1	
2	
3	
4	Relative toxicity of selected herbicides and household chemicals to earthworms
5	
6	
7	Elizabeth G. Mosqueda <sup>1</sup> , Albert T. Adjesiwor <sup>2</sup> , Andrew R. Kniss <sup>2</sup>
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13 14	<sup>1</sup> Department of Biology and Chemistry, California State University, Monterey Bay, Seaside, California, States of America
15 16	<sup>2</sup> Department of Plant Sciences, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, United States of America
17	
18	
19	*Corresponding author
20	Email: <u>akniss@uwyo.edu (AK)</u>
21	
22	
23	
24	These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 1 Abstract

2 Agrochemicals are an important component of agricultural production systems. There are 3 increasing concerns about the effect of agrochemicals on soil biota and ecosystems. We evaluated 4 the short-term, acute effects of commonly used herbicides and household chemicals on earthworms (Lumbricus terrestris L.). The experiment was conducted on 19 Feb. 2018 (Exp. 1) and repeated 5 6 on 27 Jun. 2018 (Exp. 2). In both experiments, there were 13 treatments comprising 10 herbicides: 7 atrazine (Aatrex), nicosulfuron (Accent Q), dicamba (Clarity), s-metolachlor (Dual Magnum), 8 paraquat (Gramoxone), pendimethalin (Prowl H<sub>2</sub>O), glyphosate (Roundup PowerMax), and 9 clethodim (SelectMax) caprylic acid plus capric acid (Suppress EC), and pelargonic acid (Scythe); 10 one common spray adjuvant (nonionic surfactant, Preference), a combination of two household 11 chemicals commonly promoted as herbicide substitutes (vinegar plus dish soap), and a non-treated 12 control. All treatments were applied to earthworms at field use rates as recommended on the 13 product label, or, in the case of vinegar plus soap, at a concentration we found somewhere on the 14 internet. Treatments were arranged in a completely randomized design with 10 replicates. Worms 15 sprayed with Aatrex, Accent, Clarity, Dual Magnum, SelectMax, and Suppress EC were at greater 16 risk of mortality compared to the non-treated control in Expt. 1, but in Expt. 2, chemical treatments 17 did not increase the risk of worm mortality. Average time to mortality ranged from 12 to 21 days 18 and 17 to 24 days in Expts. 1 and 2, respectively. The herbicides evaluated in this study present a 19 low risk of acute toxicity to earthworms when applied at recommended rates.

## 20 Introduction

The presence of large invertebrates such as *Lumbricus terrestris* L., the common earthworm, has been extensively documented to improve soil structure and health by increasing soil aeration and drainage, and by breaking down organic matter [1-3]. In agroecosystems, these large invertebrates have been shown to be exceptionally beneficial to crop health by creating more conducive environments for crop growth [4-7]. The beneficial effects of worms in agroecosystems have not gone unnoticed by growers who have made conscious decisions to adopt practices that create more favorable environments for worm populations, as exhibited by the practices of conservation agriculture [8].

29 One main principle of conservation agriculture is conservation tillage. Conservation tillage is 30 comprised of management practices that aim to decrease soil erosion, preserve soil structure, and 31 increase moisture storage. Conservation tillage practices minimize or completely eliminate any 32 processes which intensely disturb soil [9]. Studies have shown that tillage decreases the overall 33 abundance of earthworms, therefore conservation tillage can positively influence worm 34 populations [10-12]. However, conservation tillage can adversely impact other aspects of cropping 35 systems, such as weed density. Tillage practices are some of the most effective forms of weed 36 control. Through inversion and/or mixing of the soil through conventional tillage practices, weeds above ground can be uprooted and weed seed emergence can be reduced by burving them deep in 37 38 the soil [13, 14]. Thus, in the absence of tillage, there is heavy reliance on other weed control tools 39 such as herbicides.

