



Environmental Toxicology

Micro- and nanoplastic effects on the reproduction of *Daphnia* spp. – a meta-analysis

Ana L. Antonio Vital¹ , Luca Liprandi², Christian Laforsch^{2,3}, and Magdalena M. Mair^{1,3,*} 

¹Statistical Ecotoxicology, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany

²Animal Ecology I, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany

³Bayreuth Center for Ecology and Environmental Research (BayCEER), Bayreuth, Germany

*Corresponding author: Magdalena M. Mair. Email: magdalena.mair@uni-bayreuth.de

Abstract

Several micro- and nanoplastic particle (MNP) traits, like polymer type, size, and shape, have been shown to influence MNP toxicity. However, the direction and strength of these moderating effects are often unclear, and generalizations from single studies are challenging to establish. Meta-analyses increase generalizability and derive more accurate and precise effect size estimates by combining measurements from published studies. We conducted a meta-analysis to investigate the effects of MNP exposure on the reproductive output of water fleas of the genus *Daphnia* by aggregating 369 data points from 64 studies. We show that daphnids exposed to MNP produce, on average, 13.6 fewer neonates, a reduction of 20.8% compared with the particle-free controls (control mean = 65.37 neonates). This effect is moderated by MNP concentration, exposure duration, experimental temperature, and size category, with microplastics eliciting a stronger negative effect than nanoplastic particles. Shape category, species, age, polymer type, size (micrometers), fluorescence, modification type, presence of surfactant, and dissolved organic matter did not influence effect sizes significantly. Based on the high residual heterogeneity in the data, we suggest that additional factors likely influence observed effects and discuss how better particle characterization could improve our understanding of the drivers of MNP toxicity.

Keywords: aquatic toxicology, ecotoxicology, microplastics, offspring, water flea

Introduction

Despite significant research efforts, there are still gaps in our knowledge about the effects of micro- and nanoplastic particles (MNPs) on organisms (Brehm et al., 2023; Thompson et al., 2024). Although some studies suggest potential toxic effects (Guzzetti et al., 2018; Pannetier et al., 2020), others report no adverse effects of MNPs (Malinich et al., 2018; Weber et al., 2021). Furthermore, reported effect sizes vary substantially among experiments (Brehm et al., 2023; Foley et al., 2018; Salomon et al., 2024). This inconsistency might be because each MNP tested has a unique set of traits, and experimental setups are often not standardized across different studies (Brehm et al., 2023; Thompson et al., 2024).

Micro- and nanoplastic toxicity is influenced by several MNP traits, including (i) physical (e.g., polymer type, size, shape, zeta potential, and other surface properties; Gray & Weinstein, 2017; Pochelon et al., 2021; Saavedra et al., 2019; Schwarzer et al., 2022), (ii) chemical (e.g., presence of surfactants, additives or other plastic-associated chemicals; Boháčková & Cajthaml, 2024; Schrank et al., 2019), and (iii) biological (e.g., existence and form of an eco-corona or biofilm; Ramsperger et al., 2020; Salomon et al., 2024) factors. Moreover, characteristics connected to the biology of the organisms, like the age of exposed individuals or characteristics associated with the experimental setup, such as temperature (Chang et al., 2022; Klasios et al., 2024), MNP concentration (Fekete-Kertész et al., 2018), and exposure duration

can influence experimental outcomes further (Pikuda et al., 2023).

Although acute effects of MNP on survival are studied best among all endpoints (see Microplastics Toxicity Explorer, Brehm et al., 2023; Thornton Hampton et al., 2022; Thornton Hampton, 2025), sublethal effects such as behavioral changes and alterations in life span, body size growth, and reproduction are increasingly becoming the focus of scientific research and regulatory risk assessment (Barascou et al., 2021). Over longer exposure durations, sublethal effects can have substantial impacts on population dynamics by reducing individuals' fitness (Barata et al., 2008; Bellehumeur et al., 2016; Connell, 1995; Santadino et al., 2014) and the overall health of ecosystems (Mayer-Pinto et al., 2020). Within the same time frame, sublethal effects often occur at lower concentrations than mortality (Horie et al., 2017; Wolf & Segner, 2023). Therefore, considering sublethal effects is essential for understanding the long-term impact of potentially toxic pollutants on populations and ecosystems. Among them, alterations in reproduction are of particular relevance (Organisation for Economic Co-operation & Development [OECD], 2012, 2015), but their effect size is rarely reported.

Daphnia, a genus of filter-feeding crustaceans, is widely used in ecotoxicity studies, including studies on both survival and sublethal effects (Ebert, 2022; OECD, 2012). *Daphnia* spp. have a comparably short generation time; they reproduce through parthenogenesis (i.e., producing genetically identical clones) and

Received: May 27, 2025. Revised: August 08, 2025. Accepted: August 18, 2025

© The Author(s) 2025. 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.

play a key role in lentic aquatic food webs by linking primary production with higher trophic levels (Baird et al., 1989; Ten Berge, 1978). These characteristics make *Daphnia* an efficient model organism used widely in ecotoxicological research and within the regulatory context (OECD, 2004, 2012). *Daphnia* spp. are one of the main organism groups used in the ecotoxicity assessment of pharmaceuticals (Tkaczyk et al., 2021) and toxic metals (Kim et al., 2015) and in MNP studies (Thornton Hampton et al., 2022; Thornton Hampton, 2025). However, inconsistencies in the effects of MNPs on *Daphnia* reproduction are often observed, likely because material properties and experimental conditions have rarely been considered (Besseling et al., 2014; Khosrovyan & Kahru, 2022).

Meta-analyses summarize evidence on a particular topic by combining measurements or statistical results of multiple previous studies (Grewal et al., 2018; Spector & Thompson, 1991). They are broadly used in medical research (Wang et al., 2021) and increasingly also in ecotoxicology (e.g., Huo et al., 2022; Vilas-Boas et al., 2020; Yang & Nowack, 2020). By pooling the results of multiple studies, meta-analyses enable a more precise estimation of the true effect size (Ellis, 2010) and allow for a comprehensive assessment of how additional factors moderate these effects (Dekkers, 2018).

A first attempt to investigate the generalized effects of MNPs on *Daphnia* reproduction using a meta-analysis was published in 2024 (Funke et al. 2024). In this first study, Funke et al. (2024) modelled the number of offspring by concentration classes. However, the heterogeneity in the models remained high, which indicates that grouping the data according to exposure concentration classes alone does not sufficiently account for the variance in the data. In contrast, other factors might influence the true effect sizes, including MNP traits and additional experimental characteristics. Additionally, the literature on MNP effects on *Daphnia* reproduction has increased considerably since the period covered by Funke et al. (2024), as the last publication search was in April 2022. A re-evaluation based on an extended dataset that considers further experimental parameters and MNP traits as predictors could thus improve our understanding of MNP effects on *Daphnia* spp. reproduction.

