

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

A 3D numerical model to Track Marine Plastic Debris (TrackMPD): Sensitivity of microplastic trajectories and fates to particle dynamical properties and physical processes

Jalón-Rojas, I., Wang, X.H., Fredj, E.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.02.052>

Publication date

2019

Document version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Marine Pollution Bulletin

Citation

Jalón-Rojas, I., Wang, X.H., Fredj, E. (2019). A 3D numerical model to Track Marine Plastic Debris (TrackMPD): Sensitivity of microplastic trajectories and fates to particle dynamical properties and physical processes, *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 141, 256-272. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.02.052

Important note

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).

Please check the document version above in the following link:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025326X19301523>



This version of the accepted manuscript has been prepared according to the sharing policies of Elsevier: <https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies/sharing>

1 **A 3D numerical model to Track Marine Plastic Debris (TrackMPD):**
2 **Sensitivity of microplastic trajectories and fates to particle dynamical**
3 **properties and physical processes**

4 Isabel Jalón-Rojas¹, Xiao Hua Wang^{1,2} and Erick Fredj³

5 ¹ The Sino-Australian Research Centre for Coastal Management, School of Science, UNSW Canberra, Canberra,
6 Australia

7 ² State Key Laboratory of Satellite Ocean Environment Dynamics (Second Institute of Oceanography, SOA),
8 Hangzhou, China

9 ³ Jerusalem College of Technology, Jerusalem, Israel

10 **Corresponding author:** Isabel Jalón-Rojas (i.jalonrojas@unsw.edu.au; ijalonrojas@gmail.com)


11

12 **Abstract**

13 Numerical modelling is a key tool in understanding and determining the sources, trajectories and fates
14 of micro-plastic debris (MPD). In this study, we introduce TrackMPD, a new modelling framework for
15 the 3D transport of marine debris. TrackMPD fills the gaps in previous models by: (1) using a three-
16 dimensional approach; (2) providing compatibility with a variety of ocean models; and (3) including a
17 wide range of physical processes (advection, dispersion, windage, sinking, settling, beaching and re-
18 floating) and MPD behaviours that depend on particle dynamical properties, and the fouling and
19 degradation states. We implement a sensitivity analysis based on 44 scenarios to assess the relative
20 importance of the different processes and behaviours on the MPD trajectories and fates. Results show
21 that the MPD dynamical properties that impact their sinking, in particular plastic density and biofilm
22 thickness and density, have the biggest effect on the MPD transport, followed by turbulent dispersion
23 and washing-off.

24

1 **Graphical abstract**



2

3

4 *Keywords:* Lagrangian tracking model; Marine plastic debris; Microplastics; Physical processes;
5 Dynamical properties; Biofouling

6

7 **Highlights**

8 - Novel three-dimensional approach for modelling marine plastic debris transport

9 - Innovative modelling of physical processes and behaviour of microplastics

10 - High influence of vertical current shear on the dispersion of microplastics

11 - High impact of density and biofouling on sinking, and thus on trajectories and fates

12 - Particle size impacts the trajectories of spherical particles, but not of cylindrical

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Plastic pollution in marine regions is one of the most critical environmental issues affecting the world
3 today. Global plastic production has dramatically increased over the last decades, up to 620% between
4 1975 and 2012 (*PlasticsEurope, 2013*), as did the amount of plastic waste entering the ocean. Plastic
5 debris is now ubiquitous throughout marine systems in both surface waters and the sea bottom (*Ivar do*
6 *Sul, 2007; Barnes et al., 2009; Eriksen et al., 2014, Ling et al., 2017*), while the incoming flux of
7 plastic is expected to increase by an order of magnitude in the next decade (*Jamberk et al., 2015*). The
8 growing spread of marine macro- (>5 mm) and micro- (<5 mm) plastic debris brings about a variety of
9 ecological and socioeconomic risks, including physical damage of organisms (*Gregory, 2009*), habitat
10 modifications (*Gall and Thompson, 2015*), the loss of ecosystem services (*Smith, 2012*) and the loss of
11 tourism revenue (*Jang et al., 2014*). Microplastics can also enter and rise up the food chain, and be an
12 effective vector for invasive species and chemical pollutants, harming biodiversity and human health
13 (*Derraik, 2002; Browne et al., 2013; Clark et al., 2016; Koelmans et al., 2016*).

14 Increasing environmental concern about micro-plastic debris (MPD) has motivated numerous studies on
15 its impacts, and there is a need for a better understanding of MPD behaviour, transport and fate
16 (*Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012; Ivar do Sul and Costa, 2014*). Experimental research on MPD dynamic
17 behaviour and numerical modelling are key approaches to progress in this field. Despite the former still
18 being rare, recent studies have demonstrated the impact of physical properties of MPD on its motion.
19 Plastic density, size and shape are the main properties governing the buoyancy and mobility of MPD
20 (*Browne et al., 2010; Filella et al., 2015, Chubarenko et al., 2016; Zhang, 2017*). Higher densities and
21 sizes decrease the buoyancy of MPD, which can affect its environmental distribution. This is shown by
22 several in-situ surveys (*Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012; Enders et al., 2015*).

23 Quite recently, *Khatmullina and Isachenko (2017)* have made progress in parameterizing the impact of
24 physical properties on MPD settling velocity by measuring the settling velocity of MPD of different
25 densities, sizes and shapes, and comparing the values with existing semi-empirical formulations
26 developed for natural sediments. This highlighted the most accurate formulations, and motivated the
27 definition of a new formulation for cylindrical particles. MPD dynamic properties may be modified by
28 fouling by organisms (so-called biofouling, *Barnes, 2002; Zettler et al., 2013*) and their incorporation in
29 aggregates (*Long et al., 2015*). Biofouling increases the MPD specific density and size, contributing to a
30 loss in buoyancy and an increase in settling velocity (*Morét-Ferguson et al., 2010; Hidalgo-Ruz et al.,*
31 *2012; Chubarenko et al., 2016; Kaiser et al., 2017*). This may affect the MPD's final fate (*Rummel et*
32 *al., 2017*). MPD may also become brittle over time as part of the degradation process, fragmenting into
33 progressively smaller particles (*Weinstein et al., 2016; Jahnke et al., 2017*). There is evidence that the
34 physical properties of MPD influence their buoyancy and motion, but the impact on the particles' final
35 fate is still poorly understood.

1 Numerical models, in particular Lagrangian particle-tracking models coupled to ocean circulation
2 models, are widely used to evaluate and predict potential MPD sources, pathways and fates under
3 changing environmental conditions (see the compilation by *Liubartseva et al., 2016*). However, most of
4 these models assume marine debris to be neutral particles drifting within the surface layers, omitting
5 their dynamic behaviour and assuming a 2D approach (*Wakata and Sugimori, 1990; Isobe et al., 2009;*
6 *Martinez et al., 2009; Kako et al., 2010; Yoon et al., 2010; Ebbesmeyer et al., 2012; Lebreton et al.,*
7 *2012; Neumann, 2014; Mansui, 2015; Gajšt et al., 2016; Carlson et al., 2017; Liubartseva et al., 2018;*
8 *Murray et al., 2018*). This may be attributed to the lack of parameterization, until recently, of MPD
9 physical properties. The majority of MPD transport models thus not only ignore the sinking of particles,
10 being only valid for neustic MPD, but also other physical and biological processes such as washing-off
11 from the beach, bottom deposition, re-suspension from the bottom, fragmentation and biofouling
12 (*Hardesty et al., 2017; Zhang, 2017*). Wind drift is usually included in numerical models tracking large
13 macroplastics or objects (*Kako et al., 2010; Ebbesmeyer et al., 2012; Critchell and Lambrechts, 2016;*
14 *Murray et al., 2018*). The omission of physical processes can in part be related to the fact that most
15 studies on MPD transport focus on oceanic scales or in regional seas (review by *Liubartseva et al.,*
16 *2016*) and ignore coastal processes. In addition, Lagrangian tracking models are typically inflexible, as
17 they use hydrodynamic inputs from a specific ocean model (*Fredj et al., 2016*).

18 Despite these general features, some models have included improvements. *Liubartseva et al. (2018)*
19 consider the sedimentation and washing-off of MPD using a Monte Carlo probability technique based
20 on the particle age for sedimentation and the specific rate of washing-off and on the mean retention time
21 on the beach for washing-off. The probability of sinking was considered to increase exponentially over
22 time due to biofouling and interaction with sediments, but was independent of the particle properties. In
23 addition, the vertical transport of particles, and therefore the different horizontal currents at different
24 vertical layers, was taken into account. *Critchell and Lambrechts (2016)* also consider the MPD sinking
25 and washing-off, but through temporal rates: beached particles washed-off into the sea surface layer and
26 suspended particles settled on the bottom after a given time. Particle sinking was considered
27 instantaneous and independent of biofouling and particle characteristics. *Iwasaki et al. (2017)* used a
28 particle-tracking model that allowed particles to move vertically as a function of their size, but within a
29 depth of 0–5 m. These studies used a 2D approach, and hence ignored the fact that the settling of
30 particles together with vertical current shear can impact the MPD transport. The importance of vertical
31 current shear in the transport of microplastics has indeed been demonstrated for low-density floating
32 microplastics moving in a coastal bay under strong turbulence (*Jalón-Rojas et al., 2019*). Until now, the
33 sinking velocities of particles in a 3D approach has only been considered in the MARBLE model
34 (*Bagaev et al., 2017*). Both MARBLE and the OceanParcels Lagrangian analysis toolkit (*Lange and*
35 *Van Sebille, 2017*) track plastic particles in the flow field simulated by external hydrodynamic models.
36 Notwithstanding these developments, MPD tracking models still need substantial improvement to better

1 represent the different dynamical behaviours of particles and the key physical processes, so as to
2 improve their predictive capabilities.

