/j.chroma.2015.05.044
21 Arellano-Aguilar O, Betancourt-Lozano M, Aguilar-Zárate G, Ponce de Leon-Hill C (2017)
22 Agrochemical loading in drains and rivers and its connection with pollution in coastal
23 lagoons of the Mexican Pacific. *Environ Monit Assess* 189:189–270. doi:
24 10.1007/s10661-017-5981-8
25 Barhoumi B (2014) Biosurveillance de la pollution de la lagune de Bizerte (Tunisie) par l ’

1 analyse comparée des niveaux de contamination et de l'écotoxicité des sédiments et du biote Badreddine Barhoumi To cite this version :

2
3
4
5 3 Barhoumi B, El Megdiche Y, Clérandeau C, et al (2016) Occurrence of polycyclic aromatic
6
7 4 hydrocarbons (PAHs) in mussel (*Mytilus galloprovincialis*) and eel (*Anguilla anguilla*)
8
9 5 from Bizerte lagoon, Tunisia, and associated human health risk assessment. Cont Shelf
10
11 Res 124:104–116. doi: 10.1016/j.csr.2016.05.012
12
13 6

14 7 Barhoumi B, Lemenach K, Devier MH, et al (2014) Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
15
16 8 (PAHs) in surface sediments from the Bizerte Lagoon, Tunisia: Levels, sources, and
17
18 9 toxicological significance. Environ Monit Assess 186:2653–2669. doi: 10.1007/s10661-
19
20 10 013-3569-5
21
22 10

23
24 11 Barhoumi B, LeMenach K, Dévier MH, et al (2013) Distribution and ecological risk of
25
26 12 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) in surface
27
28 13 sediments from the Bizerte lagoon, Tunisia. Environ Sci Pollut Res 21:6290–6302. doi:
29
30 14 10.1007/s11356-013-1709-7
31
32 14

33
34 15 Béjaoui B, Harzallah A, Moussa M, et al (2008) Analysis of hydrobiological pattern in the
35
36 16 Bizerte lagoon (Tunisia). Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 80:121–129. doi:
37
38 17 10.1016/j.ecss.2008.07.011
39
40 17

41 18 Belmonte Vega A, Garrido Frenich A, Martínez Vidal JL (2005) Monitoring of pesticides in
42
43 19 agricultural water and soil samples from Andalusia by liquid chromatography coupled to
44
45 20 mass spectrometry. Anal Chim Acta 538:117–127. doi: 10.1016/j.aca.2005.02.003
46
47 20

48
49 21 Ben Othman A, Belkilani K, Besbes M (2018) Global solar radiation on tilted surfaces in
50
51 22 Tunisia: Measurement, estimation and gained energy assessments. Energy Reports
52
53 23 4:101–109. doi: 10.1016/j.egy.2017.10.003
54
55 23

56 24 Ben Said, Said O Ben, Goñi-Urriza M, et al (2010) Bacterial community structure of
57
58 25 sediments of the bizerte lagoon (Tunisia), a southern mediterranean coastal anthropized
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 lagoon. *Microb Ecol* 59:445–456. doi: 10.1007/s00248-009-9585-x
- 2 Ben Salem F Ben, Said O Ben, Aissa P, et al (2016) Pesticides in Ichkeul Lake–Bizerta
3 Lagoon Watershed in Tunisia: use, occurrence, and effects on bacteria and free-living
4 marine nematodes. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 23:36–48. doi: 10.1007/s11356-015-4991-8
- 5 Ben Salem F (2017) First Survey of Agricultural Pesticides Used for Crops in Ichkeul Lake-
6 Bizerte Lagoon Watershed (Tunisia). 13:1–10
- 7 Bondarenko S, Gan J, Haver DL, Kabashima JN (2004) Persistence of selected
8 organophosphate and carbamate insecticides in waters from a coastal watershed. *Environ*
9 *Toxicol Chem* 23:2649–2654. doi: 10.1897/03-436
- 10 Boonyatumanond R, Jaksakul A, Pancharoen P, Tabucanon MS (2002) Monitoring of
11 organochlorine pesticides residues in green mussels (*Perna viridis*) from the coastal area
12 of Thailand. *Environ Pollut* 119:245–252. doi: 10.1016/S0269-7491(01)00329-3
- 13 Botta F, Lavison G, Couturier G, et al (2009) Transfer of glyphosate and its degradate AMPA
14 to surface waters through urban sewerage systems. *Chemosphere* 77:133–139. doi:
15 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2009.05.008
- 16 Branchet P, Cadot E, Fenet H, et al (2018) Polar pesticide contamination of an urban and peri-
17 urban tropical watershed affected by agricultural activities (Yaoundé, Center Region,
18 Cameroon). *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 25:17690–17715. doi: 10.1007/s11356-018-1798-4
- 19 Čadková E, Komárek M, Kaliszová R, et al (2013) Tebuconazole Sorption in Contrasting Soil
20 Types. *Soil Sediment Contam* 22:404–414. doi: 10.1080/15320383.2013.733448
- 21 Carabias-Martínez R, Rodríguez-Gonzalo E, Herrero-Hernández E, et al (2002)
22 Determination of herbicides and metabolites by solid-phase extraction and liquid
23 chromatography - Evaluation of pollution due to herbicides in surface and groundwaters.
24 *J Chromatogr A* 950:157–166. doi: 10.1016/S0021-9673(01)01613-2
- 25 Carafa R, Wollgast J, Canuti E, et al (2007) Seasonal variations of selected herbicides and