Herbicides are one of the most effective tools available to farmers to help control weeds in crops. Herbicide use has dramatically increased since the rise of chemical weed control in the late 1940's [15] and is a prominent tool to control weeds in agroecosystems where conservation tillage has been adopted [16, 17]. Concerns over adverse effects to ecosystems caused by extensive use of agrochemicals, especially herbicides, has become a major focus for environmentalists and growers wishing to implement sustainable cropping practices[18].

46 Several studies have quantified the relative toxicity of agrochemicals on earthworms through 47 various laboratory studies and models [18-20]. Hattab, Boughattas [30] demonstrated that 7 to 14 48 days of exposure to 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (24-D), an auxin mimic herbicide, did not 49 result in mortality of the compost earthworm (Eisenia andrei Bouché). In a related study, Roberts 50 and Dorough (21) reported that 2,4-D phenol is among the most toxic chemicals to E. fetida. 51 Acetochlor, a soil-applied preemergence herbicide, had no long-term effect on *E. fetida* when 52 applied at field use rate [18]. Although previous studies evaluated the effects of a wide range of 53 herbicides on worms, most studies either evaluated only the active ingredient (instead of the 54 commercial formulation) or used herbicides rates higher than the recommended field use rate [18, 55 22-25]. The objective of this study was to directly compare the direct, acute toxicity of commercial 56 formulations of commonly used herbicides in earthworms.

## 57 Materials and methods

58 Laboratory experiments were conducted in 2018 at the University of Wyoming Laramie 59 Research and Extension Center, Laramie WY to evaluate the toxicity of herbicides and 60 household chemicals to worms. Large earthworms measuring  $\sim 13$  cm in length were purchased 61 from a local fishing store (West Laramie Fly Shop, Laramie WY) on 19 Feb. 2018 (Exp. 1) and 62 27 Jun. 2018 (Exp. 2), a few hours before spraying. In both experiments, worms from each 63 packaged container (24 worms/container) were poured into a large container and gently shaken 64 and stirred to ensure thorough mixing. Worms were then selected one at a time and placed in 65 transparent plastic seedboxes measuring  $10 \times 10$  cm.

In both experiments, field use rates of nine conventional agriculture herbicides, one
organic herbicide, one spray adjuvant, and a combination of two household chemicals were used
(Table 1). A non-treated control was also included.

### 69 Table 1. Chemicals and rates applied to worms.

	Chemical	Common name	Product application rate
	<b>Conventional herbicide</b>		
	Aatrex <sup>a</sup>	Atrazine	4677 mL ha <sup>-1</sup>
	Accent <sup>b</sup>	nicosulfuron	47 g ha <sup>-1</sup>
	Clarity <sup>c</sup>	dicamba	877 mL ha <sup>-1</sup>
	Dual magnum <sup>a</sup>	s-metolachlor	1754 mL ha-1
	Gramoxone <sup>a</sup>	paraquat	2631 mL ha-1
	Prowl $H_2O^c$	pendimethalin	2338 mL ha <sup>-1</sup>
	Roundup PowerMax <sup>a</sup>	glyphosate	$1608 \text{ mL ha}^{-1}$
	Selectiviax <sup>c</sup>	cletnodim	$\frac{8}{1}$ mL ha <sup>-1</sup>
	Scylne <sup>r</sup>	petargonic acid	3% (V/V)
	Aujuvant	nonionia surfactant	0.25.9/(x/x)
	Organia harbiaida	nomonic surfactant	0.23 % (v/v)
	Suppress ECh	caprulic acid and capric acid	30/(y/y)
	Household chemical	capitylic acid and capite acid	5 /0 (V/V)
	Vinegar <sup>j</sup> + dish soap <sup>k</sup>	_	$100 \pm 0.0078 \% (v/v)$
70	<sup>a</sup> Aatrex, Syngenta, Greensboro, N	orth Carolina, United States	
71	<sup>b</sup> Dupont, Wilmington, DE, United	d States	
72	<sup>c</sup> BASF Corp., Durham, NC, Unite	ed States	
73	<sup>d</sup> Monsanto Company, St. Louis, M	10, United States	
74	eValent Corp., Walnut Creek, CA, United States		
75	<sup>f</sup> Mycogen Corp., San Diego CA, United States		
76	<sup>g</sup> WinField Solutions, St. Paul, MN, United States		
77	<sup>h</sup> Westbridge Agricultural Products	s, Vista, CA, United States	
78	<sup>j</sup> Kraft Heinz Company, Chicago, IL, United States		
79	<sup>k</sup> Procter & Gamble, Cincinnati, OH, United States		
80			
81	Each chemical treatment w	vas replicated 10 times in a compl	etely randomized design in
		1	5
82	both experiments. Worms were sp	prayed directly in transparent plast	ic seedboxes using a single-
83	nozzle spray chamber calibrated to deliver 187 L/ha of total spray volume, and then immediately		
84	covered in 150 mL of moist pottin	ng media (BM Custom Blend, Ber	ger, Saint-Modeste, Quebec,