3 The aim of this work is to develop and present TrackMPD, a new modelling framework for the 3D
4 transport of marine plastic debris that incorporates the main physical processes relevant to plastic and
5 MPD behaviours. Following recent experimental work (*Zhiyao et al., 2008*; *Chubarenko et al., 2016*;
6 *Khatmullina and Isachenko, 2017*), TrackMPD includes the particle properties that define the MPD
7 behaviour (density, size, shape), the processes affecting their variations (biofouling, degradation) and
8 the parameterizations of physical processes (advection, diffusion, windage, sinking, beaching, washing-
9 off, deposition). Based on the Particle Tracking and Analysis Toolbox (PaTATO, *Fredj et al., 2016*),
10 TrackMPD is a user-friendly tool, compatible with velocity data from different sources. We implement
11 the model for Jervis Bay and its adjacent coast (SE Australia) in order to illustrate application of the
12 model and answer the following questions:

- 13 - to what extent is it important to model the transport of different types of MPD in three dimensions?
- 14 - how do physical processes and the physical properties of particles affect the transport and fate of MPD
15 and what is their relative impact?

16 This paper is organized as follows. Model structure, equations and numerical solutions are provided in
17 Section 2. Section 3 describes and discusses a sensitivity analysis to assess the relative influence of
18 different processes and behaviour model parameters on MPD trajectories and fates, using Jervis Bay as
19 a natural laboratory. Conclusions are drawn in Section 4.

20

21 **2. The TrackMPD modelling framework v.1**

22 TrackMPD is a three-dimensional non-Lagrangian particle-tracking model for the transport of marine
23 plastic debris in oceans and coastal systems. The power of TrackMPD lies in: (1) its compatibility with
24 diverse formats of current-velocity inputs; and (2) its ability to extend the Lagrangian modelling of
25 advection-diffusion by adding more-complex and realistic particle behaviours and physical processes,
26 which can either be included or excluded depending on the application. At present, TrackMPD can
27 include windage, beaching, washing-off, degradation, biofouling, sinking and deposition. In particular,
28 sinking and deposition depend on particle behaviour, which relies on the particle density, size, shape,
29 fouling state and degradation state. The model can incorporate new processes and behaviours, and
30 change the implementation of already existing ones, with new experimental findings or particular
31 applications.

32 TrackMPD has thus a structured and coherent modelling framework to satisfy the criteria of flexibility,
33 extendability and interchangeability. This framework is based on the Particle Tracking and Analysis

1 Toolbox (PaTATO, *Fredj et al., 2016*), which can already use velocity data from various sources, such
2 as different ocean general circulation models (OGCM: e.g. POM, ROMS and MITgcm) and satellite
3 observations, and can compute forward and backward trajectories in two or three dimensions. The
4 model consists thus of a set of coupled and mutually interacting modules. Modules are independent
5 functions or classes that define behaviours, read the inputs from a certain source, implement a given
6 physical process or perform auxiliary tasks such as create outputs. This allows independent
7 development of modules that can be easily added to the model without the need to change the other
8 modules. Furthermore, TrackMPD is a user-friendly tool developed in Matlab, and therefore is easily
9 accessible by a wide audience.

10 **2.1. Modular structure**

11 **2.1.1. Input modules**


12 As a first step, TrackMPD reads the input file (Fig. 1), in which users define the following information.

- 13 • **Hydrodynamic model name, domain, grid and parameters.** TrackMPD supports velocities
14 defined in rectangular Arakawa A and C grids, and in depth (z) and sigma (σ) vertical
15 coordinates. Version 1.x is compatible with a range of OGCM, such as POM, ROMS and
16 MITgcm; this range will be extended in future versions.
- 17 • **Physical processes and behaviours.** Turbulence, behaviour, washing-off and windage
18 modules can be turned on/off. Parameters of selected processes (Section 2.2) are defined at this
19 step.
- 20 • **Trajectory setting.** The simulation period is defined by the time step, the trajectory duration,
21 the trajectory direction (forward or backward) and the time of particles' release. The particle
22 location is defined from a .cvs file which contains four columns: longitude; latitude; depth (in
23 meters); and date of birth (the time in seconds from when the simulation starts until when the
24 particle is released).

25 **2.1.2. Trajectory computation module**

26 The marine debris trajectories are calculated off-line, i.e. after the OGCM has been integrated and the
27 velocity fields have been stored (Fig. 1). This makes it possible to calculate many more trajectories than
28 with online calculation. The model has external and internal time steps, Δt_i and Δt_G , respectively.
29 Boundary-condition algorithms prevent particles from leaving the model domain and determine if a
30 particle has beached or been deposited on the bottom. The external time step Δt_G is the time step of the
31 OGCM model output (e.g. 30 min). The internal time step Δt_i is the time interval during which particle
32 movement is calculated (e.g. 1 min). The internal time step is smaller than the external time step so that
33 particles do not move in large jumps that could cause inconsistencies between the predictions of the

1 OGCM model and the particle-tracking model. At each internal timestep of TrackMPD, particle motion
 2 is calculated as the sum of movement due to advection, turbulence and behaviour. The model contains
 3 sub-models for each of these components (Fig. 1). The equations and solution methods used in these
 4 subroutines are detailed in Section 2.2.



5
 6 **Fig. 1.** Flow diagram of the TrackMPD transport model. Optional processes are indicated by brackets.
 7 Black arrows represent the external and internal loops. Grey arrows represent the data exchange
 8 between the external and internal loops.

9

10 2.1.3 Output module

11 TrackMPD allows users to select the output parameters, time step and format (Matlab or NetCDF).
 12 Output data can contain model results, such as particles trajectories and fate (position and type – water,
 13 seafloor or land), and the model setting and inputs. The NetCDF format allows the output visualization
 14 and postprocessing in a range of software packages.

15

16 2.2. Equations and solution methods

17 2.2.1. General equations

18 TrackMPD is established in a three-dimensional domain extending in the zonal (x), meridional (y) and
 19 vertical (z) directions. Advective, diffusive and sinking displacements determine the 3D trajectories of
 20 particles according to

$$1 \quad dX(t) = dX_{adv}(t) + dX_{diff}(t) = U(x, y, z, t)dt + dX'(t) \quad (1)$$

$$2 \quad dY(t) = dY_{adv}(t) + dY_{diff}(t) = V(x, y, z, t)dt + dY'(t) \quad (2)$$

$$3 \quad dZ(t) = dZ_{adv}(t) + dZ_{diff}(t) + dZ_{sink}(t) = W(x, y, z, t)dt + dZ'(t) - w_s(t)dt. \quad (3)$$

4 The advective displacement $d\mathbf{X}_{adv} = (dX_{adv}, dY_{adv}, dZ_{adv})$ is given by the Eulerian velocity field $\mathbf{U} =$
5 (U, V, W) , which is provided by the OGCM, but can also include wind velocities. OGCM do not simulate
6 turbulent motion at scales smaller than the grid resolution of the model. In particle-tracking models,
7 particles can be moved in millimetre to centimetre steps — much less than the hydrodynamic model
8 grid scale. A random component $d\mathbf{X}' = (dX', dY', dZ')$ must be added to the particle motion to reproduce
9 turbulent diffusion $d\mathbf{X}_{diff} = (dX_{diff}, dY_{diff}, dZ_{diff})$ that occurs at the scale of the particle motion. The sinking
10 displacement dZ_{sink} depends on the settling velocity w_s . The model can also compute 2D trajectories
11 from two-dimensional modelled or observed velocity fields $\mathbf{U} = (U, V)$ by ignoring the term $dZ(t)$.

12 **2.2.2 Numerical solution**

13 *Interpolation scheme*

14 It is necessary to interpolate in time as well as in space because the duration between successive outputs
15 of the OGCM model is longer than the time step of the marine debris particle motion. OGCM model
16 predictions are read in and interpolated in space and time to the particle location. The first step in the
17 process of interpolating the water properties (e.g. current velocities, salinity, temperature, sea surface
18 height, vertical and horizontal diffusivities) to the particle location is to determine the grid cell in which
19 the particle is located. Once the particle is in a grid cell, water properties are interpolated in space to the
20 particle location. All water properties are interpolated from the native OGCM grid points (e.g. u -grid
21 points are used to calculate the u -velocity at the particle location, v -grid points are used for the v -
22 velocity and rho grid points are used for sea surface height, w -velocity, salinity and diffusivity
23 calculations). For three-dimensional water properties (e.g. current velocities, diffusivities, salinity), a
24 water-column profile scheme is applied. In this scheme, values are interpolated along each s -level to
25 create a vertical profile of values at the xy particle location.

26 *Advection*

27 A Runge-Kutta scheme of order 4/5 in both space and time is used to calculate particle movement due
28 to advection (Eq. (4)). This scheme solves for the current velocities $\mathbf{U} = (U, V, W)$ at the particle location
29 using an iterative process that incorporates velocities at previous and future times to provide the most
30 robust estimate of the trajectory of particle motion in water bodies with complex fronts and eddy fields.
31 Current velocities (m/s) provided by the Runge-Kutta scheme are multiplied by the duration of the
32 internal time step Δt_i to calculate the displacement of the particle in each component direction.

1 Displacements (m) are then added to the original location of the particle (x_n, y_n, z_n) in order to calculate
2 the new location of the particle $(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}, z_{n+1})$:

$$\begin{aligned} 3 \quad x_{n+1} &= x_n + U\Delta t_i \\ y_{n+1} &= y_n + V\Delta t_i \\ z_{n+1} &= z_n + W\Delta t_i \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

4 *Turbulence*

5 A random-walk model is used to simulate turbulent particle motion in the horizontal (x or y) directions.
6 When the horizontal diffusivity K_h is constant, the random-displacement model defaults to a random-
7 walk model:

$$8 \quad x_{n+1} = x_n + R[2r^{-1}K_h\Delta t_i]^{1/2}, \quad (5)$$

9 where K_h in m^2/s is evaluated at x_n . R is a random number with mean zero and standard deviation $r = 1$.
10 TrackMPD reproduces sub-grid-scale turbulent particle motion in the vertical (z) direction to mimic the
11 debris turbulent particle motion in that direction:

$$12 \quad z_{n+1} = z_n + R[2r^{-1}K_v\Delta t_i]^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$

13 where z_n is the initial particle location and K_v is the vertical diffusivity.