We performed a meta-analysis to obtain a most precise and accurate estimate of the effect size that MNPs impose on *Daphnia* spp. reproduction. Our analysis aimed to identify MNP traits and experimental conditions particularly associated with observed offspring number variations. To this end, we extracted 369 data points from 64 published articles, focusing on experimental factors (e.g., species, age of individuals, exposure duration, and temperature) and different MNP traits (e.g., polymer type, size category, and shape category).

Materials and methods

Search strategy

We performed a literature search to identify studies investigating the effects of MNPs on the reproductive output of water fleas of the genus *Daphnia*. After search string optimization, the final search was performed on March 5th, 2024, using the Web of Science database with the search string “([“microplastic*” OR “micro plastic*” OR “micro-plastic*” OR “nanoplastic*” OR “nano plastic*” OR “nano-plastic*”] AND [“Daphnia*”] AND [“reproduction” OR “offspring*”]).” Additionally, we added references listed in Brehm et al. (2023), a review article on MNP effects on *Daphnia* spp., and Funke et al. (2024). After removing duplicates, we screened the titles and abstracts based on the following inclusion criteria: (1)

experimental research (i.e., excluding review articles, proceeding articles, and book chapters); (2) measurements of reproductive output of *Daphnia* spp. under MNP exposure, with explicit reference to relevant terms (e.g., offspring, neonates, reproduction). The full text of studies that passed these initial criteria was screened based on two more criteria: (3) inclusion of a control treatment without MNP exposure (particle-free control) while maintaining all other experimental conditions; (4) no co-exposure with additional chemical stressors (e.g., toxic substances). Studies that did not meet all criteria were excluded, and the reason(s) for exclusion were noted. Studies passing all four criteria were included for data extraction.

Data extraction and preparation

For each MNP treatment and the particle-free controls, we extracted the reported reproductive output (mean and SD, SE, or confidence interval [CI]) and noted the exact endpoint that was measured (e.g., neonates per adult or neonates per brood). In addition, we extracted the following parameters of the experimental setup, if reported: the number of replicates (i.e., the number of test vessels), the number of individuals per replicate (i.e., the number of adults per test vessel) at the start of exposure, species name, age of the test individuals at the start of exposure (in days), exposure duration (from the start of exposure to reproduction measurement in days), presence of surfactant (yes or no), whether the exposure media contained dissolved organic matter (DOM) or particles used were incubated (in, e.g., natural freshwater or media supplemented with DOM, resulting in the formation of an eco-corona or biofilm), and experimental temperature. As for MNP characteristics, we noted polymer type, mean size (and SD if provided), fluorescence (yes or no), modification type (either one of aluminum oxide, aminated, benzophenone-3, carboxylated, di-isononyl phthalate, recycled, or UV-weathered), and shape category (spherical particle, fiber, or fragment). When details were not reported, but both the manufacturer and lot number were provided, we checked for additional information on the manufacturer’s website. Recycled low-density polyethylene (LDPE) and virgin LDPE were grouped as LDPE. Polymer types with three or fewer data points were aggregated in the polymer type group “others.” We included polymer categories for “Thermoset” and “Tire wear” (TW) for cases where authors only reported these polymer categories without providing more detailed information.

Several approximations were necessary to align the data among studies, as information was often reported on different scales or in different units. Although the adjustments applied are based on assumptions about the test system and might therefore have introduced uncertainty into the measurements, they were essential to ensure comparability among studies. When available, we extracted the concentration of MNPs used in each treatment in milligrams per liter and particles per milliliter. If necessary, concentrations reported in particles/ml were transformed to mg/L according to Thornton Hampton et al. (2022) based on particle dimensions and polymer densities. For experiments that reported reproduction over time, offspring for the time point closest to 21 days was noted. To avoid pseudo-replication, reproduction rates for all other time points were disregarded. If only one measurement timepoint was reported, this measurement was used. When reproductive output was provided as a daily average, we multiplied the number of neonates with the exposure duration (in days). In case both the average number of neonates per brood and the number of broods were provided, we multiplied the numbers to obtain an estimate for the total

number of neonates, which was then divided by the number of adults in the replicate. If only the number of neonates per brood was provided and the number of broods was not specified, we assumed five broods for a 21-day experiment (Imhof et al., 2017).

For all these cases, we calculated the overall SD by taking the square root of the sum of the squared SDs of single broods or daily measurements ($SD = \sqrt{SD_1^2 + SD_2^2 + \dots + SD_n^2}$). When only the SE was reported, the SD was calculated by multiplying the SE with the square root of the number of replicates ($SD = SE \times \sqrt{N}$). If only the number of eggs (inside the breeding cavity) was provided, we considered the reproductive output. For transgenerational experiments, we only considered the reproductive output from adults directly exposed to MNPs (i.e., not the recovery generation). If the measure of uncertainty (SD, SE, or CI) was not explicitly stated, we assumed it to be SD. Whenever feasible, we directly extracted the reproductive output from the tables, main text, or supplemental material. If measurement means were not reported directly but raw data were provided, means and SDs were calculated from the raw data. When the experimental temperature was not explicitly reported, but the breeding temperature was mentioned, we assumed them to be the same. A total of four data points from one study did not mention the age of individuals at the start of the exposure. We assumed the missing values for age to be the median age across all data points in the dataset. If data were presented only in figures, we used the R package *metaDigitise* (version 1.0.1; Pick et al., 2018) to obtain mean values and SDs from the plots. If extraction was not possible in any instance, we tried to contact the authors via email to request the raw data.

Data analysis

As a measure of effect size, we calculated the mean difference (MD) using the *escalc()* function from the *metafor* package (version 4.2; Viechtbauer, 2010). To calculate the overall effect size, we used a multivariate random-effects meta-regression model without moderators, using the *rma.mv()* function. This function automatically includes a test for residual heterogeneity (i.e., Cochran's Q-test for heterogeneity), which assesses whether the variability in effect sizes among studies is greater than expected (Viechtbauer, 2010). The full model included an intercept and all potential moderators: species name, age of individuals (in days), exposure duration (in days), temperature (in °C), concentration (in mg/L), polymer type, mean particle size (μm), shape category, whether the particles were microplastics ($> 100 \text{ nm}$) or nanoplastics ($\leq 100 \text{ nm}$; size category), fluorescence (yes or no), modification type (if applicable), presence of surfactant (yes or no), and whether DOM was present in the media or particles were preconditioned in DOM containing media prior to exposure (yes or no). In addition, for all the models, we added random effects for samples (*sample_ID*) nested within studies (*pub_ID*) to allow the model to account for heterogeneity between studies and between samples within the same study. To test the significance of each moderator individually, we fitted reduced models by excluding one moderator at a time from the full model. Finally, the *anova()* function was used to compare each reduced model with the full model via likelihood ratio tests. Results were illustrated with regression plots for the continuous and forest plots for categorical variables using the *orchaRd* package (version 2.0; Nakagawa et al., 2023). For these illustrations, meta-regression models included only one predictor at a time. All statistical analyses and data visualizations were performed in R (version 4.4.1; R Core Team, 2024).