1 related metabolites in water, sediment, seaweed and clams in the Sacca di Goro coastal
2 lagoon (Northern Adriatic). *Chemosphere* 69:1625–1637. doi:
3 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2007.05.060

4 Carazo-Rojas E, Pérez-Rojas G, Pérez-Villanueva M, et al (2018) Pesticide monitoring and
5 ecotoxicological risk assessment in surface water bodies and sediments of a tropical
6 agro-ecosystem. *Environ Pollut* 241:800–809. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2018.06.020

7 Carro N, Cobas J, García I, et al (2014) Distribution and trend of organochlorine pesticides in
8 galicia coast using mussels as bioindicator organisms. Possible relationship to biological
9 parameters. *Chemosphere* 102:37–47. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.12.010

10 Carvalho FP, Villeneuve JP, Cattini C, et al (2009) Pesticide and PCB residues in the aquatic
11 ecosystems of Laguna de Terminos, a protected area of the coast of Campeche, Mexico.
12 *Chemosphere* 74:988–995. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2008.09.092

13 Chamberlain K, Evans AA, Bromilow RH (1996) 1-Octanol/Water Partition Coefficient (K_{ow}
14) and pK_a for Ionisable Pesticides Measured by apH-Metric Method. *Pestic Sci* 47:265–
15 271. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-9063(199607)47:3<265::AID-PS416>3.0.CO;2-F

16 Charlestra L, Amirbahman A, Courtemanch DL, et al (2012) Estimating pesticide sampling
17 rates by the polar organic chemical integrative sampler (POCIS) in the presence of
18 natural organic matter and varying hydrodynamic conditions. *Environ Pollut* 169:98–
19 104. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2012.05.001

20 Chelbi M, Gagnon Y, Waewsak J (2015) Solar radiation mapping using sunshine duration-
21 based models and interpolation techniques: Application to Tunisia. *Energy Convers*
22 *Manag* 101:203–215. doi: 10.1016/j.enconman.2015.04.052

23 Comoretto L, Chiron S (2005) Comparing pharmaceutical and pesticide loads into a small
24 Mediterranean river. *Sci Total Environ* 349:201–210. doi:
25 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.01.036

- 1 Crique J, Dumoulin D, Howsam M, et al (2017) Comparison of POCIS passive samplers vs.
2 composite water sampling: A case study. *Sci Total Environ* 609:982–991. doi:
3 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.07.227
- 4 Cruzeiro C, Pardal MÂ, Rocha E, Rocha MJ (2015) Occurrence and seasonal loads of
5 pesticides in surface water and suspended particulate matter from a wetland of
6 worldwide interest — the Ria Formosa Lagoon , Portugal. doi: 10.1007/s10661-015-
7 4824-8
- 8 Cruzeiro C, Rocha E, Ângelo M, João M (2016) Environmental assessment of pesticides in
9 the Mondego River Estuary (Portugal). doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.013
- 10 De Gerónimo E, Aparicio VC, Bárbaro S, et al (2014) Presence of pesticides in surface water
11 from four sub-basins in Argentina. *Chemosphere* 107:423–431. doi:
12 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.01.039
- 13 Desgranges N (2015) Développement d'échantillonneurs passifs de type POCIS pour
14 l'évaluation de la contamination en pesticides des eaux de bassins versants
15 languedociens. Université de Bordeaux
- 16 Dujaković N, Grujić S, Radišić M, et al (2010) Determination of pesticides in surface and
17 ground waters by liquid chromatography-electrospray-tandem mass spectrometry. *Anal*
18 *Chim Acta* 678:63–72. doi: 10.1016/j.aca.2010.08.016
- 19 Eriksson M, Sodersten E, Yu Z, et al (2003) Degradation of Polycyclic Aromatic
20 Hydrocarbons at Low Temperature under Aerobic and Nitrate-Reducing Conditions in
21 Enrichment Cultures from Northern Soils Degradation of Polycyclic Aromatic
22 Hydrocarbons at Low Temperature under Aerobic and Nitrate-Reduci. *Society* 69:275–
23 284. doi: 10.1128/AEM.69.1.275
- 24 ESF-Marine Board (2011) ESF-Marine Board European Scientific Diving Panel activities
- 25 EU (2008) Directive 2008/105/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16