Canada) and loosely placing the lid of the seed box to prevent worm escape and ensure oxygen
entered the box. Seedboxes containing the treated worms were transferred to a dark room and
kept at room temperature.

Mortality was recorded as a binary variable by assigning 0 if the worm was alive and 1 if the worm was dead. Worms were considered dead when they did not respond to a gentle poke of the finger [26]. Mortality was assessed regularly until all worms including the non-treated controls were dead. This corresponded to 45 and 51 days after treatment (DAT) in Expt. 1 and Expt. 2, respectively.

93 Survival analysis was used to quantify the acute toxicity of each treatment to earthworms.
94 A Cox proportional hazards model (Eq. 1) was used to estimate the risk of mortality. The model
95 was of the form:

96 
$$\lambda(t,x) = \lambda_0(t) \exp(\beta^T x)$$
 (1)  
97 Where  $\lambda(t,x)$  is the hazard rate of each chemical treatment (x) at a given time (t),  $(\beta^T x)$   
98 is the regression function of each treatment, and  $\lambda_0(t)$  is the time-dependent part of the model  
99 [27]. The regression function  $(\beta^T x)$  is similar to the coefficients in multiple linear regression and  
100 thus, the greater the coefficient (hazard ratio), the greater the risk of mortality. The proportional  
101 hazards regression was performed in the R statistical language (v 3.5.1) using the 'survival'  
102 package (v 2.38) [28-30].

## 103 **Results and discussion**

104 Cox proportional hazards ratios indicated that worms sprayed with Aatrex, Accent, Clarity, Dual 105 Magnum, SelectMax, and Suppress were at greater risk of mortality compared to the non-treated 106 control in Expt. 1 (Fig 1). However, variability in hazard ratios were also greater in these

107 treatments (Fig 1). In Expt. 2, chemical treatments did not increase the risk of worm mortality 108 compared to the non-treated control. In fact, the application of Preference and Scythe appeared to 109 reduce the risk of mortality compared to the non-treated control in Expt. 2 (Fig 1). This shows that 110 in most cases, worms died from starvation rather than the direct effects of chemical treatments.

111 Fig 1. Risk of worm (Lumbricus terrestris) mortality (Cox proportional hazards ratio)

112 following application of conventional herbicides (Aatrex, Accent, Clarity, Dual magnum,

113 Gramoxone, Prowl H<sub>2</sub>O, Roundup PowerMax, SelectMax, and Scythe), an organic herbicide

114 (Suppress EC), an adjuvant (Preference), and household chemicals (vinegar and soap) on 19

115 Feb. 2018 (A) and 27 Jun. 2018 (B), Laramie WY. Bars indicate 95% confidence interval.

116 Dashed vertical line indicates hazard coefficient of the non-treated control. Bars that overlap the

117 dashed line are not different from the non-treated control at the 0.05 probability level

118

Average time to earthworm mortality ranged from 12 to 21 days and 17 to 24 days in Expts. 1 and 2, respectively (Fig 2). This indicates that the risk of acute mortality from direct exposure to these chemicals is low when applied at recommended rates.