Results

Literature search and data extraction

We identified 122 publications (see Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analyses diagram; Figure 1) through the Web of Science database search, 84 publications from Brehm et al. (2023), and 32 from Funke et al. (2024). After removing duplicates and triplicates ($n=42$), we screened the titles and abstracts of 172 individual publications. Following this screening, 96 articles were excluded, as they did not meet the inclusion criteria. We thoroughly assessed the full text of 76 articles for eligibility and the possibility of extracting all necessary data. Data extraction was impossible for 12 of those studies (see Figure 1 for reasons for exclusion and online supplementary material for the full literature list including all screening results). Ultimately, our meta-analysis resulted in the successful extraction of 369 data points from 64 publications. All extracted data can be found in the supplementary online material.

Meta-analysis of *Daphnia* spp. reproduction

Averaged over all studies, the number of neonates produced per *Daphnia* in the particle-free control groups was 65.37 (mixed random effects meta-regression model: MD = 65.37; SE = 2.85; 95% CI = [59.77, 70.96]; $z = 22.90$; $p < 0.001$). When exposed to MNPs, the number of neonates decreased by 20.8% (MD = -13.60; SE = 2.77; 95% CI = [-19.03, -8.17]; $z = -4.90$; $p < 0.001$). However, it is unlikely that this effect estimate derives from a true common effect, given the high residual heterogeneity observed in the model (QE [degrees of freedom (df) = 368] = 29,979.05; $p < 0.001$).

Collectively, all the moderators together explained a significant amount of variability in effect sizes (full mixed regression model [test of moderators: QM (df = 35) = 100.36; $p < 0.001$; residual heterogeneity of the model QE (df = 333) = 20,228.73; $p < 0.001$). Adverse effects of MNP on reproduction increased with increasing particle concentration (full vs. reduced mixed meta-regression model: likelihood ratio [LR] = 28.48; $p < 0.001$; concentration range = 7.19e-08 to 500 mg/L, median = 1.25 mg/L, mean = 18.01 mg/L; Figure 2), increasing exposure duration (LR = 11.36; $p < 0.001$; range of exposure durations = 6 to 39, median = 21, mean = 20.29; Figure 3A), increasing temperature (LR = 42.35; $p < 0.001$; range of temperature = 15 to 30, median = 20, mean = 20.85; Figure 3B), and size category (LR = 4.13; $p = 0.04$). Shape category (LR = 3.09; $p = 0.21$), species (LR = 2.60; $p = 0.45$), size (LR = 0.08; $p = 0.76$; see online supplementary material Figure S1), age of individuals at the start of exposure (LR = 0.08; $p = 0.76$; range of age = 0 to 18, median = 0, mean = 0.7; see online supplementary material Figure S2), polymer type (LR = 10.56; $p = 0.56$), fluorescence (LR = 0.33; $p = 0.56$; see online supplementary material Figure S3), modification type (LR = 2.10; $p = 0.95$; see online supplementary material Figure S4), presence of surfactant (LR = 2.96; $p = 0.08$; see online supplementary material Figure S5), and DOM present (LR < 0.001; $p = 0.98$) were not significant.

Species

In total, we extracted data for four *Daphnia* species (Figure 4): *D. pulex* (32 data points; six studies), *D. magna* (331 data points; 56 studies), *D. galeata x longispina* (two data points; one study), and *D. carinata* (four data points; two studies). The meta-regression showed that for *D. pulex*, the reproductive output was, on average, reduced by 22.06% (control mean = 79.01; mixed meta-regression model: MD = -17.43; SE = 7.59; 95% CI = [-32.30, -2.55]; $z = -2.29$; $p = 0.02$) and 19.74% for *D. magna* (control mean = 62.76; mixed meta-regression model: MD = -12.39;




Figure 1. Adapted Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analyses flow diagram illustrating the systematic process of including eligible studies in our meta-analysis.




Figure 2. Effect of micro- and nanoplastic particle concentration in mg/L on the reproductive output of *Daphnia* spp. Note the logarithmic scale of the x-axis. The size of the data points is proportional to the inverse SE. The meta-regression line is the solid line, with the 95% confidence interval as the shaded area.

SE = 2.84; 95% CI = $[-17.97, -6.81]$; $z = -4.35$; $p < 0.001$). *Daphnia carinata* also showed an overall decrease of 28.08% in reproductive output under MNP exposure (control mean = 189.42; mixed meta-regression model: MD = -53.19 ; SE = 17.58; 95% CI =

$[-87.66, -18.72]$; $z = -3.02$; $p = 0.002$). The data for *D. galeata longispina* were limited to only two data points from one study; therefore, no summary statistics were calculated.

Polymer

A total of 19 polymer types were included in the meta-analysis (see online [supplementary material Table S1](#)). The number of studies per polymer type ranged from 1–34. Although polymer was overall not a significant moderator, we found differences among the polymer types (Figure 5). The reproductive output of *Daphnia* spp. was significantly reduced overall when exposed to the four most tested polymers: polystyrene (231 data points from 34 studies; mixed meta-regression model: MD = -11.31 , SE = 3.61; 95% CI = $[-18.39, -4.23]$; $z = -3.13$; $p = 0.001$); polyethylene (36 data points from 14 studies; MD = -17.91 ; SE = 6.16; 95% CI = $[-30.00, -5.82]$; $z = -2.90$; $p = 0.003$); Thermoset (24 data points from five studies; MD = -25.23 ; SE = 8.07; 95% CI = $[-41.07, -9.40]$; $z = -3.12$; $p = 0.001$); and TW (13 data points; two studies; MD = -25.30 ; SE = 12.85; 95% CI = $[-50.50, -0.10]$; $z = -1.96$; $p = 0.04$). Additionally, reproductive output was also reduced by polyethylene terephthalate exposure (four data points; two studies; MD = -51.38 ; SE = 16.51; 95% CI = $[-83.74, -19.01]$; $z = -3.11$; $p = 0.001$). All other polymer types did not significantly change MNP effects on *Daphnia* reproduction (mixed meta-regression model: all $p > 0.09$).




Figure 3. Effect of experimental conditions on micro- and nanoplastic particle effects on the reproductive output of *Daphnia* spp. (A) exposure duration (in days); (B) temperature (in degrees Celsius [$^{\circ}$ C]). The size of the data points is proportional to the inverse SE. The meta-regression line is the solid line, with the 95% confidence interval as the shaded area.