- 1 december 2008 amending Directives 2000/60/EC and as regards priority substances in
2 the field of water policy. 84–97
3
4
5 3 EU (2013) Directive 2013/39/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 August
6
7 4 2013 amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards priority substances
8
9 5 in the field of water policy
10
11
12 6 Gao JP, Maguhn J, Spitzauer P, Kettrup A (1998) Sorption of pesticides in the sediment of the
13
14 7 Teufelsweiher pond (Southern Germany). I: Equilibrium assessments, effect of organic
15
16 8 carbon content and pH. *Water Res* 32:1662–1672. doi: 10.1016/S0043-1354(97)00377-1
17
18
19 9 Gonzalez-Rey M, Tapie N, Le Menach K, et al (2015) Occurrence of pharmaceutical
20
21 10 compounds and pesticides in aquatic systems. *Mar Pollut Bull* 96:384–400. doi:
22
23 11 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.04.029
24
25
26 12 Greenwood R, Mills G, Vrana B (2007) *Passive sampling techniques in environmental*
27
28 13 *monitoring*. Elsevier, Amsterdam; Oxford
29
30
31 14 Guo W, Zhang H, Huo S (2014) Organochlorine pesticides in aquatic hydrophyte tissues and
32
33 15 surrounding sediments in Baiyangdian wetland, China. *Ecol Eng* 67:150–155. doi:
34
35 16 10.1016/j.ecoleng.2014.03.047
36
37
38 17 Hamilton DJ, Ambrus Á, Dieterle RM, et al (2003) Regulatory limits for pesticide residues in
39
40 18 water (IUPAC Technical Report). *Pure Appl Chem* 75:1123–1155. doi:
41
42 19 10.1351/pac200375081123
43
44
45 20 Herceg-Romanić S, Kljaković-Gašpic Z, Klinčić D, Ujević I (2014) Distribution of persistent
46
47 21 organic pollutants (POPs) in cultured mussels from the Croatian coast of the Adriatic
48
49 22 Sea. *Chemosphere* 114:69–75. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.04.017
50
51
52 23 Hijosa-Valsero M, Bécares E, Fernández-Aláez C, et al (2016) Chemical pollution in inland
53
54 24 shallow lakes in the Mediterranean region (NW Spain): PAHs, insecticides and
55
56 25 herbicides in water and sediments. *Sci Total Environ* 544:797–810. doi:
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.11.160
- 2 Ibrahim I, Togola A, Gonzalez C (2013a) Polar organic chemical integrative sampler (POCIS)
- 3 uptake rates for 17 polar pesticides and degradation products: laboratory calibration.
- 4 Environ Sci Pollut Res 20:3679–3687. doi: 10.1007/s11356-012-1284-3
- 5 Ibrahim I, Togola A, Gonzalez C (2013b) In-situ calibration of POCIS for the sampling of
- 6 polar pesticides and metabolites in surface water. Talanta 116:495–500. doi:
- 7 10.1016/j.talanta.2013.07.028
- 8 INERIS (2011) Environmental quality standards for Tebuconazole
- 9 INERIS (2013) Environmental guide value for Prosulfocarb – n ° CAS : 52888-80-9
- 10 Jiménez JJ, Bernal JL, Rivera JM, et al (1999) Seasonal changes in the contents of widely
- 11 used pesticides in waters and sediments from small lakes in the province of Leon
- 12 (Spain). Toxicol Environ Chem 70:57–66. doi: 10.1080/02772249909358739
- 13 Kaushik A, Sharma HR, Jain S, et al (2010) Pesticide pollution of River Ghaggar in Haryana,
- 14 India. Environ Monit Assess 160:61–69. doi: 10.1007/s10661-008-0657-z
- 15 Khaled A, El Nemr A, Said TO, et al (2004) Polychlorinated biphenyls and chlorinated
- 16 pesticides in mussels from the Egyptian Red Sea coast. Chemosphere 54:1407–1412.
- 17 doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2003.10.042
- 18 Kuster M, López de Alda MJ, Hernando MD, et al (2008) Analysis and occurrence of
- 19 pharmaceuticals, estrogens, progestogens and polar pesticides in sewage treatment plant
- 20 effluents, river water and drinking water in the Llobregat river basin (Barcelona, Spain).
- 21 J Hydrol 358:112–123. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.05.030
- 22 Li Y, Niu J, Shen Z, et al (2014) Spatial and seasonal distribution of organochlorine pesticides
- 23 in the sediments of the Yangtze Estuary. Chemosphere 114:233–240. doi:
- 24 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.04.112
- 25 Liess M, Schulz R, Liess MHD, et al (1999) Determination of insecticide contamination in

1 agricultural headwater streams. *Water Res* 33:239–247. doi: 10.1016/S0043-

2 1354(98)00174-2

3 Lissalde S, Mazzella N, Fauvelle V, et al (2011) Liquid chromatography coupled with tandem

4 mass spectrometry method for thirty-three pesticides in natural water and comparison of

5 performance between classical solid phase extraction and passive sampling approaches. *J*

6 *Chromatogr A* 1218:1492–1502. doi: 10.1016/j.chroma.2011.01.040

7 Lissalde S, Mazzella N, Mazellier P (2014) Polar organic chemical integrative samplers for

8 pesticides monitoring: Impacts of field exposure conditions. *Sci Total Environ* 488–

9 489:188–196. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.04.069

10 Macdonald RW, Harner T, Fyfe J (2005) Recent climate change in the Arctic and its impact

11 on contaminant pathways and interpretation of temporal trend data. *Sci Total Environ*

12 342:5–86. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.12.059

13 Mai B, Chen S, Luo X, et al (2005) Distribution of polybrominated diphenyl ethers in

14 sediments of the Pearl River Delta and adjacent South China Sea. *Environ Sci Technol*