14 *Sinking and deposition*

15 The settling velocity w_s (m/s) occurs when the net gravitational force (gravity minus buoyancy) equals
16 the drag force. It is a characteristic feature of any negatively buoyant particle, and determines its
17 sinking displacement:

$$18 \quad z_{n+1} = z_n - w_s(t_i)\Delta t_i. \quad (7)$$

19 w_s can be directly defined by users or calculated by TrackMPD according to the particle behaviour
20 (physical properties, biofouling, degradation; see Section 2.2.3). In the last case, it can remain constant
21 or vary over time under the influence of biofouling and degradation. Particles reaching the sea bottom
22 are considered as settled particles.

23 *Windage*

24 Very low density objects may float, and so can be highly exposed to wind. TrackMPD allows users to
25 include the direct drift of spherical and cylindrical objects caused by wind through the advection
26 formulation Eq. (4). In that case, the velocity field U is given by current (U_c, V_c, W_c) and wind (U_w, V_w, W_w)
27 velocities (m/s) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= \frac{U_c + U_w \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{air} S_{above}}{\rho_{water} S_{below}}}}{1 + \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{air} S_{above}}{\rho_{water} S_{below}}}} \\
V &= \frac{V_c + V_w \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{air} S_{above}}{\rho_{water} S_{below}}}}{1 + \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{air} S_{above}}{\rho_{water} S_{below}}}}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where ρ_{air} and ρ_{water} are the air and water densities (g/cm^3), respectively, and S_{above}/S_{below} is the ratio between the dry and wet cross-sectional areas of the particles. This formulation comes from the balance between the wind pressure force acting on the upper part of the particle and the water drag force on the underwater part, ignoring viscous forces (Anderson et al., 1998). S_{above}/S_{below} is the result of the balance between gravity acting on the particle of density ρ and the Archimedean force h due to current pressure on the underwater part of the particle:

$$\left(\frac{h}{R}\right)^2 \cdot \left(3 - \frac{h}{R}\right) = 4 \frac{\rho}{\rho_{water}}. \tag{9}$$

S_{above}/S_{below} is calculated in TrackMPD following Chubarenko et al. (2016) from ρ (g/cm^3), ρ_{water} (g/cm^3) and the radius of the sphere or cylinder R (m):

$$\frac{S_{above}}{S_{below}} = \frac{2\pi}{(\alpha - \sin \alpha)} - 1, \tag{10}$$

where $\alpha = 2 \arccos(1 - h/R)$, with the ratio h/R the numerical solution of Eq. (9).

Beaching and washing-off

Marine debris can reach land and beach on the near-shore. Beached debris can be trapped on the coast or washed off on the next incoming tide (Johnson, 1989; Johnson and Eiler, 1999; Hinata et al., 2017). TrackMPD allows users to include a range of conditions to reproduce this behaviour. In particular, TrackMPD v.1 is able to read tidal elevation data and wash off debris at high tide. In addition, it includes a Monte Carlo approach with probability P of being washed off, based on Lagrangian oil-spill models (Al-Rabeh et al., 2000):

$$P = 0.5^{-t/T}, \tag{11}$$

where t is the time step from the last beaching and T is the half-life for debris to remain on the beach before being washed off again. This approach assumes that the probability of washing-off decreases exponentially with time due to interaction with the coastline (Liubarzeva et al., 2018). Beached debris can be washed off from the coast to the sea at high tides to its last position before beaching if a randomly generated number (between 0 and 1) is less than P . TrackMPD will include more-complex formulation in future versions to better reproduce the washing-off by tides, and also by waves.

1 2.2.3. Behaviour parameterization

2 The sinking behaviour of simulated marine debris is determined by the settling velocity w_s (Eqs. (3) and
3 (6)). This parameter can be a model input for any kind of marine debris, macro-plastics, MPD or any
4 other kind of object. In the case of MPD, TrackMPD allows the temporal estimation of w_s according the
5 MPD behaviour. MPD behaviour is defined by its physical properties (density, shape, size), which can
6 change over time under the effect of biofouling or degradation. Settling-velocity estimation for different
7 behaviours is described below. It is based on recent experimental research, and may be easily modified
8 in future model versions as a result of new experimental findings or particular applications.

9 *Physical properties*

10 MPD behaviour mainly depends on three characteristics: density; shape; and size (*Ballent et al., 2012;*
11 *Chubarenko et al., 2016; Khatmullina and Isachenko, 2017; Kooi et al., 2017*). The specific density of
12 plastic particles depends on the type of polymer, ranging from $<0.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$ for foamed polystyrene to
13 2.3 g/cm^3 for teflon (*Chubarenko et al., 2016*). Denser particles of the same size and shape settle sooner
14 (*Kooi et al., 2017*). The size of MPD identified in the environment is very variable (*Cole, 2016*), with 5
15 mm widely recognized as the maximum size. Lower sizes vary between studies, and depend on the
16 sampling method (i.e. mesh size of the net, typically from 3 to 5 mm; *Hidalgo-Ruz et al., 2012*).
17 Particles of the same density but larger size increase the ratio of the gravitational force acting on the
18 particle to the viscous resistance of the fluid, and therefore the settling velocity. Common shapes of
19 MPD are fibers, pellets and fragments of various geometries, from spherical to irregular. Primary MPD
20 (the result of direct release) usually have regular shapes (such as beads or spherules), whereas
21 secondary MPD (exposed to degradation) show diverse shapes (*Khatmullina and Isachenko, 2017*). Old
22 fragments are characterized by smooth edges due to the ongoing polishing by other particles or
23 sediment (*Doyle et al., 2011*). Elongated shapes are associated with large particles, while small particles
24 are usually more spherical (*Gilfillan et al., 2009*). The shape of MPD determines the nature of its
25 motion, and therefore influences its settling velocity (*Isachenko et al., 2016*).

26 Despite the well-known impact of these physical properties on MPD settling velocity, only very few
27 studies have been concerned with its parameterization. *Khatmullina and Isachenko (2017)* measured the
28 settling velocity of around 600 microplastics of different sizes (from 0.5 to 5 mm) and shapes (spheres,
29 short cylinders (diameter \approx length) and long cylinders), and compared the observed values with several
30 empirical predictions developed for natural sediments. There was reasonable agreement except for long
31 cylinders, for which a new approximation was proposed. The *Zhiyao et al. (2008)* formulation provided
32 one of the best fits to data without the need for calibration. TrackMPD can incorporate this type of
33 formulation. In particular, TrackMPD v.1 uses the Zhiyao and the Katmullina and Isachenko
34 formulations to calculate the settling velocity of spherical and cylindrical MPD, respectively, as a
35 function of their density and size: radius R (m) for spheres; radius R (m) and length L (m) for cylinders:

1 Spheres ([Zhiyao et al., 2008](#)):

$$2 \quad w_s = \frac{v}{2R} d_*^3 (38.1 + 0.93 d_*^{12/7})^{-7/8}, \quad (12)$$

3 where $d_* = 2R(g(\rho_p - \rho_w)/\rho_w v^2)^{1/3}$ is the dimensionless particle diameter, ρ_p the particle density, ρ_w the
4 water density (same units as ρ_p), v the water kinematic viscosity (m^2/s) and g the gravity acceleration
5 (m/s^2). w_s is calculated in m/s .

6 Cylinders ([Katmullina and Isachinko, 2017](#)):

$$7 \quad w_s = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1}{v} g \frac{(\rho_p - \rho_w)}{\rho_w} \frac{2RL}{55.238L + 12.691}. \quad (13)$$

8 This formulation provides w_s in mm/s , and requires the previous transformation to mm of all the
9 variables involving a longitudinal scale.

10 Both formulations can be used for short cylinders. Other shapes, such as films or flat angular particles,
11 and other MPD characteristics, such as the surface texture, might be considered in future model
12 versions in line with the development of experimental studies and semi-empirical formulations. The
13 specific MPD density can be selected as a function of the polymer type from the compilation of
14 densities by [Chubarenko et al. \(2016\)](#), which has been included in the TrackMPD package.

15 *Biofouling*

16 The growth of algae, invertebrates, bacteria or microbes on particle surfaces, so-called biofouling, can
17 increase the size and density of MPD, and therefore contribute to a loss of its buoyancy ([Loeb and](#)
18 [Neihof, 1975](#); [Zardus et al., 2008](#); [Rummel et al., 2017](#)). Particles initially characterized by positive
19 buoyancy can sink into the water column or even become incorporated into deep sediment layers on the
20 sea bottom ([Thompson, 2004](#)). TrackMPD can include the impact of this process on MPD trajectories
21 by increasing the size and density of fouled particles. Following simple geometrical rules proposed by
22 [Chubarenko et al. \(2016\)](#), the density ρ_p of a fouled particle due to a biofilm layer of thickness BT can
23 be approximated by

24 Spheres:

$$25 \quad \rho_p = \rho_0 \frac{R_0^3}{(R_0 + BT)^3} + \rho_D \left[1 - \frac{R_0^3}{(R_0 + BT)^3} \right], \quad (14)$$

26 Cylinders:

$$27 \quad \rho_p = \rho_0 \frac{R_0^2}{(R_0 + BT)^2} + \rho_D \left[1 - \frac{R_0^2}{(R_0 + BT)^2} \right], \quad (15)$$

1 where R is the radius of the original particle, ρ_0 is the density of the polymer and ρ_f is the biofilm
2 density.

3 In TrackMPD, the biofouling can be considered as either a stationary or non-stationary process. In the
4 first case, the particle is characterized by a constant biofilm thickness (BT) over time, representing a
5 given biofouling state. In non-stationary biofouling, the thickness can vary over time according to a
6 range of formulations. Even if there is evidence of a progressive temporal increase in BT (*Ye and*
7 *Andrady, 1991; Morét-Ferguson et al., 2010; Lobelle and Cunliffe, 2011*), to our knowledge, there are
8 no experimentally based parameterizations of these processes. TrackMPD v.1 includes an increase in
9 the biofilm thickness at a constant rate BR to give some insight into the impact of this non-stationary
10 process on MPD trajectories:

$$11 \quad BT = BT_0 + BR \Delta t, \quad (16)$$

12 where BT_0 is the initial biofouling thickness and Δt is the time step. This assumption was made in
13 previous studies to calculate the MPD sinking period (*Chubarenko et al., 2016*). More-accurate
14 parameterizations will be included in future model versions in line with new experimental research.