Figure 4. Mean difference in reproductive output among individuals of four *Daphnia* species exposed to micro- and nanoplastic particles compared with particle-free controls. Narrow lines represent prediction intervals, bold black lines show 95% confidence intervals; 'k' indicates the number of data points, with the number in parentheses corresponding to the number of publications. The dashed line at zero represents the point where no effect is detected; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Size category

The compiled studies included particles on the nanoscale (≤ 100 nm; 70 data points; 15 studies; mean \pm SD = 0.071 ± 0.02 μ m; range = 0.003–0.1 μ m) and microscale (> 100 nm; 299 data points; 54 studies; mean \pm SD = 27.86 ± 73.90 μ m; range = 0.103–600 μ m) with particle sizes ranging overall from 0.003–600 μ m (median = 4.10 μ m; mean = 22.59 ± 67.39 μ m). For two data points in one study, particle size was not reported. For these cases, the median of the reported sizes was assumed, and the missing data points were included as microplastic in the size category. Although particles categorized as microplastic significantly reduced the number of offspring by 16.55 (Figure 6; mixed meta-regression model: MD = -16.55 ; SE = 2.97; 95% CI = $[-22.39, -10.71]$; $z = -5.55$; $p < 0.001$), particles categorized as nanoplastic

had no significant moderating effect (MD = -1.30 ; SE = 5.30; 95% CI = $[-11.70, 9.09]$; $z = -0.24$; $p = 0.80$).

Shape category

Our meta-analysis included MNPs of all three particle shape categories: spherical particles (231 data points; 45 studies), fragments (124 data points; 22 studies), and fibers (14 data points; four studies). Fragments and spherical particles moderated MNP effects on reproductive output similarly (Figure 7), with spherical particles reducing offspring numbers by 13.12 (mixed meta-regression model: MD = -13.12 ; SE = 3.19; 95% CI = $[-19.38, -6.86]$; $z = -4.10$; $p < 0.001$) and fragments by 13.23 neonates (MD = -13.23 ; SE = 4.21; 95% CI = $[-21.48, -4.98]$; $z = -3.14$; $p = 0.001$). Exposure to fibers had a stronger negative effect, reducing offspring




Figure 5. Mean differences between the reproductive output of *Daphnia* individuals in response to micro- and nanoplastic particle treatment and particle-free control dependent on polymer type. TW = tire-wear; LDPE = low-density polyethylene; PVC = polyvinylchloride; PUR = polyurethane; PS = polystyrene; PLA = polylactic acid; PET = polyethylene terephthalate; PES = polyester; PE = polyethylene; PCL = polycaprolactone; PA = polyamide. Narrow lines represent prediction intervals, and bold black lines show 95% confidence intervals; 'k' indicates the number of data points, with the number in parentheses corresponding to the number of publications. Dashed line at zero represents the point where no effect is detected. Polymer types with three or fewer data points were aggregated as "others"; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

numbers on average by 23.82 neonates (MD = -23.82; SE = 9.30; 95% CI = [-42.06, -5.58]; $z = -2.56$; $p = 0.01$).

Presence of DOM

Our analysis included plastic particles exposed to non-biotic media (344 data points; 62 studies), and particles exposed to DOM (25 data points; four studies). Although exposure to MNP in media containing DOM or when particles were incubated in DOM-containing media prior to exposure did not significantly reduce the reproductive output (MD = -12.22; SE = 7.14; 95% CI = [-26.23, 1.78]; $z = -1.70$; $p = 0.08$), exposure to MNP conducted in media without DOM significantly reduced *Daphnia* spp. reproduction (Figure 8; mixed meta-regression model: MD = -13.66; SE = 2.78; 95% CI = [-19.13, -8.19]; $z = -4.90$; $p < 0.001$).

Discussion

Across all compiled studies, MNPs reduced the number of offspring produced by *Daphnia* spp. by 13.6 on average, which represents a reduction of 20.8%. This effect increased with increasing MNP concentration, was stronger for microplastic particles than for nanoplastic ones, and was further moderated by exposure duration and temperature.

Although we expected the observed concentration dependency of effects, the increased negative impact of larger microplastic particles (> 100 nm) compared with the smaller nanoplastic particles (≤ 100 nm) was surprising. Size has previously been shown to be

negatively correlated with effect size (i.e., larger particles lead to more minor effects) for endpoints including *Daphnia* lifespan (Jeong et al., 2016) and reproduction (An et al., 2021), among others, which is usually explained by the increased surface-to-volume ratio of the smaller particles (Koelmans et al., 2022). In addition, nanoplastics are more often translocated into tissues and cells, which may lead to adverse effects (Xu et al., 2019). At the same time, larger MNPs possess a larger volume. When considering that food uptake in these nonselective filter feeders follows a type I functional response (i.e., food consumption rate increases linearly with food abundance up to a threshold level at which it remains constant; Jeschke et al., 2004) and that the filtered volume is thus limited, the maximum amount of food that can be ingested along with MNPs will be lower for larger MNPs. The stronger effects reported for microplastic compared with nanoplastic particles may, therefore, be attributed to reduced food intake (i.e., food dilution effect; Ogonowski et al., 2016). Nevertheless, the limited number of data points for nanoplastic particles and the lower precision in effect size estimated for nanoplastics (i.e., wider CI) indicates that more data would be needed to draw reliable conclusions.

Similar to comparative studies on the toxicities of chemical pollutants (Völker et al., 2013), we found that sensitivity toward MNPs might differ among different *Daphnia* species, with *D. carinata* being more sensitive than *D. magna* and *D. pulex*. However, in contrast to our findings, these studies on chemicals found *D. carinata* to be less sensitive than the other species (Phyu et al., 2004).




Figure 6. Mean differences in reproductive output between exposure to particles categorized as nanoplastic or microplastic and particle-free control. Narrow lines represent prediction intervals, and bold black lines show 95% confidence intervals; 'k' indicates the number of data points, with the number in parentheses corresponding to the number of publications. Dashed line at zero represents the point where no effect is detected; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

A likely reason for this discrepancy is that species like *D. carinata* that occur in lakes and smaller ponds may be more robust to particulate matter than pure pelagic species, as pond species are naturally exposed to higher concentrations of mineral particles (Hart, 1992). However, according to this hypothesis, *D. magna*, which usually dwells close to the ground, stirring up and feeding on the substrate, is expected to be more tolerant towards particulate matter compared with other species, but this pattern is not represented in our data. Similar to the few measurements for *D. galeata x longispina*, data for *D. carinata* are still scarce (only four data points from two studies), and more experiments explicitly designed to test the difference between species are needed to draw more solid conclusions. For future experiments, it would also be interesting to test whether differences in sensitivity can be found among different clones (i.e., within the same species; see, for example, Imhof et al., 2017).

For the compiled dataset, no moderating effect was observed for the age of the test individuals at the start of exposure. Although this might result from a strong bias in the data towards the testing of neonates, we found a moderating effect of exposure duration, which is similarly biased towards 21-day exposure periods. Although this consistency in experimental design is necessary to increase comparability among results across studies (see OECD, 2012), additional research is needed to specifically investigate how MNP effects on reproduction change with test individual age and under extended exposure durations. Promising approaches include experiments measuring lifetime reproductive success (Betini et al., 2020) and studies assessing reproductive output across consecutive clutches (Imhof et al., 2017).

The effect of temperature was also significant, and the negative slope indicates that MNP exposure at higher temperatures potentially reduces reproductive performance further. Again, considering the strong bias of studies toward testing at 20 °C (following OECD, 2012), further experiments targeting specific effects of MNPs under increased temperatures (simulating multiple stressor situations under climate warming) are needed.