15 39:3521–3527. doi: 10.1021/es048083x

16 Maloschik E, Ernst A, Hegedus G, et al (2007) Monitoring water-polluting pesticides in

17 Hungary. *Microchem J* 85:88–97. doi: 10.1016/j.microc.2006.05.002

18 Martínez Bueno MJ, Herrera S, Munaron D, et al (2014) POCIS passive samplers as a

19 monitoring tool for pharmaceutical residues and their transformation products in marine

20 environment. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 23:5019–5029. doi: 10.1007/s11356-014-3796-5

21 Meakins NC, Bubb JM, Lester JN (1995) The mobility, partitioning and degradation of

22 atrazine and simazine in the salt marsh environment. *Mar Pollut Bull* 30:812–819. doi:

23 10.1016/0025-326X(95)00074-W

24 Mezghani et al. (2016) Liste des pesticides Homologués

25 Miège C, Budzinski H, Jacquet R, et al (2013) Polar organic chemical integrative sampler

- 1 (POCIS): Application for monitoring organic micropollutants in wastewater effluent and
2 surface water. *J Environ Monit* 14:626–635. doi: 10.1039/c1em10730e
- 3 Miège C, Mazzella N, Allan I, et al (2015) Position paper on passive sampling techniques for
4 the monitoring of contaminants in the aquatic environment - Achievements to date and
5 perspectives. *Trends Environ Anal Chem* 8:20–26. doi: 10.1016/j.teac.2015.07.001
- 6 Momplaisir GM, Rosal CG, Heithmar EM, et al (2010) Development of a solid phase
7 extraction method for agricultural pesticides in large-volume water samples. *Talanta*
8 81:1380–1386. doi: 10.1016/j.talanta.2010.02.038
- 9 Moncada A (2004) Environmental Fate of Diuron. *Ground Water*
- 10 Moreno-González R, León VM (2017) Presence and distribution of current-use pesticides in
11 surface marine sediments from a Mediterranean coastal lagoon (SE Spain). *Environ Sci*
12 *Pollut Res* 24:8033–8048. doi: 10.1007/s11356-017-8456-0
- 13 Mzoughi N, Hellal F, Dachraoui M, et al (2002) Méthodologie de l'extraction des
14 hydrocarbures aromatiques polycycliques. Application à des sédiments de la lagune de
15 Bizerte (Tunisie). *Comptes Rendus - Geosci* 334:893–901. doi: 10.1016/S1631-
16 0713(02)01827-8
- 17 Mzoughi N, Lespes G, Bravo M, et al (2005) Organotin speciation in Bizerte lagoon
18 (Tunisia). *Sci Total Environ* 349:211–222. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.12.067
- 19 Navarro S, Vela N, José Giménez M, Navarro G (2004) Effect of temperature on the
20 disappearance of four triazine herbicides in environmental waters. *Chemosphere* 57:51–
21 59. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2004.05.016
- 22 Necibi M, Mzoughi N, Néjib Daly Yahia M, Pringault O (2015) Distributions of
23 organochlorine pesticides and polychlorinated biphenyl in surface water from Bizerte
24 Lagoon, Tunisia. *Desalin Water Treat* 56:2663–2671. doi:
25 10.1080/19443994.2015.1024935

- 1 Nefzaoui A, Ketata H, El-Mourid M (2012) Changes in North Africa production systems to
2 meet climate uncertainty and new socio-economic scenarios with a focus on dryland
3 areas. *Options Mediterr Ser A, Semin Mediterr* 421:403–421
- 4 Ouertani N, Hamouda R, Belayouni H (2006) Etude de la mati??re organique dans les
5 s??diments superficiels d'un syst??me aquatique confin?? anoxique ??voluant en milieu
6 urbain: Cas du Lac sud de Tunis. *Geo Eco Trop* 30:21–34
- 7 Palma P, K?ock-Schulmeyer M, Alvarenga P, et al (2014) Risk assessment of pesticides
8 detected in surface water of the Alqueva reservoir (Gadiana basin, southern of
9 Portugal). *Sci Total Environ* 488–489:208–219. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.04.088
- 10 Papadakis EN, Vryzas Z, Kotopoulou A, et al (2015) Ecotoxicology and Environmental
11 Safety A pesticide monitoring survey in rivers and lakes of northern Greece and its
12 human and ecotoxicological risk assessment. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 116:1–9. doi:
13 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2015.02.033
- 14 PAPP R (2010) Les propri??t??s ENVIRONNEMENTALES des substances. 1–126
- 15 Poulhier G, Lissalde S, Charriau A, et al (2014) Can POCIS be used in Water Framework
16 Directive (2000/60/EC) monitoring networks? A study focusing on pesticides in a
17 French agricultural watershed. *Sci Total Environ* 497–498:282–292. doi:
18 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.08.001
- 19 Poulhier G, Lissalde S, Charriau A, et al (2015) Estimates of pesticide concentrations and
20 fluxes in two rivers of an extensive French multi-agricultural watershed: application of
21 the passive sampling strategy. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 22:8044–8057. doi:
22 10.1007/s11356-014-2814-y
- 23 Ralston-Hooper K, Hardy J, Hahn L, et al (2009) Acute and chronic toxicity of atrazine and
24 its metabolites deethylatrazine and deisopropylatrazine on aquatic organisms.
25 *Ecotoxicology* 18:899–905. doi: 10.1007/s10646-009-0351-0