15 *Degradation*

16 The degradation of plastic in the environment can be induced by light, heat, oxygen and organisms.
17 Highly degraded plastics become brittle enough to fall apart in fragments (*Andrady, 2011*). This process
18 usually takes a long time, 50 years or more for plastic to fully degrade (*Müller et al., 2001*). However,
19 fragmentation may start early in the swash zone (*Efimova et al., 2018*) and in some coastal systems such
20 as salt marshes (around 8 weeks according to *Weinstein et al., 2016*), and therefore can impact MPD
21 transport at seasonal time scales. Specific models for MPD should be developed to help understand and
22 properly predict this complex process. The aim of this study is not to develop this kind of model or an
23 accurate parameterization of model degradation and fragmentation. However, we include a simple
24 parameterization of the MPD size decrease over time to gain some insight into the relative impact of a
25 progressive MPD wear on MPD trajectories. For this purpose, MPD size decreases at a constant rate
26 DR , which affects the settling velocity:


$$27 \quad \text{Size } (D \text{ or } L) = \text{Size}_0 (1 - DR \cdot T/100), \quad (17)$$

28 where Size_0 is the initial diameter D or length L of the particle and T is the time from the beginning of
29 the degradation to the current time step. DR is the percentage of size decrease per day, which can be
30 applied to different shapes. It is based on the quantification of the temporal evolution of MPD
31 properties in some experimental research (*Weinstein et al., 2016*). This parameterization allows a
32 preliminary assessment of the potential impact that degradation may have on MPD tracking. However,

1 a proper simulation of MPD degradation needs better formulation based on laboratory studies and field
2 monitoring.

3 3. Application and sensitivity analysis

4 TrackMPD has been applied to a case study in Jervis Bay and its adjacent coast (SE Australia, Fig. 2a).
5 Jervis Bay is a semi-enclosed embayment 15 km long and 8 km wide, with an average depth of 15 m
6 (Fig. 2c). The aim of this application is to demonstrate the ways TrackMPD can be used to include
7 different physical processes and MPD behaviours, and to discuss the relative impact of these physical
8 processes and behaviours on the trajectories and fates of MPD. While there is evidence of the presence
9 of MPD in Jervis Bay (*Ling et al., 2017*), evaluating potential trajectories and accumulation zones of
10 MPD in this system is not the focus of this work. The proposed simulations use idealized values for the
11 model parameters to assess the importance of the processes and behaviours represented and, ultimately,
12 to demonstrate the importance of the three-dimensional tracking of MPD.



13
14 **Fig. 2.** Jervis Bay and its adjacent coast: (a) location map (SE Australia); (b) POM grid and domain; (c) the bay and the
15 seeding locations for the sensitivity simulations (black circles). Shaded areas represent urban zones. Solid and dashed arrows
16 represent the surface and bottom circulation patterns of the bay, respectively, during the simulation period.

17

18 3.1 Model settings

19 Jervis Bay has been the focus of numerous modelling studies to explain its hydrodynamic processes
20 using the Princeton Ocean Model (POM; *Wang and Symonds, 1999; Wang, 2001; Sun et al., 2017; Liao
21 and Wang, 2018*). POM is a sigma-coordinate, free-surface, primitive-equation ocean model, which
22 includes a turbulence sub-model (*Mellor, 1998*). In this application, we use the POM hydrodynamic
23 model results from 24 June to 11 July 1998 to force TrackMPD. This is the period used in the previous
24 studies to validate POM in Jervis Bay, obtaining a very good fit to observations (see validation details

1 in *Sun et al., 2017*). The mesh size ranges from 500 m around the bay to 7 km at the open boundaries
2 (Fig. 2b). Twenty-one sigma layers were considered vertically, with higher resolution near the surface
3 and bottom. The model was forced by tides, heat flux, wind stress, daily mean temperature, salinity and
4 currents. Hydrodynamic outputs (currents, salinity, temperature) were provided in 1-hour increments.
5 During the simulation period, the bay was characterized by its typical circulation pattern; clockwise and
6 anticlockwise circulations in the northern and southern basin, respectively. The flow exchange through
7 the entrance was characterized by warm near-surface inflow on the southern side, and cold deeper
8 outflow on the northern side (Fig. 2). Readers should refer to *Sun et al. (2017)* for more details on the
9 hydrodynamic model setting.

10 A total of 44 sensitivity scenarios (Table 1, Supplementary Material A) were simulated to evaluate the
11 relative importance of the physical processes (horizontal dispersion, vertical dispersion, washing-off
12 and sinking) and behaviours (physical properties, biofouling and degradation) for MPD transport. The
13 “control” scenario did not include any physical process or behaviour, except advection-dispersion with
14 relatively small diffusivity coefficients — i.e. the microplastics were considered to be passive particles.
15 Windage was not included in the sensitivity analysis since it is only relevant for the transport of floating
16 objects (*Critchell and Lambrechts, 2015*).

17 Degradation occurs at long time scales (from several months to tens of years, *Weinstein et al., 2016*) so
18 its relative influence cannot be compared with other faster processes. Therefore, we analysed the impact
19 of degradation independently of the main sensitivity analysis. The degradation rates were overstated to
20 provide an insight into the potential influence of this process. For biofouling, we compared the
21 behaviour of particles with a constant biofouling state (given by the biofouling thickness and density)
22 and particles subject to temporally varying biofouling (given by the biofouling rate). The biofouling rate
23 has yet to be quantified, as explained in Section 2.2.3, so its real influence cannot be properly evaluated.
24 However, we used some reasonable values following descriptive observations (e.g. biofouling visible
25 after several days or weeks; *Ye and Andrade, 1991*; *Lobelle and Cunliffe, 2011*), in order to gain some
26 insight into its influence on MPD transport. Model parameters for the different scenarios are given in
27 Table 1. Where possible, they were values from the literature (key references are in Table 1). To
28 analyse the sensitivity to model parameters, their values were changed one by one in the different
29 scenarios, and the resulting trajectories then compared with the control-scenario trajectories following
30 the method described in Section 3.2. In the behaviour scenarios, characterized by several parameters,
31 the parameters not being evaluated were kept constant at their lowest proposed value (e.g. 1.026 g/cm³
32 for density and 0.3 m for size). The specific parameters in each scenario are detailed in Supplementary
33 Material A.

34

35

1 **Table 1.** Model parameters, sensitivity values and key references.

Process/Behaviour		Model parameter	Value	Scenario	Comments and key references	
Dispersion	Horizontal dispersion	Horizontal dispersion coefficient K_h , m^2/s	1	Control	Parameter value depends on the specific environment. We used the values proposed in Critchell and Lambrechts (2016)	
			2	1		
5			2			
Vertical dispersion	Vertical dispersion coefficient K_v , m^2/s	10 ⁻⁵	Control	Common values in marine systems Talley et al., 2011		
		5×10 ⁻⁵	4			
10 ⁻⁴		5				
Washing-off		Particle half-life on land before washing off T_w days	No washing off	Control	Limited data. We used values of the same order of magnitude as in previous applications (Liubartseva et al., 2018), and included continuous washing-off at high tides (no Monte Carlo)	
			1	6		
			2	7		
Sinking/ Behaviour		Density ρ g/cm^3	Passive	Control	We selected density values commonly found in marine systems (Khatmullina and Isachenko, 2017): passive (e.g. polyethylene); 1.026 (near seawater density, e.g. some polystyrenes); 1.035 (e.g. acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene); 1.05 (e.g. styrene-acrylonitrile); 1.2 (e.g. polycarbonate); 1.665 (e.g. polyester)	
			1.026	9, 15		
			1.035	1, 16		
			1.05	11, 17		
			1.2	12, 18		
		Shape	Passive	Control	Shapes with available formulations of settling velocity, Katmullina and Isachinko (2017)	
			Sphere	9-13, 19-21, 25-27, 31-32, 36-37		
		Size D or L mm*	Cylinder	Passive	Control	Microplastics are usually defined as particles ranging in size from 0.3 mm to 5 mm, Hidalgo-Ruz et al. (2012)
				0.3	9, 14	
				1	19, 22	
		Biofouling thickness BT g/cm^3	Biofouling density BD g/cm^3	0	Control	Chubarenko et al. (2016) suggest values around 0.5 mm.
				0.01	9, 14	
0.05	25, 28					
0.1	26, 29					
Biofouling rate mm/day	Biofouling rate mm/day	0	Control	Limited data. Several studies suggest that biofouling can be visible after several days/weeks (Ye and Andradý, 1991 ; Morét-Ferguson et al., 2010 ; Lobelle and Cunliffe, 2011). We tried to reproduce this behaviour.		
		0.0001	9, 14			
		0.0005	35, 38			
Degradation rate $DR\%$	Degradation rate $DR\%$	0	Control	Limited data. We used higher values than expected in coastal environments, just to gain insight into the importance of this process.		
		0.1	19			
		10	41			
			30	43		

2 * The size of spheres and cylinders are defined by the diameter (D) and length (L), respectively. The cylinder diameter was constant in all the
3 simulations at 0.3 mm.

4 The simulations were seeded at four locations (Fig. 2b): two inside the bay, in the inner region (R1) and
5 around the entrance (R2); and two outside the bay, south (R3) and north (R4) of the entrance. These
6 locations were strategically selected to reflect the constant transport of water into (warm surface inflow
7 R3/R1) and out of (cold deep outflow R2/R4) the bay due to the cyclonic flow (see Fig. 2). Ten
8 particles were released at each seeding site on 26 June 1998 for each scenario to compare the
9 trajectories resulting from the different processes and behaviours. Simulations were run for 12 days, the
10 mean residence time in the bay under low-exchange conditions ([Sun et al., 2017](#)), and provided the
11 particle positions each hour.