122

Fig 2. Worm (*Lumbricus terrestris*) mortality distribution following application of conventional herbicides (Aatrex, Accent, Clarity, Dual magnum, Gramoxone, Prowl H<sub>2</sub>O, Roundup PowerMax, SelectMax, and Scythe), an organic herbicide (Suppress EC), an adjuvant (Preference), and household chemicals (vinegar and soap) compared to the nontreated control (Control) on 19 Feb. 2018 (A) and 27 Jun. 2018 (B), Laramie WY. Dashed vertical lines indicate mean time (days) to mortality.

129

130 Roberts and Dorough (31) stated that the active ingredient in gramoxone is only moderately toxic 131 to earthworms. Similarity, glyphosate (the active ingredient in Roundup PowerMax) has low to 132 negligible toxicity in E. fetida [32]. Hattab, Boughattas (33) demonstrated that 7 to 14 days 133 exposure to 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (24-D), an auxin herbicide with similar activity as 134 dicamba, did not result in mortality of the compost earthworm (E. andrei). However, exposure to 135 2,4-D herbicide reduced the growth of the earthworm [33]. On the contrary, Roberts and Dorough 136 (21) reported that 2,4-D phenol is among the most toxic chemicals to the earthworm *E. fetida*. 137 Butler and Verrell (22) concluded in a study that Ortho Weed Be Gon, the commercial formulation 138 of mecocrop, 2,4-D, and dicamba mixture was not toxic to the earthworm *E. fetida* and could even 139 reduce the toxicity of organophosphate insecticides to worms.

Exposure of annelid worms (*L. variegatus*) to high concentrations of diuron, a herbicide that inhibits photosynthesis, did not affect *L. variegatus* reproduction and no mortality was recorded 10 days after application [34]. Nebeker and Schuytema (34) concluded that although diuron reduced the weight of *L. variegatus*, field use rates of diuron would do little harm to worms. Similarly, exposure of the aquatic worm (*Tubifex tubifex*) to isoproturon herbicide, a herbicide that inhibits photosynthesis did not result in mortality 7 days after treatment [35]. However, the growth rate of *T. tubifex* reduced with increased rates of isoproturon [35].

147 It is important to state that the experimental procedure we employed assumed a worst-case 148 scenario where herbicides are sprayed directly on worms and worms are confined to the toxic 149 environment for the rest of their lives. This is unlikely under field conditions because worms may 150 exhibit an avoidance response when exposed to toxic chemicals by moving into uncontaminated 151 soils if accessible [22, 32]. However, similar methods have been used in the past to evaluate worstcase scenarios. For example, Bruhl [36] sprayed juvenile frogs (*Rana temporaria*) directly with terrestrial pesticides using methods similar to ours and reported mortality "within one hour" of application. The authors of that study went so far as to suggest pesticide exposure may be an underestimated cause of global amphibian decline. Our results, though, suggest that most of the herbicides and household products evaluated here are unlikely to cause such dramatic acute effects in earthworms if used as directed.

These herbicides, when applied at the recommended field use rates are not likely to cause acute mortality in earthworms. We did not evaluate other aspects of toxicity (such as activity or reproduction) in this study, but evidence from previous studies suggest that the effect on reproduction of *L. terrestris* is also unlikely [34]. Chemical toxicity depends on the worm species. For example, *Eisenia foetida* is less sensitive to chemicals compared to *L. rubellus* [21]. Thus, the species of worm used in the study might have influenced the results.

## 164 **Conclusions**

Worms sprayed with Aatrex, Accent, Clarity, Dual magnum, SelectMax, and Suppress were at greater risk of mortality compared to the non-treated control in Expt. 1. In Expt. 2, chemical treatments did not increase the risk of worm mortality. Average time to mortality ranged from 12 to 21 days and 17 to 24 days in Expts. 1 and 2, respectively. Herbicides present low risk of acute mortality to worms when applied at recommended field use rates.