Biases in the compiled dataset are also visible in the traits of the tested MNPs. Although many different polymer types were tested, some polymers (e.g., polystyrene with 231 data points) have a much higher representation than others (e.g., polyethylene terephthalate with only four data points). This uneven distribution limits the generalizability of the results for less-studied polymers. Although, in general, the type of polymer was not a significant moderator, it is well known that toxic outcomes might depend on the polymer type (Zimmermann et al., 2020) in addition to other factors. Besides the structure of the polymer itself, plastic materials often contain leachable additives that have been shown to drive toxicity on *Daphnia* (Schränk et al., 2019), because the ecotoxicity of MNPs is also determined by the composition and concentration of those plastic-associated chemicals (Iftikhar et al., 2024). Additionally, nominally identical polymer particles might have different toxic effects (Ramsperger et al., 2022) depending on properties that are often not reported, such as particle zeta potential or other measures of surface charge (Wieland et al., 2024) or different types and amounts of plastic associated chemicals (Ivleva, 2021). Similar to previous meta-analyses on MNP effects on *Daphnia* spp. (Brehm et al., 2023; Funke et al., 2024; Salomon et al., 2024) and other organisms




Figure 7. Forest plot showing the mean differences in reproductive output for each particle shape category. Narrow lines represent prediction intervals, and bold black lines show 95% confidence intervals; 'k' indicates the number of data points, with the number in parentheses corresponding to the number of publications. Dashed line at zero represents the point where no effect is detected; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

(Ji et al., 2021), a bias towards testing spherical particles is also visible in our dataset, with fibers still being tested only scarcely.

It is often argued that particles exposed to the environment could change their properties in a way that influences their toxicity (Behera & Das, 2023; Waldschläger et al., 2020). Although exposure to DOM is not entirely understood, studies suggest that particles with eco-corona or biofilm are more likely to be internalized by cells (Ramsperger et al., 2020), and higher internalization rates may lead to stronger biological effects. However, these cell-based studies used murine macrophage cell lines, which differ drastically from endothelial cells. Moreover, *Daphnia* presents a peritrophic membrane coating the midgut. This membrane protects the gut from potential injuries caused by the naturally occurring particles ingested during water filtering (Quaglia et al., 1976). Thus, when the membrane is undamaged, only MNPs smaller than its pore size (e.g., *D. magna* ~ 130 nm) can enter into contact with the epithelial cells (Heinlaan et al., 2011), the point of potential cellular uptake.

Our meta-analysis is inconclusive regarding the effects of the presence of DOM, as treatments with particles exposed to DOM had a broader CI and nonsignificant result. Dissolved organic matter has been previously shown to mitigate the toxic effects of MNPs on *Daphnia* survival (Fadare et al., 2019; Salomon et al., 2024) and on other species (e.g., *Artemia salina*; Kamalakannan et al., 2024). This suggests that although incubation in biotic environments leads to eco-corona formation, it also attenuates the toxic effects of MNPs, possibly by altering particle bioavailability (Liu et al., 2022) or by serving as an additional food source

(Amariei et al., 2022). The mitigating effect of eco-corona presence and the harsher effects of larger size particles could be explained as *Daphnia*'s response to food availability. The alteration of *Daphnia* reproductive success caused by MNPs is a combination of nutrition uptake impairment and toxic effects. Therefore, food concentration during experimental exposure should be considered when discussing MNP toxicity.

In our meta-analysis, we compiled 369 data points from 64 studies, about double the number of data points and studies aggregated in a previous meta-analysis published by Funke et al. (2024; 158 data points from 32 studies). Unexpectedly, however, the effect size estimate from our analysis shows a wider CI (width: 10.86; range: -19.03 to -8.17) than the CI reported in Funke et al. (2024; width: 7.86, range: -14.44 to -6.58). Considering that microplastics research currently shifts towards testing a more diverse set of MNP traits (e.g., fibers and more diverse sets of polymers) and given the significant effects of several moderators in our analysis, we anticipate that the wider CI reflects a higher heterogeneity and thus, higher variance not only in the measured effect sizes but also in MNP traits compared with the dataset of Funke et al. (2024). In addition, the average effect of MNPs on *Daphnia* spp. reproduction estimated by our analysis (offspring number on average reduced by 13.6) is higher than the effect size estimated by Funke et al. (2024; offspring number reduced by 10.51). The increase of recent studies testing MNP properties that lead to higher toxicities (e.g., fibers, polymer types like TW particles; Carrasco-Navarro et al., 2021; Qiao et al., 2019) has likely led to this shift. For future meta-analyses, we




Figure 8. Mean differences in reproductive output when exposure to micro- and nanoplastic particles were conducted in the media with dissolved organic matter (DOM: yes) or without (DOM: no). Narrow lines represent prediction intervals, and bold black lines show 95% confidence intervals; 'k' indicates the number of data points, with the number in parentheses corresponding to the number of publications. Dashed line at zero represents the point where no effect is detected; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

expect that the generalized hazard (i.e., averaged over all MNP traits) of MNPs, as estimated from literature values, might still change. This could either increase with greater representation of MNP traits associated with higher toxicity or decrease, for example, depending on the species. Considering MNP traits in future analyses is thus vital to understanding the trait-dependent hazard and risk that MNPs pose to the environment.

Although our analysis accounts for many moderators, our results suggest that other unexplored moderators or interactions may additionally contribute to the observed variability (see high residual heterogeneity in the full model). A better characterization and reporting of MNP properties and the experimental setup are thus essential to derive more accurate effect sizes. Additional moderators that might influence effects include, for instance, food concentration during MNP exposure, particle surface properties (e.g., zeta-potential, other surface charge measure, or a detailed characterization of the eco-corona, if present), and an in-depth analysis of plastic-associated chemicals (Diepens & Koelmans, 2018; Zimmermann et al., 2020).

Conclusion

Our meta-analysis compiled 369 data points from 64 studies investigating the effects of MNPs on *Daphnia* spp. reproduction. Based on these data, we show that, across all tested MNPs, reproduction decreased on average by 13.6 neonates per adult, a 20.8% reduction compared with the control. This reduction is moderated by MNP concentration, exposure duration, experimental

temperature, and size category (micro- or nanoplastic). However, the variance in the data is high, and additional factors that are often not measured or not reported likely influence measured outcomes further. These include additional factors about the experimental setup, like the food concentration during exposure, and a more in-depth characterization of MNPs, including measurements of surface properties (surface charge, zeta-potential, properties of the eco-corona) and a detailed analysis of plastic-associated chemicals.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online at *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*.

Data availability

All data are provided in the supplemental material. All raw data and code are also openly available on GitHub (<https://github.com/StatEcotox/Antonio-Vital-et-al-2025>) and Zenodo (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17043976>).

Author contributions

Ana L. Antonio Vital (Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing), Luca Liprandi (Data curation, Validation, Writing—review & editing), Christian Laforsch (Funding acquisition,

Supervision, Writing—review & editing), and Magdalena M. Mair (Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Visualization, Writing—review & editing)

Funding

This study was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) – SFB 1357–391977956.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding this study.