1

2 3.2 Sensitivity analysis

3 The relative importance of each process and behaviour parameter was evaluated by comparing the
4 trajectories of each scenario with those of the control scenario (passive particles, no washing-off and
5 low dispersion). In order to avoid the random behaviour of turbulent dispersion having an impact on the
6 comparison of scenarios, the same turbulent displacement was assigned to each particle at each time
7 step for all scenarios, except for scenarios 1–3 (for K_h) and 4–5 (for K_v) that aimed to show the
8 importance of turbulent dispersion on MPD trajectories (Table 1). We used three approaches to describe
9 and quantify the differences between each scenario and the control: (1) visual and descriptive
10 comparison of the resulting trajectories; (2) comparison of the percentage of particles reaching each of
11 the three different types of fate — remaining suspended in the water, beached on land and settled to the
12 bottom; (3) calculation of a dimensionless dynamical skill score that quantified the trajectory
13 differences between each pair of scenarios over the whole duration of the experiments. We used a skill
14 score (ss) based on the normalized cumulative Lagrangian separation (*Liu and Weisberg, 2001*) to
15 compare the numerical and observed particle trajectories. This method has been frequently used to
16 assess the performance of numerical ocean circulation models and oil-spill tracking models (*Röhrs et*
17 *al., 2012; Liu et al., 2014; Sayol et al., 2014*). In this study, the skill score quantified the agreement
18 between the trajectories of a given scenario and the trajectories of the control scenario, so that an ss
19 close to 0 indicated a bad agreement, while an ss equal to 1 indicated that the trajectories were exactly
20 the same. This allowed us to rank scenarios, and therefore to identify the processes and behaviours
21 parameters that most affected the MPD trajectories and fates. Following *Liu and Weisberg (2001)*, the
22 skill score is defined as:

$$23 \quad ss = \begin{cases} 1 - c/n & (c \leq n) \\ 0 & (c > n) \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

24 where n is a tolerance threshold that defines the requirements of the comparison, so that a smaller value
25 corresponds to stricter requirements and c is the normalized cumulative Lagrangian separation distance,
26 calculated as the cumulative Lagrangian separation distance (d) divided by the cumulative length of the
27 observed trajectory (l):

$$28 \quad c = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N d_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N l_i}, \quad (19)$$

29 where i indicates the time step at which d and l were calculated, in this case every 12 hours during the
30 trajectory period. We selected a tolerance threshold $n = 1$, following previous applications of this index
31 (*Liu and Weisberg, 2001; Liu et al., 2014*). For each scenario, we calculated the ss of all the released
32 particles, then the mean value for particles released at the same point.

1 3.3 Results and discussion


2 3.3.1 Relative impact of the physical processes

3 The MPD trajectories in all the scenarios differed from the control and from one another. All the
 4 modelled physical processes and behaviours therefore affected the transport of MPD, but to different
 5 degrees. The impact of each parameter on the trajectories also varied between the seeding locations
 6 (Fig. 2). Table 2 shows the skill scores and the percentages of the different type of particle fate (water,
 7 beach and bottom) for each scenario. These percentages are also shown in Fig. 3 for some key
 8 scenarios. As detailed in Section 3.2, ss quantifies the differences between the trajectories of the
 9 evaluated scenario and the control scenario. As each scenario represents the influence of one process or
 10 behaviour parameter, a low ss indicated a high impact of the evaluated parameter on the MPD
 11 trajectories and fates. In general, sinking and the behaviour parameters as a whole exhibited the lowest
 12 ss and therefore the biggest influence on the MPD transport, followed by turbulent dispersion and
 13 washing-off (Table 2).

14 **Table 2.** Skill Score and percentage of suspended, beached and settled particles for each sensitivity scenario. R1–R4 represent
 15 the four seeding sites (Fig. 2.c).

Physical processes and behaviour parameters	Scenario	Parameter value	Skill Score				Final Fate			
			R1	R2	R3	R4	Suspended (%)	Beached (%)	Settled (%)	
Control							30	70	0	
Horizontal turbulent dispersion	K_h	1	5 m ² /s	0.92	0.37	0.75	0.64	17.5	82.5	0
		2	10 m ² /s	0.82	0.35	0.70	0.57	12.5	87.5	0
		3	20 m ² /s	0.68	0.37	0.72	0.58	15	85	0
Vertical turbulent dispersion	K_v	4	5×10 ⁻⁵ m ² /s	0.88	0.52	0.81	0.67	20	77.5	2.5
		5	10 ⁻⁴ m ² /s	0.86	0.25	0.86	0.59	35	55	10
Washing-off	T_w	6	1 day	0.93	0.85	0.99	0.99	57.5	42.5	0
		7	2 day	0.93	0.85	0.99	0.99	75	25	0
		8	No Monte Carlo	0.91	0.81	0.99	0.99	77.5	22.5	0
Sphere	ρ	9	1.026 g/cm ³	0.61	0.40	0.68	0.53	32.5	20	47.5
		10	1.035 g/cm ³	0.50	0.01	0.63	0.63	0	2.5	97.5
		11	1.05 g/cm ³	0.40	0.02	0.55	0.64	0	0	100
		12	1.2 g/cm ³	0.36	0.34	0.58	0.64	0	0	100
		13	1.665 g/cm ³	0.36	0.29	0.57	0.64	0	0	100
Cylinder	ρ	14	1.026 g/cm ³	0.57	0.24	0.67	0.53	50	25	25
		15	1.035 g/cm ³	0.43	0.02	0.58	0.58	0	0	100
		16	1.05 g/cm ³	0.39	0.02	0.56	0.64	0	0	100
		17	1.2 g/cm ³	0.36	0.29	0.57	0.64	0	0	100
		18	1.665 g/cm ³	0.36	0.29	0.57	0.64	0	0	100
Sinking/ Behaviour	D Sphere	9	0.3 mm	0.61	0.40	0.68	0.53	32.5	20	47.5
		19	1 mm	0.48	0.00	0.66	0.63	0	0	100
		20	2 mm	0.39	0.01	0.58	0.64	0	0	100
		21	5 mm	0.36	0.34	0.58	0.64	0	0	100
		14	0.3 mm	0.57	0.24	0.67	0.53	50	25	25
Cylinder	L	22	1 mm	0.53	0.23	0.67	0.46	32.5	10	57.5
		23	2 mm	0.52	0.21	0.63	0.58	27.5	17.5	55
		24	5 mm	0.52	0.27	0.64	0.52	10	12.5	77.5
		9	0 mm	0.61	0.40	0.68	0.53	32.5	20	47.5
Sphere	BT	25	0.01 mm	0.57	0.10	0.59	0.62	0	17.5	82.5
		26	0.05 mm	0.39	0.02	0.54	0.64	0	0	100
		27	0.1 mm	0.38	0.07	0.56	0.64	0	0	100
		14	0 mm	0.57	0.24	0.67	0.53	50	25	25

Cylinder	28	0.01 mm	0.57	0.10	0.62	0.57	0	17.5	82.5
	29	0.05 mm	0.40	0.03	0.57	0.65	0	0	100
	30	0.1 mm	0.39	0.01	0.58	0.64	0	0	100
BD Sphere	9	0 g/cm ³	0.61	0.40	0.68	0.53	32.5	20	47.5
	25	1.05 g/cm ³	0.57	0.10	0.59	0.62	0	17.5	82.5
	31	1.1 g/cm ³	0.41	0.03	0.70	0.63	0	0	100
	32	1.35 g/cm ³	0.38	0.20	0.57	0.64	0	0	100
BD Cylinder	14	0 g/cm ³	0.57	0.24	0.67	0.53	50	25	25
	28	1.05 g/cm ³	0.57	0.10	0.62	0.57	0	17.5	82.5
	33	1.1 g/cm ³	0.42	0.01	0.70	0.58	0	0	100
	34	1.35 g/cm ³	0.38	0.15	0.57	0.64	0	0	100
BR Sphere	9	0 mm/day	0.61	0.40	0.68	0.53	32.5	20	47.5
	35	0.001 mm/day	0.61	0.38	0.67	0.44	2.5	20	77.5
	36	0.005 mm/day	0.59	0.30	0.58	0.68	0	17.5	82.5
	37	0.01 mm/day	0.56	0.36	0.71	0.65	0	12.5	87.5
BR Cylinder	14	0 mm/day	0.57	0.24	0.67	0.53	50	25	25
	38	10 ⁻³ mm/day	0.58	0.23	0.59	0.57	2.5	15	82.5
	39	5 · 10 ⁻³ mm/day	0.57	0.24	0.54	0.62	0	7.5	92.5
	40	0.01 mm/day	0.54	0.33	0.69	0.63	0	12.5	87.5



1


2 **Fig. 3.** Percentage of suspended, beached and settled MPD at the end of the simulation period (12 days) for scenarios
3 representative of the different processes and behaviour parameters: control; horizontal dispersion ($K_h = 10 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$, Scenario 2);
4 vertical dispersion ($K_v = 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$, Scenario 5); washing-off (T_w , Scenario 7); low-density small spheres (Scenario 10); low-
5 density large cylinders (Scenario 25); low-density small spheres affected by non-stationary biofouling ($BR = 10^{-3} \text{ mm/day}$
6 Scenario 39); and most of the other behaviours (Scenarios 11–14, 16–22, 27–28, 30–35).

7 *Washing-off*

8 The washing-off scenarios had high values of ss (0.81–0.99), which reveals their similarity with the
9 control (no washing-off, Table 2). In these scenarios, each particle followed the same trajectory as in
10 the control, from the release time to their beaching (Fig. 4). After beaching, some particles were
11 resuspended, others trapped on the coast. This was reflected by the higher percentage of suspended
12 particles at the end of the simulation: 57.5–77% compared to 30% for the control (I and IV in Fig. 3,
13 Table 2). Particles released in the bay (R1 and R2) beached sooner, so they had more opportunity to be
14 washed off into the sea again, as reflected by the lower ss (0.81–0.93, Table 2). Despite this, these
15 particles were beached on the east coast of the bay, which is characterized by low currents and
16 residence times, so most of the washed-off particles remained in this region.

17 Particles released outside the bay stayed permanently in suspension or beached by the end of the
18 simulation period. Their trajectories and final fates were therefore very similar to the control (ss near 1)
19 but they could differ more and more with increased simulation times. The longer the MPD were

1 allowed to stay on land before being washed off (higher T_w or nullification of the Monte Carlo Method),
 2 the higher the probability of them then being washed-off. This was shown by the increase in settled
 3 particles with increasing T_w at the end of the simulation. However, the impact of higher washing-off
 4 probabilities on particle trajectories was barely captured by the ss . This was also due to the trapping of
 5 particles in the eastern region of the bay in all scenarios and the short simulation time, which prevented
 6 the washed-off particles moving away from the beaching locations.