170	References
171 172	1 Blanchart E. Albrecht A. Alegre I. Duboisset A. Gilot C. Pashanasi B. et al. Effects of
173	earthworms on soil structure and physical properties. Earthworm management in
174	tropical agroecosystems. 1999;5:149-71.
175	2. Bronick CJ, Lal R. Soil structure and management: a review. Geoderma. 2005;124(1-2):3-22.
176	3. Amezketa E. Soil aggregate stability: a review. Journal of sustainable agriculture. 1999;14(2-
177	3):83-151.
178	4. Brown GG, Edwards CA, Brussaard L. How earthworms affect plant growth: burrowing into
179	the mechanisms. Earthworm ecology. 2004;2:13-49.
180	5. Brussaard L. Soil fauna, guilds, functional groups and ecosystem processes. Applied soil
181	ecology. 1998;9(1-3):123-35.
182	6. Verhoef H, Brussaard L. Decomposition and nitrogen mineralization in natural and
183	agroecosystems: the contribution of soil animals. Biogeochemistry. 1990;11(3):175.
184	7. Hendrix PF, Parmelee RW, Crossley D, Coleman DC, Odum EP, Groffman PM. Detritus
185	food webs in conventional and no-tillage agroecosystems. Bioscience.
186	1986;36(6):374-80.
187	8. Lahmar R. Adoption of conservation agriculture in Europe: lessons of the KASSA project.
188	Land use policy. 2010;27(1):4-10.
189	9. Derpsch R. Conservation tillage, no-tillage and related technologies. Conservation
190	agriculture: Springer; 2003. p. 181-90.
191	10. Rovira A, Smettem K, Lee K. Effect of rotation and conservation tillage of earthworms in a
192	red-brown earth under wheat. Australian Journal of Agricultural Research.
193	1987;38(5):829-34.

194	11. House GJ, Parmelee RW. Comparison of soil arthropods and earthworms from conventional
195	and no-tillage agroecosystems. Soil and Tillage Research. 1985;5(4):351-60.
196	12. Wardle DA. Impacts of disturbance on detritus food webs in agro-ecosystems of contrasting
197	tillage and weed management practices. Advances in ecological research. 26:
198	Elsevier; 1995. p. 105-85.
199	13. Gunsolus JL. Mechanical and cultural weed control in corn and soybeans. American Journal
200	of Alternative Agriculture. 1990;5(3):114-9.
201	14. Bond W. Non-chemical weed management. Weed Management Handbook. 2002:296-7.
202	15. Timmons F. A history of weed control in the United States and Canada. Weed Sci.
203	1970;18(2):294-307.
204	16. Derksen DA, Lafond GP, Thomas AG, Loeppky HA, Swanton CJ. Impact of agronomic
205	practices on weed communities: tillage systems. Weed Sci. 1993;41(3):409-17.
206	17. Buhler DD. Influence of tillage systems on weed population dynamics and management in
207	corn and soybean in the central USA. Crop Science. 1995;35(5):1247-58.
208	18. Xiao N, Jing B, Ge F, Liu X. The fate of herbicide acetochlor and its toxicity to Eisenia
209	fetida under laboratory conditions. Chemosphere. 2006;62(8):1366-73.
210	19. Roberts BL, Wyman Dorough H. Relative toxicities of chemicals to the earthworm Eisenia
211	foetida. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry: An International Journal.
212	1984;3(1):67-78.
213	20. Wang Y, Wu S, Chen L, Wu C, Yu R, Wang Q, et al. Toxicity assessment of 45 pesticides
214	to the epigeic earthworm Eisenia fetida. Chemosphere. 2012;88(4):484-91.
215	21. Roberts BL, Dorough HW. Relative Toxicities of Chemicals to the Earthworm Eisenia-
216	Foetida. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry. 1984;3(1):67-78. doi: Doi