Acknowledgments

We thank T. Cedervall, H. Imhof, and K. Lyu for kindly providing raw data.

References

- Amariei, G., Rosal, R., Fernández-Piñas, F., & Koelmans, A. A. (2022). Negative food dilution and positive biofilm carrier effects of microplastic ingestion by *D. magna* cause tipping points at the population level. *Environmental Pollution*, 294, 118622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.118622>
- An, D., Na, J., Song, J., & Jung, J. (2021). Size-dependent chronic toxicity of fragmented polyethylene microplastics to *Daphnia magna*. *Chemosphere*, 271, 129591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.129591>
- Baird, D. J., Barber, I., Bradley, M., Calow, P., & Soares, A. M. V. M. (1989). The *Daphnia* bioassay: A critique. In M. Munawar, G. Dixon, C. I. Mayfield, T. Reynoldson, & M. H. Sadar (Eds.), *Environmental Bioassay Techniques and their Application* (pp. 403–406). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-1896-2_39
- Barascou, L., Brunet, J. L., Belzunces, L., Decourtye, A., Henry, M., Fourrier, J., Le Conte, Y., & Alaux, C. (2021). Pesticide risk assessment in honeybees: Toward the use of behavioral and reproductive performances as assessment endpoints. *Chemosphere*, 276, 130134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.130134>
- Barata, C., Alañon, P., Gutierrez-Alonso, S., Riva, M. C., Fernández, C., & Tarazona, J. V. (2008). A *Daphnia magna* feeding bioassay as a cost effective and ecological relevant sublethal toxicity test for Environmental Risk Assessment of toxic effluents. *Science of the Total Environment*, 405, 78–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2008.06.028>
- Behera, S., & Das, S. (2023). Environmental impacts of microplastic and role of plastisphere microbes in the biodegradation and upcycling of microplastic. *Chemosphere*, 334, 138928. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2023.138928>
- Bellehumeur, K., Lapointe, D., Cooke, S. J., & Moon, T. W. (2016). Exposure to sublethal levels of PCB-126 impacts fuel metabolism and swimming performance in rainbow trout. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. Part B, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology*, 199, 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpb.2016.01.005>
- Besseling, E., Wang, B., Lürling, M., & Koelmans, A. A. (2014). Nanoplastic affects growth of *S. obliquus* and reproduction of *D. magna*. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48, 12336–12343. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es503001d>
- Betini, G. S., Wang, X., Avgar, T., Guzzo, M. M., & Fryxell, J. M. (2020). Food availability modulates temperature-dependent effects on growth, reproduction, and survival in *Daphnia magna*. *Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 756–762. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5925>
- Boháčková, J., & Cajthaml, T. (2024). Contribution of chemical toxicity to the overall toxicity of microplastic particles: A review. *Science of the Total Environment*, 957, 177611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.177611>
- Brehm, J., Ritschar, S., Laforsch, C., & Mair, M. M. (2023). The complexity of micro- and nanoplastic research in the genus *Daphnia*—A systematic review of study variability and a meta-analysis of immobilization rates. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 458, 131839. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2023.131839>
- Carrasco-Navarro, V., Muñoz-González, A. B., Sorvari, J., & Martínez-Guitarte, J. L. (2021). Altered gene expression in *Chironomus riparius* (insecta) in response to tire rubber and polystyrene microplastics. *Environmental Pollution*, 285, 117462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.117462>
- Chang, M., Zhang, C., Li, M., Dong, J., Li, C., Liu, J., Verheyen, J., & Stoks, R. (2022). Warming, temperature fluctuations and thermal evolution change the effects of microplastics at an environmentally relevant concentration. *Environmental Pollution*, 292, 118363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.118363>
- Connell, D. W. (1995). Prediction of bioconcentration and related lethal and sublethal effects with aquatic organisms. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 31, 201–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X\(96\)81925-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X(96)81925-4)
- Dekkers, O. M. (2018). Meta-analysis: Key features, potentials and misunderstandings. *Research and Practice in Thrombosis and Haemostasis*, 2, 658–663. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rth2.12153>
- Diepens, N. J., & Koelmans, A. A. (2018). Accumulation of plastic debris and associated contaminants in aquatic food webs. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 52, 8510–8520. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02515>
- Ebert, D. (2022). *Daphnia* as a versatile model system in ecology and evolution. *EvoDevo*, 13, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-022-00199-0>
- Ellis, P. D. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes: Statistical power, meta-analysis, and the interpretation of research results*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fadare, O. O., Wan, B., Guo, L. H., Xin, Y., Qin, W., & Yang, Y. (2019). Humic acid alleviates the toxicity of polystyrene nanoplastic particles to *Daphnia magna*. *Environmental Science: Nano*, 6, 1466–1477. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C8EN01457D>
- Fekete-Kertész, I., Stirling, T., Ullmann, O., Farkas, É. V. A., Kirckeszner, C., Feigl, V., & Molnár, M. (2018). How does experimental design modify the result of *Daphnia magna* heartbeat rate test? – Analyses of factors affecting the sensitivity of the test system. *Periodica Polytechnica Chemical Engineering*, 62, 257–264. <https://doi.org/10.3311/PPch.10841>
- Foley, C. J., Feiner, Z. S., Malinich, T. D., & Höök, T. O. (2018). A meta-analysis of the effects of exposure to microplastics on fish and aquatic invertebrates. *Science of the Total Environment*, 631–632, 550–559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.03.046>
- Funke, E., Webb, L., & Wolinska, J. (2024). The effect of microplastics on *Daphnia* fitness—Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Freshwater Biology*, 69, 461–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.14228>
- Gray, A. D., & Weinstein, J. E. (2017). Size- and shape-dependent effects of microplastic particles on adult daggerblade grass shrimp (*Palaemonetes pugio*). *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 36, 3074–3080. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3881>
- Grewal, D., Puccinelli, N., & Monroe, K. B. (2018). Meta-analysis: Integrating accumulated knowledge. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46, 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0570-5>
- Guzzetti, E., Sureda, A., Tejada, S., & Faggio, C. (2018). Microplastic in marine organism: Environmental and toxicological effects.

- Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 64, 164–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2018.10.009>
- Hart, R. C. (1992). Experimental studies of food and suspended sediment effects on growth and reproduction of six planktonic cladocerans. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 14, 1425–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/14.10.1425>
- Heinlaan, M., Kahru, A., Kasemets, K., Arbeille, B., Prensier, G., & Dubourguier, H. C. (2011). Changes in the *Daphnia magna* midgut upon ingestion of copper oxide nanoparticles: A transmission electron microscopy study. *Water Research*, 45, 179–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2010.08.026>
- Horie, Y., Yamagishi, T., Takahashi, H., Shintaku, Y., Iguchi, T., & Tatarazako, N. (2017). Assessment of the lethal and sublethal effects of 20 environmental chemicals in zebrafish embryos and larvae by using OECD TG 212. *Journal of Applied Toxicology: JAT*, 37, 1245–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jat.3487>
- Huo, Y., Dijkstra, F. A., Possell, M., & Singh, B. (2022). Ecotoxicological effects of plastics on plants, soil fauna and microorganisms: A meta-analysis. *Environmental Pollution*, 310, 119892. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119892>
- Iftikhar, A., Qaiser, Z., Sarfraz, W., Ejaz, U., Aqeel, M., Rizvi, Z. F., & Khalid, N. (2024). Understanding the leaching of plastic additives and subsequent risks to ecosystems. *Water Emerging Contaminants & Nanoplastics*, 3, 5. <https://doi.org/10.20517/wecn.2023.58>
- Imhof, H. K., Rusek, J., Thiel, M., Wolinska, J., & Laforsch, C. (2017). Do microplastic particles affect *Daphnia magna* at the morphological, life history and molecular level? *PLoS One*, 12, e0187590. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187590>
- Ivleva, N. P. (2021). Chemical analysis of microplastics and nanoplastics: Challenges, advanced methods, and perspectives. *Chemical Reviews*, 121, 11886–11936. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.1c00178>
- Jeong, C. B., Won, E. J., Kang, H. M., Lee, M. C., Hwang, D. S., Hwang, U. K., Zhou, B., Souissi, S., Lee, S. J., & Lee, J. S. (2016). Microplastic size-dependent toxicity, oxidative stress induction, and p-JNK and p-p38 activation in the monogonont rotifer (*Brachionus koreanus*). *Environmental Science & Technology*, 50, 8849–8857. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01441>
- Jeschke, J. M., Kopp, M., & Tollrian, R. (2004). Consumer-food systems: Why type I functional responses are exclusive to filter feeders. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 79, 337–349. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793103006286>
- Ji, Z., Huang, Y., Feng, Y., Johansen, A., Xue, J., Tremblay, L. A., & Li, Z. (2021). Effects of pristine microplastics and nanoplastics on soil invertebrates: A systematic review and meta-analysis of available data. *Science of the Total Environment*, 788, 147784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147784>
- Kamalakkannan, M., Thomas, J., & Chandrasekaran, N. (2024). Humic acid alleviates the toxicity of polystyrene nanoplastics in combination with their copper nanoparticle co-pollutants in *Artemia salina*. *Environmental Science: Nano*, 11, 4074–4088. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D4EN00437J>
- Khosrovyan, A., & Kahru, A. (2022). Virgin and UV-weathered polyamide microplastics posed no effect on the survival and reproduction of *Daphnia magna*. *PeerJ*, 10, e13533. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13533>
- Kim, H. J., Koedrih, P., & Seo, Y. R. (2015). Ecotoxicogenomic approaches for understanding molecular mechanisms of environmental chemical toxicity using aquatic invertebrate, *Daphnia* model organism. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 16, 12261–12287. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms160612261>
- Klasios, N., Birch, A., Murillo, A. M., & Tseng, M. (2024). Warming temperatures exacerbate effects of microplastics in a widespread zooplankton species. *Environmental Pollution*, 349, 123918. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2024.123918>
- Koelmans, A. A., Redondo-Hasselerharm, P. E., Nor, N. H. M., de Ruijter, V. N., Mintenig, S. M., & Kooi, M. (2022). Risk assessment of microplastic particles. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 7, 138–152. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-021-00411-y>
- Liu, S., Junaid, M., Liao, H., Liu, X., Wu, Y., & Wang, J. (2022). Eco-corona formation and associated ecotoxicological impacts of nanoplastics in the environment. *Science of the Total Environment*, 836, 155703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155703>
- Malinich, T. D., Chou, N., Sepúlveda, M. S., & Höök, T. O. (2018). No evidence of microplastic impacts on consumption or growth of larval *Pimephales promelas*. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 37, 2912–2918. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4257>
- Mayer-Pinto, M., Ledet, J., Crowe, T. P., & Johnston, E. L. (2020). Sublethal effects of contaminants on marine habitat-forming species: A review and meta-analysis. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 95, 1554–1573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12630>
- Nakagawa, S., Lagisz, M., O’Dea, R. E., Pottier, P., Rutkowska, J., Senior, A. M., Yang, Y., & Noble, D. W. A. (2023). orchaRd 2.0: An R package for visualising meta-analyses with orchard plots. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 14, 2003–2010. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14152>
- Ogonowski, M., Schür, C., Jarsén, Å., & Gorokhova, E. (2016). The effects of natural and anthropogenic microparticles on individual fitness in *Daphnia magna*. *PLoS One*, 11, e0155063. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155063>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2004). Test No. 202: *Daphnia sp. acute immobilisation test*. OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section 2. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264069947-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2012). Test No. 211: *Daphnia magna reproduction test*. OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section 2. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264185203-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2015). Test No. 421: *Reproduction/developmental toxicity screening test*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264242692-en>
- Pannetier, P., Morin, B., Le Bihanic, F., Dubreil, L., Clérandeau, C., Chouvellon, F., Van Arkel, K., Danion, M., & Cachot, J. (2020). Environmental samples of microplastics induce significant toxic effects in fish larvae. *Environment International*, 134, 105047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105047>
- Phyu, Y. L., Warne, M. S. J., & Lim, R. P. (2004). Toxicity of atrazine and molinate to the cladoceran *Daphnia carinata* and the effect of river water and bottom sediment on their bioavailability. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 46, 308–315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-003-2313-5>
- Pick, J. L., Nakagawa, S., & Noble, D. W. A. (2018). Reproducible, flexible and high-throughput data extraction from primary literature: The metaDigitise R package. <https://doi.org/10.1101/247775>
- Pikuda, O., Roubeau Dumont, E., Chen, Q., Macairan, J. R., Robinson, S. A., Berk, D., & Tufenkji, N. (2023). Toxicity of microplastics and nanoplastics to *Daphnia magna*: Current status, knowledge gaps and future directions. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 167, 117208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2023.117208>
- Pochelon, A., Stoll, S., & Slaveykova, V. I. (2021). Polystyrene nanoplastic behavior and toxicity on crustacean *Daphnia magna*: Media composition, size, and surface charge effects. *Environments*, 8, 101. <https://doi.org/10.3390/environments8100101>
- Qiao, R., Deng, Y., Zhang, S., Wolosker, M. B., Zhu, Q., Ren, H., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Accumulation of different shapes of microplastics initiates intestinal injury and gut microbiota dysbiosis in the