7
 8 **Fig. 4.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 9 different washing-off scenarios (Tables 1 and 2): (A) no washing-off (control scenario); (B) $T_w = 1$ (Scenario 6); (C) $T_w = 2$
 10 (Scenario 7); (D) no Monte Carlo Method (Scenario 8). The different colours represent MPD released at different sites: in the
 11 inner bay (R1, black); near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and north of the bay entrance (R4,
 12 pink).

13
 14 *Turbulent dispersion*

15 Turbulence can be an important process in determining the trajectory and fate of the MPD. In general,
 16 an increase in the horizontal and vertical dispersion coefficients (K_h , K_v) increases the differences from
 17 the control trajectories (decreasing ss , Table 2), but the impact of these parameters depends to a large
 18 extent on the release point. Particles released in the inner bay (R1) followed the clockwise circulation of
 19 the bay for most values of K_h and K_v used, so the final fates of the MPD were very similar in all the
 20 scenarios ($ss = 0.82-0.92$, black lines and symbols in Fig. 5). Only a K_h of $20 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ facilitated some

1 particles escaping from the main circulation and beach on the north coast of the bay ($ss = 0.68$, Fig. 5d).
2 Particles released near the entrance (R2) stayed in the bay for all values of the dispersion coefficients
3 and beached on the east coast of the bay (green lines and symbols in Fig. 5). However, higher K_v
4 increased the probability of particles being displaced to the west by stratified currents, and then to the
5 north coast of the bay by the clockwise circulation (Fig. 5e-f). In addition, larger K_v caused some of
6 these particles to reach the bottom near the coast (III in Figs. 3, 5e-f). Despite these trajectories, any
7 differences can be considered at first sight as relatively small; for different values of K_h in particular,
8 the resulting ss was very low (0.25–37, Table 2). This can be explained by the fact that a third of the
9 particles beached just after release at R2 in the control scenario. With increasing dispersion coefficients,
10 these particles followed trajectories that, although short, resulted in a small ss .

11 The impact of the dispersion coefficients on the trajectories of particles released outside the bay was
12 moderate ($ss = 0.59$ – 0.86 , Table 2). Most of the particles released at these sites landed or were
13 suspended in the same region north of Jarvis Bay at the end of all the dispersion scenarios (blue and
14 pink lines and symbols in Fig. 5). Increasing K_h enhanced the probability of particles released at R4
15 beaching on the north coast (II in Figs. 3, 5a-d); increasing K_v enhanced the probability of these same
16 particles entering Jarvis Bay (Fig. 5e-f).



1
2 **Fig. 5.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
3 different dispersion scenarios (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): (A) $K_h = 1 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ and $K_v = 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ (control scenario); (B)
4 $K_h = 5 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ and constant K_v ($10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$) (Scenario 1); (C) $K_h = 10 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ and constant K_v ($10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$) (Scenario 2); (D) $K_h = 20$
5 m^2/s and constant K_v ($10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$) (Scenario 3); (E) constant K_h ($1 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$) and $K_v = 5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ (Scenario 4); (F) constant K_h (1
6 m^2/s) and $K_v = 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ (Scenario 5). The different colours represent MPD released at different sites: in the inner bay (R1,
7 black); near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and north of the bay entrance (R4, pink).

8
9 *Sinking*
10 MPD buoyancy had a dramatic impact on the model results ($ss = 0.02\text{--}0.68$). In most of the sinking
11 scenarios, all the particles settled before the end of the simulation, except low-density cylinders, low-
12 density small spheres and particles subject to progressive biofouling (Table 2, Fig. 3). This contrasted
13 sharply with the control scenario results (70% and 30% of beached and suspended particles,
14 respectively). The horizontal distribution of particles was therefore highly influenced by sinking,

1 particularly for particles released at the bay entrance (R2, Table 2, Figs. 6–10). These particles moved
2 northward due to surface currents when they had a passive behaviour and beached along the eastern
3 coast of the bay (Fig. 6a), whereas non-buoyant particles could be moved outside the bay by
4 intermediate and bottom currents (Figs. 6b-d, 7b-d, see hydrodynamic description in Section 3.1).
5 Particles released in the inner bay stayed inside the bay in all the scenarios, although their final fate
6 depended on their behaviour (Figs. 6–10). Non-buoyant particles released outside the bay were also
7 highly impacted by vertical gradients in the horizontal currents, so their trajectories and fates depended
8 on the MPD behaviour. These results are in contrast with the modelling results of *Critchell and*
9 *Lambrechts (2016)*, who suggested that sinking has a relatively small influence on MPD fate. This is
10 because they assumed that particles settle at a given rate (day^{-1}), and ignored the impact of the vertical
11 current shear on the MPD transport as it moves vertically. The relative importance of each behaviour
12 parameter affecting MPD transport is discussed further in Section 3.3.2.

13

14 **3.3.2 Relative impact of behaviours**

15 The trajectories in all behaviour scenarios differed to a large extent from the control, as highlighted by
16 low *ss* values (Table 2, Fig. 11). Figure 11 compares the *ss* of the different behaviour scenarios (Table
17 2), showing the relative influence of the behaviour parameters (density, size, shape, and biofouling
18 thickness, density and rate) on the MPD trajectories (for clarity, only values corresponding to particles
19 released inside the bay, R1/R2, were included). This comparison suggests that, given the same release
20 point, the relative importance of the different behaviour parameters was quite similar (similar order of
21 magnitude of *ss*). All the behaviour parameters had a large impact on MPD transport, as all of them
22 contributed to MPD buoyancy; however, the effect of some quantitative parameters, such as size, can
23 vary according to the particle shape.

24


25 *Physical properties: density, size and shape*

26 The effect of increasing density (Fig. 6) and increasing size (Fig. 7) on the trajectories and fates of
27 spherical MPD particles was very similar. Particles released in the inner bay (R1) were transported by
28 the clockwise circulation in all the density and size scenarios (black lines in Figs. 6, 7). However,
29 higher densities and sizes favoured an earlier sinking, and therefore a final fate closer to the release
30 point but further away from the fate region of the control scenario. This was highlighted by the decrease
31 in *ss* as density or size increased (R1 spheres in Fig. 11a-b).


32 Spherical particles released near the entrance (R2) exhibited different trajectories, depending on their
33 density and size: **(a)** passive particles beached after a few hours close to the release point (green
34 crosses, Figs. 6a, 7a); **(b)** some small particles with a density slightly higher than that of water also

1 beached near the release point, but others were transported to the west by the inflow current near the
2 surface (green lines, Figs. 6b, 7b); (c) particles with intermediate densities ($1.035\text{--}1.05\text{ g/cm}^3$, green
3 lines in Fig. 6c-d) and sizes (1–2 mm, green lines in Fig. 7c-d) were transported out of the bay by deep
4 outflow currents (an ss near 0 indicates a large difference from the control trajectories, R2 spheres in
5 Fig. 11a-b); (d) high-density ($>1.2\text{ g/cm}^3$, Fig. 6e-f) and big particles (5mm, Fig. 7e) settled quickly and
6 near the release point (higher ss than intermediate densities and sizes, R2 spheres in Fig. 11a-b).

7 Particles released outside the bay (R3/R4) were also significantly influenced by density and size. Low-
8 density small particles (pink and blue, Figs. 6b, 7b) were transported to the north region, as passive
9 particles (pink and blue, Figs. 6a, 7a), but settled before reaching the coast or were about to settle by the
10 end of the simulation. Some of this type of particle were also transported inside the bay by surface
11 inflow currents. Particles with intermediate densities and sizes (pink and blue, Figs. 6c-d, 7c-d) were
12 transported to the northeast by intermediate and deep strong currents, travelling long distances in some
13 cases (e.g. blue lines in Fig. 6c). This agrees with some experimental studies that suggest that non-
14 buoyant MPD might travel longer distances than buoyant MPD due to hydrodynamic mixing processes
15 (*Frère et al., 2017; Zhang, 2017*). Very high densities and sizes led particles to sink quickly near the
16 release point (pink and blue, Figs. 6e-f, 7e).




1
 2 **Fig. 6.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 3 scenarios with spheres of different densities (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): (A) passive particles (control scenario);
 4 (B) $\rho = 1.026 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 10); (C) $\rho = 1.035 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 11); (D) $\rho = 1.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 12); (E) $\rho = 1.2 \text{ g/cm}^3$
 5 (Scenario 13); (F) $\rho = 1.665 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 14). All particles had diameter 0.33 mm. The different colours represent MPD
 6 released at different sites: in the inner bay (R1, black); near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and
 7 north of the bay entrance (R4, pink).



1
 2 **Fig. 7.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 3 scenarios with spheres of different size (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): (A) passive particles (control scenario); (B) $D =$
 4 0.33 mm (Scenario 9); (C) $D = 1$ mm (Scenario 19); (D) $D = 2$ mm (Scenario 20); (E) $D = 5$ mm (Scenario 21). All particles
 5 had a density of 1.026 g/cm³. The different colours represent MPD released at different sites: in the inner bay (R1, black); near
 6 the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and north of the bay entrance (R4, pink).


7
 8 The impact of density on the trajectories of cylindrical MPD was the same as for spherical MPD.
 9 Cylindrical particles followed similar paths to spherical particles for each density value and each release
 10 site (see trajectories of Scenarios 15–19 in Supplementary Material B). This is shown in Fig. 11a; ss
 11 values were similar for the trajectories of the spherical and cylindrical particles. The behaviour of
 12 cylindrical particles of different sizes was, in contrast, completely different from that of spherical
 13 particles. For the same density, cylindrical particles released at the same site all followed similar
 14 trajectory patterns, regardless of size. These patterns were the following ($\rho = 1.026$ g/cm³ and all

1 cylinder lengths; Fig. 8): particles released at R1 were transported by the clockwise circulation and
 2 settled on the north coast of the bay; particles released at R2 settled near the release site or were
 3 transported to the western coast of the bay by near-surface currents; and particles released at R3 and R4
 4 were transported to the north, where they settled, or were about to settle, by the end of the simulation.
 5 Unlike spheres, not all the cylindrical medium- and large-size particles settled by the end of the
 6 simulations (compare VI and VIII in Fig. 3, Table 2). This lack of an effect of increasing size on the
 7 trajectories of cylindrical particles was also evidenced by the constant values of ss for all the scenarios
 8 with cylinders of different sizes (all showed a similar difference from the control trajectories, Fig. 11b),
 9 and by the moderate increase in the percentage of settled particles with size (Table 2, Scenario in Fig.
 10 3). This was a direct consequence of the settling-velocity equation used for these particles (*Katmullina*
 11 *and Isachinko, 2017*, Section 2.2.3), which is based on the observation of different behaviours for
 12 cylindrical and spherical MPD. While the behaviour of spherical particles depends on both density and
 13 size, the behaviour of cylindrical MPD mainly depends on the density.