|--|

#### 218 WOS:A1984SN99300009.

- 219 22. Butler DW, Verrell PA. Inhibitory effect of a herbicide formulation on toxicity of malathion
- to the worm Eisenia fetida. Bull Environ Contam Toxicol. 2005;75(3):421-8. Epub
- 221 2006/01/03. PubMed PMID: 16385945.
- 222 23. Chen J, Saleem M, Wang C, Liang W, Zhang Q. Individual and combined effects of
- 223 herbicide tribenuron-methyl and fungicide tebuconazole on soil earthworm Eisenia
- 224 fetida. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):2967. Epub 2018/02/16. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-21288-
- y. PubMed PMID: 29445108; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5813222.
- 226 24. Wang Y, An X, Shen W, Chen L, Jiang J, Wang Q, et al. Individual and combined toxic
- effects of herbicide atrazine and three insecticides on the earthworm, Eisenia fetida.
  Ecotoxicology. 2016;25(5):991-9. Epub 2016/04/14. doi: 10.1007/s10646-016-16564. PubMed PMID: 27068296.
- 230 25. Wang Y, Cang T, Yu R, Wu S, Liu X, Chen C, et al. Joint acute toxicity of the herbicide
  231 butachlor and three insecticides to the terrestrial earthworm, Eisenia fetida. Environ
  232 Sci Pollut Res Int. 2016;23(12):11766-76. Epub 2016/03/08. doi: 10.1007/s11356233 016-6347-4. PubMed PMID: 26946506.
- 234 26. Neuhauser EF, Durkin PR, Malecki MR, Anatra M. Comparative Toxicity of 10 Organic235 Chemicals to 4 Earthworm Species. Comp Biochem Phys C. 1986;83(1):197-200.
- doi: Doi 10.1016/0742-8413(86)90036-8. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1986A223100034.
- 237 27. Armitage P, Berry G, Matthews JNS. Statistical methods in medical research: John Wiley &
  238 Sons; 2008.

239	28. R Core Team. 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. v 3.5.1 R
240	Foundation for for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: https://www.R-
241	project.org/. 2018.
242	29. Therneau TM. A package for survival analysis in S. 2015. Version 2.38. 2015.
243	30. Therneau TM, Grambsch PM. Modeling survival data extending the cox model. 2000.
244	31. Roberts BL, Dorough HW. Hazards of Chemicals to Earthworms. Environmental
245	Toxicology and Chemistry. 1985;4(3):307-23. doi: Doi 10.1897/1552-
246	8618(1985)4[307:Hocte]2.0.Co;2. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1985AJW1600006.
247	32. Verrell P, Van Buskirk E. As the worm turns: Eisenia fetida avoids soil contaminated by a
248	glyphosate-based herbicide. B Environ Contam Tox. 2004;72(2):219-24. doi:
249	10.1007/s00128-003-9134-0. PubMed PMID: WOS:000188531100001.
250	33. Hattab S, Boughattas I, Boussetta H, Viarengo A, Banni M, Sforzini S. Transcriptional
251	expression levels and biochemical markers of oxidative stress in the earthworm
252	Eisenia andrei after exposure to 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D). Ecotoxicol
253	Environ Saf. 2015;122:76-82. Epub 2015/07/27. doi: 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2015.07.014.
254	PubMed PMID: 26210610.
255	34. Nebeker AV, Schuytema GS. Chronic effects of the herbicide diuron on freshwater
256	cladocerans, amphipods, midges, minnows, worms, and snails. Arch Environ Con
257	Tox. 1998;35(3):441-6. doi: DOI 10.1007/s002449900400. PubMed PMID:
258	WOS:000075722400012.
259	35. Mosleh YY, Paris-Palacios S, Couderchet M, Biagianti-Risbourg S, Vernet G. Effects of the
260	herbicide isoproturon on metallothioneins, growth, and antioxidative Defenses in the

- 261 aquatic worm Tubifex tubifex (Oligochaeta, Tubificidae). Ecotoxicology.
- 262 2005;14(5):559-71. PubMed PMID: WOS:000231908500006.
- 263 36. Brühl CA, Schmidt T, Pieper S, Alscher A. Terrestrial pesticide exposure of amphibians: An
- 264 underestimated cause of global decline? Scientific Reports. 2013;3:1135. doi:
- 265 10.1038/srep01135.

266

# 267 Supporting information

- 268 S1 Data
- 269 S2 R code



Figure 1



Days after treatment to mortality

Figure 2