- 1 Savinov V (2000) Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) in Sediments of the White Sea,
2 Russia. *Mar Pollut Bull* 40:807–818. doi: 10.1016/S0025-326X(00)00004-7
3
4 Terzopoulou E, Voutsas D (2016) Active and passive sampling for the assessment of
5 hydrophilic organic contaminants in a river basin-ecotoxicological risk assessment.
6
7 *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 23:5577–5591. doi: 10.1007/s11356-015-5760-4
8
9 Van Metre PC, Alvarez DA, Mahler BJ, et al (2017) Complex mixtures of Pesticides in
10 Midwest U.S. streams indicated by POCIS time-integrating samplers. *Environ Pollut*
11 220:431–440. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.085
12
13 Vryzas Z, Vassiliou G, Alexoudis C, Papadopoulou-Mourkidou E (2009) Spatial and
14 temporal distribution of pesticide residues in surface waters in northeastern Greece.
15
16 *Water Res* 43:1–10. doi: 10.1016/j.watres.2008.09.021
17
18 Wu SC, Gschwend PM (1986) Sorption kinetics of hydrophobic organic compounds to
19 natural sediments and soils. *Environ Sci Technol* 20:717–725. doi: 10.1021/es00149a011
20
21 Xue N, Xu X, Jin Z (2005) Screening 31 endocrine-disrupting pesticides in water and surface
22 sediment samples from Beijing Guanting reservoir. *Chemosphere* 61:1594–1606. doi:
23
24 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2005.04.091
25
26 Yabuki Y, Nagai T, Inao K, et al (2016) Temperature dependence on the pesticide sampling
27 rate of polar organic chemical integrative samplers (POCIS). *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem*
28 80:2069–2075. doi: 10.1080/09168451.2016.1191329
29
30 Yohannes YB, Ikenaka Y, Saengtienchai A, et al (2014) Concentrations and human health
31 risk assessment of organochlorine pesticides in edible fish species from a Rift Valley
32 lake-Lake Ziway, Ethiopia. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 106:95–101. doi:
33
34 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2014.04.014
35
36 Zaghden H, Tedetti M, Sayadi S, et al (2017) Origin and distribution of hydrocarbons and
37 organic matter in the surficial sediments of the Sfax-Kerkennah channel (Tunisia,
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Southern Mediterranean Sea). *Mar Pollut Bull* 117:414–428. doi:

10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.02.007

Zhang J, Liu F, Chen R, et al (2012) Levels of polychlorinated biphenyls and organochlorine pesticides in edible shellfish from Xiamen (China) and estimation of human dietary intake. *Food Chem Toxicol* 50:4285–4291. doi: 10.1016/j.fct.2012.08.052

Zhang Z, Troldborg M, Yates K, et al (2016) Evaluation of spot and passive sampling for monitoring, flux estimation and risk assessment of pesticides within the constraints of a typical regulatory monitoring scheme. *Sci Total Environ* 569–570:1369–1379. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.219




Fig. 1 Study zones and sampling sites (A: lagoon, B: Chegui oued, C: Garaa oued and D: Tinja oued) in the Bizerte lagoon watershed




Fig.2 Global detection and quantification frequencies obtained by passive sampling (A) and grab sampling (B) at the four study sites during the three sampling campaigns




Fig. 3 Detection and quantification frequencies of targeted herbicides and fungicides in the lagoon (A), Chegui oued (B), Garaa oued (C) and Tinja oued (D), the sites sampled by passive sampling during the three sampling campaigns in 2015 and 2016




Fig. 4 Total pesticide concentrations (ng L⁻¹) in the water obtained by passive sampling as a function of the sampling site (lagoon (A), Chegui oued (B), Garaa oued (C) and Tinja oued (D)) and season




Fig. 5 Detection and quantification frequencies of targeted herbicides and fungicides in the sediments at sampling sites in the lagoon (A), Chegui oued (B), Garaa oued (C) and Tinja oued (D) during the three sampling campaigns in 2015 and 2016

Table 1 Limits of detection (LOD) and quantification (LOQ) obtained by HPLC-MS/MS, and LOQ calculated for POCIS (Poulier et al., 2014), water, sediment and laboratory sampling rates of the 32 targeted compounds