14
 15 **Fig. 8.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 16 scenarios with cylinders of different sizes (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): (A) passive particles (control scenario); (B) L


1 = 0.33 mm (Scenario 14); (C) $L = 1$ mm (Scenario 22); (D) $L = 2$ mm (Scenario 23); (E) $D = L$ (Scenario 24). All the particles
 2 had a constant density of 1.026 g/cm^3 . The different colours represent MPD released at different sites: in the inner bay (R1,
 3 black); near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and north of the bay entrance (R4, pink).



4
 5 **Fig. 9.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 6 scenarios with spheres subject to stationary biofouling (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): (A) no biofouling (Scenario 9);
 7 (B) $BT = 0.01$ mm and $BD = 1.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 25); (C) $BT = 0.05$ mm and $BD = 1.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 26); (D) $BT = 0.1$
 8 mm and $BD = 1.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 27); (E) $BT = 0.01$ mm and $BD = 1.1 \text{ g/cm}^3$ (Scenario 31); (F) $BT = 0.01$ mm and $BD =$
 9 1.35 g/cm^3 (Scenario 32). All the particles had an initial density of 1.026 g/cm^3 and an initial size of 0.33 mm. The different
 10 colours represent MPD released at different sites: in the inner bay (R1, black); near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay
 11 entrance (R3, blue); and north of the bay entrance (R4, pink).

12
 13 **Biofouling**
 14 The effect of different fouling states on MPD transport was analysed by varying the biofilm thickness
 15 (BT), with a relatively low biofilm density (1.05 g/cm^3), and varying the biofilm densities (BD), with a
 16 relatively small biofilm thickness (0.01 mm), of particles with a constant density and size (Table 1 and
 17 Supplementary Material A). The trajectories in the biofouling scenarios differed to a larger extent from


1 the control than the trajectories in the scenario free of biofouling, for both spherical and cylindrical
 2 particles (lower ss , Fig. 11b-c, Table 2). This revealed the large influence of this bio-physical process
 3 on MPD motion and fate. Figure 9 compares the trajectories of these scenarios for spherical particles.
 4 In most cases, biofouling led to a significant increase in the settling velocity, and particles settled very
 5 soon in this shallow system (Fig. 9c-f). Only particles released at R3 and characterized by a low biofilm
 6 thickness and density (blue lines, Fig. 9b) travelled longer distances through deeper waters before
 7 settling, carried by a strong intermediate current. Cylindrical particles showed very similar behaviour
 8 and trajectories to spherical particles (similar ss , Fig. 11c-d, see trajectories in Supplementary Material
 9 B). This is because the trajectories and fates of both spherical and cylindrical particles were very
 10 sensitive to density, and biofilms are characterized by densities much higher than water (Fisher *et al.*
 11 1983). The main difference was that cylindrical MPD released at R3 did, in general, travel slight longer
 12 distances due to the slightly lower settling velocity of cylindrical fouled particles compared to spherical.



13
 14 **Fig. 10.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 15 scenarios with spheres subject to non-stationary biofouling (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): (A) no biofouling (Scenario
 16 9); (B) $BR = 0.001$ mm/day (Scenario 35); (C) $BR = 0.005$ mm/day (Scenario 36); (D) $BR = 0.01$ mm/day (Scenario 37). All the
 17 particles had an initial density of 1.026 g/cm³ and an initial size of 0.33 mm. The different colours represent MPD released at
 18 different sites: in the inner bay (R1, black); near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and north of the
 19 bay entrance (R4, pink).

20

1 These results demonstrate that both biofouling parameters, biofilm thickness and density, played an
2 important role in the behaviour of MPD. However, biofouling is a non-stationary process, so biofouling
3 thickness can vary over time. As explained in Section 2.2.3, a progressive increase in the biofouling
4 thickness was parameterized by a constant biofilm rate (BR , mm/day) in order to gain insight into the
5 sensitivity of the MPD transport to this process. Trajectories and fates of particles subjected to very
6 small BR (0.001 mm/day) were very similar to those of particles free of biofouling (Fig. 10a-b, similar
7 *ss*, Fig. 11e), although with some differences. Some particles with a small BR , released near the
8 entrance (R2), were displaced outside the bay before sinking, caused by the deeper outflow currents;
9 particles released outside the bay (R3/R4) settled sooner and further north. This was highlighted by the
10 increase in the percentage of settled particles by the end of the simulation (compare V and VII in Fig.
11 3). As BR increased, particles showed a behaviour closer to that of more-dense or large particles (Fig.
12 10c-d). For example, particles released at R2 were flushed out of the bay. These conclusions are valid
13 for both spherical (Fig. 10) and cylindrical particles (see trajectories in Supplementary Material B).
14 These results demonstrate that progressive changes in the biofilm thickness can impact MPD transport.
15 Therefore, for accurate predictions of MPD fate, the MPD tracking models need to be fed with realistic
16 estimates of biofilm variability (*Kooi et al., 2017*), which in turns requires prioritizing laboratory and
17 field studies in this area.



1


2 **Fig. 11.** Skill scores of scenarios modelling the effect of the behaviour parameters (see values in Table 2): (A) density
 3 (Scenarios 9–18); (B) size (Scenarios 9, 14, 19–24); (C) biofouling thickness (Scenarios 9, 14, 25–30); (D) biofouling density
 4 (Scenarios 9, 14, 25, 28, 31–34); (E) biofouling rate (Scenarios 9, 14, 35–40). The different colours represent MPD released at
 5 different sites: in the inner bay (R1, black) and near the entrance (R2, green). Crosses and dots represent spherical and
 6 cylindrical particles, respectively.

7

8 *Degradation*

9 As explained in Section 3.1, degradation was not included in the sensitivity analysis since it is a slower
 10 process that needs a more accurate parameterization. Nevertheless, we compared the trajectories of
 11 particles subject to different (overstated) degradation rates, representing a constant loss of size ($DR\%$
 12 size decrease per day, Section 2.2.3), in order to provide some insight into its influence on MPD
 13 trajectories and fates (Fig. 12). All these scenarios were characterized by a density of 1.026 g/cm^3 , an
 14 initial size of 1 mm and spherical shape (see details in Supplementary Material A). Particles subject to
 15 both small (0.1% per day, Fig. 12b) and high (10% per day, Fig. 12c) degradation rates showed the
 16 same behaviour as particles free of degradation (Fig. 12c). Only some particles, with a DR of 30% per

1 day, followed different paths, as the loss of size favoured a retarded sinking and therefore transport into
 2 deeper water by a strong intermediate current (blue and green lines in Fig. 12d). The slow loss of size
 3 had only a small influence on the transport of non-buoyant MPD in relatively shallow systems, but
 4 improved experimental and modelling parameterization are necessary to investigate this further. An
 5 instantaneous fragmentation of particles may have a higher impact on the transport of MPD, as particles
 6 with different sizes can have very different behaviours (Fig. 7). This process will be included in future
 7 versions of TrackMPD once there is a better understanding.



8
 9 **Fig. 12.** Sources (circles), trajectories (lines) and fates, water (points), beach (crosses) and bottom (triangles), of MPD for the
 10 scenarios subject to degradation (Table 1 and Supplementary Material): **(A)** no degradation (Scenario 19); **(B)** $DR = 0.1\%$ per
 11 day (Scenario 41); **(C)** $DR = 10\%$ per day (Scenario 42); **(D)** $DR = 20\%$ per day (Scenario 43). All the particles had a density
 12 of 1.026 g/cm^3 , an initial size of 1 mm and spherical shape. The different colours represent MPD released at different sites:
 13 in the inner bay (R1, black), near the entrance (R2, green); south of the bay entrance (R3, blue); and north of the bay entrance
 14 (R4, pink).

15
 16 **4. Conclusions**
 17 TrackMPD provides a comprehensive, user-friendly, and versatile environment for the modelling of
 18 marine plastic transport in coastal and marine systems. We have demonstrated that the proposed
 19 modelling framework fills the gaps in previous models by: (1) considering a three-dimensional
 20 approach; (2) providing compatibility with a variety of ocean models; and (3) including a wide range of

1 physical processes (advection, dispersion, windage, sinking, settling, beaching and washing-off) and
2 MPD behaviour that depend on particle dynamical properties, and the fouling and degradation state.
3 The modular structure allows users to select and adjust the processes and behaviours included in a
4 simulation, and favours the future replacement of model formulations in line with experimental
5 progress.

6 Through a sensitivity analysis of the model parameters, we have demonstrated the large influence of the
7 proposed physical processes and behaviours on the transport and fate of MPD, and thus the relevance of
8 a three-dimensional modelling approach. Sinking had a dramatic impact on MPD trajectory and fate,
9 followed by turbulent dispersion and washing-off. The relative importance of all the model behaviour
10 parameters influencing the MPD trajectories was quite similar. Density, size and shape determine MPD
11 buoyancy, which played a key role in the vertical transfer of particles between the vertical shear layers
12 and on the settling of particles, especially in shallow waters. The behaviour of spherical particles was
13 determined by density and size, while the behaviour of cylindrical particles mainly depended on
14 density. Biofouling thickness and density had a strong influence in decreasing MPD buoyancy and
15 thereby impacting MPD motion. Preliminary results on the impact of time-varying biofouling and
16 degradation suggest that a progressive increase in biofouling thickness may have a significant influence
17 on MPD paths and fates, while the progressive decrease in size due to degradation seems to have only a
18 slight influence, particularly in shallow systems.