- gut of zebrafish. *Chemosphere*, 236, 124334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.07.065>
- Quaglia, A., Sabelli, B., & Villani, L. (1976). Studies on the intestine of Daphnidae (Crustacea, Cladocera) ultrastructure of the midgut of *Daphnia magna* and *Daphnia obtusa*. *Journal of Morphology*, 150, 711–725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.1051500306>
- R Core Team (2024). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. (Vienna, Austria) [software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Ramsperger, A. F. R. M., Jasinski, J., Völkl, M., Witzmann, T., Meinhart, M., Jérôme, V., Kretschmer, W. P., Freitag, R., Senker, J., Fery, A., Kress, H., Scheibel, T., & Laforsch, C. (2022). Supposedly identical microplastic particles substantially differ in their material properties influencing particle-cell interactions and cellular responses. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 425, 127961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.127961>
- Ramsperger, A. F. R. M., Narayana, V. K. B., Gross, W., Mohanraj, J., Thelakkat, M., Greiner, A., Schmalz, H., Kress, H., & Laforsch, C. (2020). Environmental exposure enhances the internalization of microplastic particles into cells. *Science Advances*, 6, eabd1211. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abd1211>
- Saavedra, J., Stoll, S., & Slaveykova, V. I. (2019). Influence of nanoplastic surface charge on eco-corona formation, aggregation and toxicity to freshwater zooplankton. *Environmental Pollution*, 252, 715–722. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.135>
- Salomon, S., Grubmüller, E., Kropf, P., Nickl, E., Rühl, A., Weigel, S., Becker, F., Antonio Vital, A. L., Laforsch, C., Schott, M., & Mair, M. M. (2024). Effects of dissolved organic matter on the toxicity of micro- and nanoplastic particles to *Daphnia*—A meta-analysis. *Microplastics and Nanoplastics*, 4, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43591-024-00088-4>
- Santadino, M., Coviella, C., & Momo, F. (2014). Glyphosate sublethal effects on the population dynamics of the earthworm *Eisenia fetida* (Savigny, 1826). *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*, 225, 2207. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-014-2207-3>
- Schrank, I., Trotter, B., Dummert, J., Scholz-Böttcher, B. M., Löder, M. G. J., & Laforsch, C. (2019). Effects of microplastic particles and leaching additive on the life history and morphology of *Daphnia magna*. *Environmental Pollution*, 255, 113233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113233>
- Schwarzer, M., Brehm, J., Vollmer, M., Jasinski, J., Xu, C., Zainuddin, S., Fröhlich, T., Schott, M., Greiner, A., Scheibel, T., & Laforsch, C. (2022). Shape, size, and polymer dependent effects of microplastics on *Daphnia magna*. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 426, 128136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.128136>
- Spector, T. D., & Thompson, S. G. (1991). The potential and limitations of meta-analysis. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 45, 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.45.2.89>
- Ten Berge, W. F. (1978). Breeding *Daphnia magna*. *Hydrobiologia*, 59, 121–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00020772>
- Thompson, R. C., Courtene-Jones, W., Boucher, J., Pahl, S., Raubenheimer, K., & Koelmans, A. A. (2024). Twenty years of microplastics pollution research—What have we learned? *Science*, 386, ead12746. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adl2746>
- Thornton Hampton, L. M. T., Briggs Wyler, D., Carney Almroth, B., Coffin, S., Cowger, W., Doyle, D., Hataley, E. K., Hutton, S. J., Mair, M. M., Miller, E. L., Monclús, L., Sharpe, E. E., Samreen, S., Ahmed, K. T., Allamby, Q. P. V., Antonio Vital, A. L., Asnicar, D., Bare, J. L., Barrick, A., ... Mehinto, A. C. (2025). The toxicity of microplastics explorer (ToMEx) 2.0. *Microplastics and Nanoplastics*, 5, 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43591-025-00145-6>
- Thornton Hampton, L. M., Lowman, H., Coffin, S., Darin, E., De Frond, H., Hermabessiere, L., Miller, E., De Ruijter, V. N., Faltynkova, A., Kotar, S., Monclús, L., Siddiqui, S., Völker, J., Brander, S., Koelmans, A. A., Rochman, C. M., Wagner, M., & Mehinto, A. C. (2022). A living tool for the continued exploration of microplastic toxicity. *Microplastics and Nanoplastics*, 2, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43591-022-00032-4>
- Tkaczyk, A., Bownik, A., Dudka, J., Kowal, K., & Ślaska, B. (2021). *Daphnia magna* model in the toxicity assessment of pharmaceuticals: A review. *Science of the Total Environment*, 763, 143038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143038>
- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36, 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v036.i03>
- Vilas-Boas, J. A., Cardoso, S. J., Senra, M. V. X., Rico, A., & Dias, R. J. P. (2020). Ciliates as model organisms for the ecotoxicological risk assessment of heavy metals: A meta-analysis. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, 199, 110669. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.110669>
- Völker, C., Boedicker, C., Daubenthaler, J., Oetken, M., & Oehlmann, J. (2013). Comparative toxicity assessment of nanosilver on three *Daphnia* species in acute, chronic and multi-generation experiments. *PLoS One*, 8, e75026. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0075026>
- Waldschläger, K., Born, M., Cowger, W., Gray, A., & Schüttrumpf, H. (2020). Settling and rising velocities of environmentally weathered micro- and macroplastic particles. *Environmental Research*, 191, 110192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110192>
- Wang, X. M., Zhang, X. R., Li, Z. H., Zhong, W. F., Yang, P., & Mao, C. (2021). A brief introduction of meta-analyses in clinical practice and research. *Journal of Gene Medicine*, 23, e3312. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgm.3312>
- Weber, A., von Randow, M., Voigt, A. L., von der Au, M., Fischer, E., Meermann, B., & Wagner, M. (2021). Ingestion and toxicity of microplastics in the freshwater gastropod *Lymnaea stagnalis*: No microplastic-induced effects alone or in combination with copper. *Chemosphere*, 263, 128040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.128040>
- Wieland, S., Ramsperger, A. F. R. M., Gross, W., Lehmann, M., Witzmann, T., Caspari, A., Obst, M., Gekle, S., Auernhammer, G. K., Fery, A., Laforsch, C., & Kress, H. (2024). Nominally identical microplastic models differ greatly in their particle-cell interactions. *Nature Communications*, 15, 922. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-45281-4>
- Wolf, J. C., & Segner, H. E. (2023). Hazards of current concentration-setting practices in environmental toxicology studies. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 53, 297–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408444.2023.2229372>
- Xu, M., Halimu, G., Zhang, Q., Song, Y., Fu, X., Li, Y., Li, Y., & Zhang, H. (2019). Internalization and toxicity: A preliminary study of effects of nanoplastic particles on human lung epithelial cell. *Science of the Total Environment*, 694, 133794. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.133794>
- Yang, T., & Nowack, B. (2020). A meta-analysis of ecotoxicological hazard data for nanoplastics in marine and freshwater systems. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 39, 2588–2598. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4887>
- Zimmermann, L., Göttlich, S., Oehlmann, J., Wagner, M., & Völker, C. (2020). What are the drivers of microplastic toxicity? Comparing the toxicity of plastic chemicals and particles to *Daphnia magna*. *Environmental Pollution*, 267, 115392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115392>

© The Author(s) 2025. 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 Toxicology and Chemistry, 2025, 44, 3517–3528
<https://doi.org/10.1093/etjnl/vgaf224>
Original Article