Pesticide active substance	Chemical class	Analytical LOD ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	Analytical LOQ ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	LOQ POCIS (ng L^{-1})	LOQ water (ng L^{-1})	LQ sediment ng g^{-1}	Water recovery rate (%)	Sampling rates (L d^{-1})	Rs references (L d^{-1})
Herbicides									
Acetochlor	Chloracetanilide	2.2	7.5	1.6	22.5	2.2	83	0.223	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Alachlor	Chloroacetamide	1.1	3.8	0.7	11.4	1.1	76	0.256	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Atrazine	Triazine	0.4	1.5	0.3	4.4	0.4	88	0.254	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Chlortoluron	Urea	0.7	2.3	0.4	6.8	0.7	43	0.252	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
DCPMU**	Urea	1.0	3.5	0.6	10.4	1.0	19	0.285	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
DCPU**	Urea	1.2	4.0	0.6	12.0	1.2	8	0.333	(Ibrahim et al. 2013b)
DEA**	Triazine	1.1	3.7	1.3	11.0	1.1	92	0.133	(Ibrahim et al. 2013b)
DET**	Triazine	0.5	1.7	0.3	5.0	0.5	69	0.254	(Ibrahim et al. 2013b)
DIA**	Triazine	1.0	3.4	2.4	10.1	1.0	69	0.068	(Ibrahim et al. 2013b)
Diuron	Phenylurea	0.7	2.3	0.4	6.9	0.7	68	0.257	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Flazasulfuron	Sulfonylurea	0.7	2.2	-	6.6	0.7	0	Unavaible	-
Isoproturon	Urea	0.9	2.9	0.6	8.7	0.9	48	0.237	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Linuron	Urea	0.9	2.8	1.0	8.5	0.9	90	0.141	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Metolachlor	Chloracetanilide	0.4	1.3	0.2	4.0	0.4	69	0.268	(Ibrahim et al. 2013b)
Oxadixyl	Phenylamide	1.1	3.6	0.7	10.8	1.1	55	0.263	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Propyzamide	Benzamide	0.8	2.6	0.6	7.8	0.8	90	0.195	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)

Prosulfocarb*	Thiocarbamate	0.5	1.6	1.0	4.7	0.5	67	0.071	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Simazine*	Triazine	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.2	0.1	101	0.218	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Simazine Hydroxy	Triazine	0.7	2.3	-	6.9	0.7	0	Unavaible	-
Terbuthylazine	Triazine	0.3	1.1	0.3	3.3	0.3	87	0.163	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Terbuthylazine Hydroxy	Triazine	0.7	2.5	-	7.4	0.7	0	Unavaible	-
Fungicides									
Azoxystrobin*	Strobilurin	1.0	3.2	1.0	9.5	1.0	66	0.154	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Carbendazim*	Bendimidazole	0.5	1.6	0.3	4.8	0.5	21	0.304	(Poulier et al. 2015)
Dimetomorph	Morpholine	0.6	1.9	0.2	5.8	0.6	66	0.395	(Poulier et al. 2015)
Epoxiconazole*	Triazole	0.7	2.3	0.4	6.9	0.7	73	0.280	(Ahrens et al. 2015)
Metalaxyl	Phenylamide	0.8	2.7	0.5	8.0	0.8	55	0.264	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Penconazole	Triazole	1.0	3.4	0.6	10.2	1.0	99	0.279	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Prochloraz*	Azole	0.200	0.7	0.4	2.0	0.2	60	0.080	(Desgranges 2015)
Pyrimethanil	Anilinopyrimidine	1.1	3.6	0.7	10.9	1.1	89	0.231	(Ibrahim et al. 2013a)
Tebuconazole*	Triazole	0.7	2.2	0.4	6.5	0.7	71	0.240	(Greenwood et al. 2007)
Tetraconazole	Triazole	0.7	2.2	-	6.6	0.7	92	Unavaible	-
Insecticides									
Imidacloprid	Neonicotinoide	1.7	5.6	0.9	16.7	1.7	0.8	0.290	(Poulier et al. 2015)

* *Pesticides inventoried in the survey*

** *Degradation products: DCPMU: 1-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-3-methylurea / DCPU: 3,4-dichlorophenyl urea / DEA: desethylatrazine / DET: desethyl terbuthylazine / DIA : deisopropylatrazine*

Table 2 Inventoried active ingredients in the agricultural regions of the Bizerte lagoon watershed surveyed (south of Bizerte, Tinja, and Menzel Bourguiba)

Active ingredients	Chemical classes	Pesticides	Estimated doses(g ha ⁻¹)	Crops
Fungicides				
Azoxystrobin**	Strobilurins	Fungicide	200	Wheat. pulses
Difenoconazole	Triazoles	Fungicide	125	Vine
Mancozeb	Carbamates	Fungicide	40	Vine
Maneb	Carbamates	Fungicide	10	Vine
Zineb*	Carbamates	Fungicide	10	Vine
Boscalid	Carboxamides	Fungicide	7.50	Vine
Chlorothalonil**	Organochlorines (chloronitriles)	Fungicide	5.50	Pulses
Prochloraz**	Imidazoles	Fungicide	2.25	Wheat . barley
Tebuconazole**	Triazoles	Fungicide	1.25	wheat. barley. oat. pulses
Spiroxamine	Spirocetalamines	Fungicide	1.12	Vine
Flusilazole**	Triazoles	Fungicide	1	Barley
Thiophanate-methyl	Benzimidazoles	Fungicide	0.78	Vine
Flutriafol**	Triazoles	Fungicide	0.6	Barley
Propiconazole**	Triazoles	Fungicide	0.63	Barley
Carbendazim**	Benzimidazoles	Fungicide	0.50	Cereals. wheat
Prothioconazole**	Triazolinthiones	Fungicide	0.50	Cereals
Epoxiconazole**	Triazoles	Fungicide	0.47	Wheat . barley
Kresoxim-methyl	Strobilurins	Fungicide	0.44	Vine
Cyproconazole	Triazoles	Fungicide	0.20	Oat
Metconazol*	Triazoles	Fungicide	0.01	Wheat . barley
Insecticides				
Bifenthrin	Pyrethroides	Insecticide	80	Vine . fruit trees
Deltamethrin	Pyrethroides	Insecticide	62.5	Vine. fruit trees. cereals
Herbicides				
Glyphosate**	Amino- phosphonates	Herbicide	21.60	All crops
Simazine**	Triazines	Herbicide	3.75	Pulses
Bentazone**	Diazines	Herbicide	3	Cereals . pulses
Prosulfocarb**	Thiocarbamates	Herbicide	1	Wheat
2.4D**	Esters	Herbicide	0.90	Wheat. barley . oat
Clethodim	Cyclohexanes diones	Herbicide	0.60	Pulses
Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl*	Aryloxyphenoxy-propionates (FOPS)	Herbicide	0.28	Cereals
Mefenpyr-diethyl	Pyrazoles	Herbicide	0.23	Cereals

Clodinafop-propagyl	Aryloxy-phenoxy-propionates (FOPS)	Herbicide	0.14	Wheat
Pinoxaden*	Phenylpyrazolines	Herbicide	0.14	Wheat
Pyroxulam*	Triazolopyrimidines	Herbicide	0.12	Cereals
Mesosulfuron-methyl	Sulfonylurea	Herbicide	0.08	Cereals
Tribenuron-Méthyl	Sulfonylurea	Herbicide	0.05	Cereals
Aminopyralid	Triazolopyrimidines	Herbicide	0.05	Wheat. oat!
Cloquintocet-mexyl	Phenylpyrazolines	Herbicide	0.03	Barley
Florasulam	Thiocarbamates	Herbicide	0.02	Cereals
Iodosulfuron	Sulfonylurea	Herbicide	0.02	Cereals
Trifluralin	Dinitroanilines	Herbicide	0.01	Pulses

* *Active ingredients not approved in Tunisia (Mezghani et al. 2016)*

***Active ingredients from the list of 15 selected pesticides*

Table 3 Pesticides quantified by POCIS as a function of the site and the season (mean concentrations ng L⁻¹; n=3 injections)

Pesticides	Survey	Lagoon (A)						Chegui oued (B)						Garaa oued (C)						Tinja oued (D)					
		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Herbicides																									
Acetochlor	nd	13.5	1.2	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		5.0	1.3	<LOD	
Alachlor	nd	2.7	0.3	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Atrazine	nd	<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Chlortoluron**	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		3.6	0.1	<LOD		2.3	1.6	3.1	0.1	<LOD		17.0	5.3	4.1	0.3	<LOD		3.0	1.2	2.3	0.2
DCPMU*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
DPCU*	nd	1.8	0.1	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		1.0	0.9	<LOD		<LOD		0.9	0.3	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD	
DEA*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
DET*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		5.0	0.9	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
DIA*	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		93.3	6.1	192.0	4.6	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Diuron	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ	
Flazasulfuron	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Isoproturon	nd	<LOD		<LOD		4.0	1.1	<LOD		<LOD		1.8	0.2	<LOD		<LOD		4.4	0.2	<LOD		<LOD		2.4	0.1
Linuron**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Metolachlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Oxadixyl	nd	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Propyzamide	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Prosulfocarb**	d	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Simazine**	d	9.0	0.8	4.5	2.1	<LOQ		<LOD		168.0	11.1	431.6	7.2	<LOD		20.0	1.3	<LOQ		5.7	1.2	10.0	0.2	<LOQ	
Simazine hydroxy*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Terbutylazine**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Terbutylazine hydroxy*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Fungicides																									
Azoxystrobin**	d	<LOD		6.5	1.3	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		8.0	0.1	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Carbendazim**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Dimetomorph**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Epoxiconazole**	nd	8.4	0.9	5.8	3.0	<LOQ		<LOQ		7.2	1.8	8.5	0.9	<LOQ		46.0	2.0	<LOQ		<LOQ		2.0	0.9	<LOQ	
Metalaxyl**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Penconazole**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Prochloraz**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Pyrimethanil**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Tebuconazole**	d	3.9	0.9	4.0	0.3	<LOQ		<LOQ		142.0	9.0	190.5	11.4	<LOQ		102.2	3.2	<LOQ		<LOQ		0.8	0.2	<LOQ	
Tetraconazole	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Insecticides																									
Imidacloprid**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Total concentrations		39.3		20.8		7.6		<LOD		413.8		832.5		<LOD		194.1		8.5		5.7		20.8		9.4	

*d: determined in the survey; nd: not determined in the survey; < LOD: concentration below the analytical detection limit; < LOQ: concentration below the analytical quantification; *: Degradation products; **: pesticides approved in Tunisia*

Table 4 Pesticides quantified by grab sampling as a function of the site and the season (mean concentrations ng L⁻¹; n=3 injections)

Pesticides	Survey	Lagoon (A)						Chegui oued (B)						Garaa oued (C)						Tinja oued (D)					
		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Herbicides																									
Acetochlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Alachlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Atrazine	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Chlortoluron**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		15.1	0.5	<LOQ		<LOQ		16.4	1.1	<LOD		40.0	12.3	24.4	0.6	<LOD		15.0	11.7	15.4	0.5
DCPMU*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
DCPU*	nd	<LOQ		6.1	3.5	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD	
DEA*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
DET*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
DIA*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		286.2	22.8	182.0	94.2	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Diuron	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		15.0	0.6	<LOD		<LOD		14.8	0.9	<LOD		<LOD		15.9	1.1	<LOD		<LOD		15.5	0.7
Flazasulfuron	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Isoproturon	nd	<LOD		<LOQ		10.2	0.4	<LOD		<LOQ		10.4	0.5	<LOQ		<LOD		11.2	0.3	<LOQ		<LOD		105.0	0.2
Linuron**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Metolachlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Oxadixyl	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Propyzamide	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Prosulfocarb**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		25.4	4.0	10.6	0.4	<LOD		<LOD	
Simazine**	d	<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		730.9	27.9	<LOQ		<LOQ		56.9	6.3	11.6	0.3	12.9	0.3	32.5	7.3	<LOQ	
Simazine hydroxy*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Terbutylazine**	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD	
Terbutylazine hydroxy*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Fungicides																									
Azoxystrobin**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		11.6	1.8	<LOQ		<LOD		17.5	2.6	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Carbendazim**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Dimetomorph**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Epoxiconazole**	nd	<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		106.6	2.8	43.4	2.5	<LOQ		<LOD		99.5	5.5	12.6	0.2	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Metalaxyl**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Penconazole**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Prochloraze**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Pyrimethanil**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Tebuconazole**	d	<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		500.3	21.8	84.9	42.7	<LOD		178.4	67.5	60.4	3.9	<LOQ		56.5	16.0	<LOD	
Tetraconazole	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Insecticides																									
Imidacloprid**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Total concentrations		<LOD		6.1		40.3		106.6		1572.4		308.5		<LOD		392.3		161.5		23.5		104.0		135.9	

*d: determined in the survey; nd: not determined in the survey; < LOD: concentration below the analytical detection limit; < LOQ: concentration below the analytical quantification; *: Degradation products; **: pesticides approved in Tunisia*

Table 5 Pesticides quantified in sediments as a function of the site and the season (mean concentrations ng g⁻¹ d.w; n=3 injections) and physical-chemical parameters of sediment samples

Pesticides	Survey	Lagoon (A)						Chegui oued (B)						Garaa oued (C)						Tinja oued (D)					
		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016		Autumn 2015		Spring 2016		Summer 2016	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Herbicides																									
Acetochlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		4.8	0.7	<LOD		<LOD		2.8	0.3	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD	
Alachlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		2.3	0.9	<LOD		<LOD		2.5	0.1	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		1.8	0.3	<LOQ		<LOD	
Atrazine	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Chlortoluron	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ	
DCPMU*	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
DCPU*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		0.5	0.1	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ	
DEA*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
DET*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
DIA*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Diuron	nd	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Flazasulfuron	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Isoproturon	nd	<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Linuron**	nd	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Metolachlor	nd	<LOD		<LOD		1.5	0.1	<LOD		<LOD		0.8	0.2	<LOD		<LOD		0.7	0.1	<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ	
Oxadixyl	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Propyzamide	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Prosulfocarb**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		5.0	0.1	6.3	0.3	4.1	0.6	5.2	0.3	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Simazine**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Simazine hydroxy*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Terbutylazine**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Terbutylazine hydroxy*	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Fungicides																									
Azoxystrobin**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Carbendazim**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Dimetomorph**	nd	<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOQ		0.7	0.1	<LOQ		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD	
Epoxiconazole**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		1.0	0.1	<LOQ		0.8	0.2	4.2	0.5	3.3	1.7	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Metalaxyl**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Penconazole**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Prochloraz**	d	<LOD		<LOD		1.2	0.7	<LOD		<LOD		1.8	0.1	<LOD		<LOD		1.2	0.5	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Pyrimethanil**	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Tebuconazole**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		1.4	0.1	31.1	2.3	5.1	1.1	8.9	0.3	6.2	1.1	5.7	0.8	<LOD		<LOD		<LOQ	
Tetraconazole	nd	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Insecticides																									
Imidacloprid**	d	<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Total concentration		<LOD		<LOD		9.8		2.4		31.1		19.5		19.9		13.6		14.6		<LOD		<LOD		<LOD	
Physico-chemical parameters																									
%<63 µm		69		66		12		63		77		62		100		94		100		57		11		16	
TOC (%)		1		1		1		1		1		1		2		2		2		1		2		1	

*d: determined in the survey; nd: not determined in the survey; < LOD: concentration below the analytical detection limit; < LOQ: concentration below the analytical quantification; *: Degradation products; **: pesticides approved in Tunisia; TOC (%) : percentage of total organic carbon; %<63 μm : percentage of finer grain size fractions.*



Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Supplementary material.doc