19 In addition to accurate hydrodynamic data, the successful estimation and prediction of MPD sources,
20 paths, distribution and accumulation zones using TrackMPD, and numerical models in general, require
21 accurate in-situ measurements of model parameters. At the very least, drifter data to estimate the
22 dispersion coefficients and validate trajectories, and microplastic samples to evaluate the particle
23 physical properties are required. Combining surface and subsurface drifter experiments could help to
24 assess particle behaviour in turbulent and stratified environments. Our modelling results also highlight
25 the need for priority research on biofouling parameterization to better understand and predict MPD
26 movement. Improvements in parameterizing and quantifying rates of other biological and physical
27 processes and behaviours such washing-off, resuspension, degradation, fragmentation and animal
28 ingestion are also critical to progress in this issue. Future ambitions for the model involve the
29 compatibility with unstructured grids, and the improvement or new development of processes and
30 behaviour formulations. A priority will be to better parameterize non-stationary biofouling and the
31 washing-off, and include plastic fragmentation and bottom resuspension.

32 **Acknowledgments**

33 The authors thank Nick Goldie and Dr Peter McIntyre for proofreading the article. The authors also
34 acknowledge the reviewers for their useful comments. This is publication no. 56 of SARCCM at
35 UNSW Canberra. Professor Erick Fredj was supported by a SARCCM Visiting Fellow Grant. This

1 work was supported by Intersect, the National Computational Infrastructure National Facility at the
2 Australian National University and by UNSW LIEF grant share LE120100181. The code source will be
3 published under GPL licence and, in the meantime, can be requested from authors.

4 **References**

- 5 Al-Rabeh, A.H., Lardner, R.W., Gunay, N., 2000. Gulfspill Version 2.0: A software package
6 for oil spills in the Arabian Gulf. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 15, 425–442.
7 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-8152\(00\)00013-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-8152(00)00013-X)
- 8 Anderson, E., Odulo, A., Spaulding, M., 1998. Modeling of Leeway Drift. U.S. Coast Guard
9 Res. Dev. Cent. Rep. GC-D-06-09.
- 10 Andrady, A. L., 2011. Microplastics in the marine environment, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 62(8),
11 1596–1605, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.05.030>.
- 12 Bagaev, A., Mizyuk, A., Khatmullina, L., Isachenko, I. and Chubarenko, I., 2017.
13 Anthropogenic fibres in the Baltic Sea water column: Field data, laboratory and numerical
14 testing of their motion, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 599–600:560–571.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.04.185>.
- 16 Ballent, A., Purser, A., de Jesus Mendes, P., Pando, S., Thomsen, L., 2012. Physical transport
17 properties of marine microplastic pollution. *Biogeosciences Discuss.* 9, 18755–18798.
18 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bgd-9-18755-2012>
- 19 Barnes, D.K.A., 2002. Invasions by marine life on plastic debris. *Nature* 416, 808–809.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1038/416808a>
- 21 Barnes, D.K.A., Galgani, F., Thompson, R.C., Barlaz, M., 2009. Accumulation and
22 fragmentation of plastic debris in global environments. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*
23 364, 1985–1998. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0205>
- 24 Browne, M.A., Galloway, T.S., Thompson, R.C., 2010. Spatial patterns of plastic debris along
25 estuarine shorelines. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44, 3404–3409.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es903784e>
- 27 Browne, M.A., Niven, S.J., Galloway, T.S., Rowland, S.J., Thompson, R.C., 2013.
28 Microplastic moves pollutants and additives to worms, reducing functions linked to health
29 and biodiversity. *Curr. Biol.* 23, 2388–2392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.10.012>
- 30 Carlson, D.F., Suaria, G., Aliani, S., Fredj, E., Fortibuoni, T., Griffa, A., Russo, A., Melli, V.,
31 2017. Combining litter observations with a regional ocean model to identify sources and
32 sinks of floating debris in a semi-enclosed basin: The Adriatic Sea. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 4(78).
33 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00078>
- 34 Chubarenko, I., Bagaev, A., Zobkov, M., Esiukova, E., 2016. On some physical and dynamical
35 properties of microplastic particles in marine environment. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 108, 105–
36 112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.04.048>

- 1 Clark, J.R., Cole, M., Lindeque, P.K., Fileman, E., Blackford, J., Lewis, C., Lenton, T.M.,
2 Galloway, T.S., 2016. Marine microplastic debris: a targeted plan for understanding and
3 quantifying interactions with marine life. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 14, 317–324.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1297>
- 5 Cole, M., 2016. A novel method for preparing microplastic fibers. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 34519.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep34519>
- 7 Critchell, K., Lambrechts, J., 2016. Modelling accumulation of marine plastics in the coastal
8 zone; what are the dominant physical processes? *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 171, 111–122.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2016.01.036>
- 10 Derraik, J.G.B., 2002. The pollution of the marine environment by plastic debris: A review.
11 *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 44(9), 842–852. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X\(02\)00220-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X(02)00220-5)
- 12 Doyle, M.J., Watson, W., Bowlin, N.M., Sheavly, S.B., 2011. Plastic particles in coastal
13 pelagic ecosystems of the Northeast Pacific ocean. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 71, 41–52.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2010.10.001>
- 15 Ebbesmeyer, C.C., Ingraham, W.J., Jones, J.A., Donohue, M.J., 2012. Marine debris from the
16 Oregon Dungeness crab fishery recovered in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands:
17 Identification and oceanic drift paths. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 65, 69–75.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.09.037>
- 19 Efimova, I., Bagaeva, M., Bagaev, A., Kileso, A. and Chubarenko I., 2018. Secondary
20 microplastics generation in the sea swash zone with coarse bottom sediments: Laboratory
21 experiments. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 5(313). <http://doi: 10.3389/fmars.2018.00313>
- 22 Enders, K., Lenz, R., Stedmon, C.A., Nielsen, T.G., 2015. Abundance, size and polymer
23 composition of marine microplastics $\geq 10\mu\text{m}$ in the Atlantic Ocean and their modelled
24 vertical distribution. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 100, 70–81.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.09.027>
- 26 Eriksen, M., Lebreton, L.C.M., Carson, H.S., Thiel, M., Moore, C.J., Borerro, J.C., Galgani, F.,
27 Ryan, P.G., Reisser, J., 2014. Plastic pollution in the world's oceans: More than 5 trillion
28 plastic pieces weighing over 250,000 tons afloat at sea. *PLoS One* 9(12).
29 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0111913>
- 30 Filella, M., 2015. Questions of size and numbers in environmental research on microplastics:
31 Methodological and conceptual aspects. *Environ. Chem.* 12, 527–538.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1071/EN15012>
- 33 Fisher, N.S., Bjerregaard, P., Fowler, S.W., 1983. Interactions of marine plankton with
34 transuranic elements. 1. Biokinetics of neptunium, plutonium, americium, and californium
35 in phytoplankton. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 28, 432–447.
36 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1983.28.3.0432>
- 37 Fredj, E., Carlson, D.F., Amitai, Y., Gozolchiani, A., Gildor, H., 2016. The particle tracking
38 and analysis toolbox (PaTATO) for Matlab. *Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods* 14, 586–599.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lom3.10114>

- 1 Frére, L., Paul-Pont, I., Rinnert, E., Petton, S., Jaffré, J., Bihannic, I., Soudant, P., Lambert, C.,
2 Huvet, A., 2017. Influence of environmental and anthropogenic factors on the
3 composition, concentration and spatial distribution of microplastics: A case study of the
4 Bay of Brest (Brittany, France). *Environ. Pollut.* 225, 211–222.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.03.023>
- 6 Gajšt, T., Bizjak, T., Palatinus, A., Liubartseva, S., Kržan, A., 2016. Sea surface microplastics
7 in Slovenian part of the Northern Adriatic. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 113, 392–399.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.10.031>
- 9 Gall, S.C., Thompson, R.C., 2015. The impact of debris on marine life. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 92,
10 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.12.041>
- 11 Gilfillan, L.R., Ohman, M.D., Doyle, M.J., Watson, W., 2009. Occurrence of plastic micro-
12 debris in the southern California Current system. *Calif. Coop. Ocean. Fish. Investig.*
13 *Reports* 50, 123–133.
- 14 Gregory, M.R., 2009. Environmental implications of plastic debris in marine settings-
15 entanglement, ingestion, smothering, hangers-on, hitch-hiking and alien invasions. *Phil.*
16 *Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 364(1526), 2013–2015. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0265>
- 17 Hardesty, B.D., Harari, J., Isobe, A., Lebreton, L., Maximenko, N., Potemra, J., van Sebille,
18 E., Vethaak, A.D., Wilcox, C., 2017. Using numerical model simulations to improve the
19 understanding of micro-plastic distribution and pathways in the marine environment.
20 *Front. Mar. Sci.* 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00030>
- 21 Hidalgo-Ruz, V., Gutow, L., Thompson, R.C., Thiel, M., 2012. Microplastics in the marine
22 environment: A review of the methods used for identification and quantification. *Environ.*
23 *Sci. Technol.* 46, 3060–3075. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es2031505>
- 24 Hinata, H., Mori, K., Ohno, K., Miyao, Y., Kataoka, T., 2017. An estimation of the average
25 residence times and onshore-offshore diffusivities of beached microplastics based on the
26 population decay of tagged meso- and macrolitter. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 122, 17–26.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.05.012>
- 28 Isachenko, I., Khatmullina, L., Chubarenko, I., Stepanova, N., 2016. Settling velocity of
29 marine microplastic particles: laboratory tests. *Geophys. Res. Abstr. EGU Gen. Assem.*
30 18, 2016–6553.
- 31 Isobe, A., Kako, S.I., Chang, P.H., Matsuno, T., 2009. Two-way particle-tracking model for
32 specifying sources of drifting objects: Application to the East China Sea shelf. *J. Atmos.*
33 *Ocean. Technol.* 26(8), 1672–1682. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHO643.1>
- 34 Ivar do Sul, J.A., Costa, M.F., 2007. Marine debris review for Latin America and the wider
35 Caribbean region: From the 1970s until now, and where do we go from here? *Mar. Pollut.*
36 *Bull.* 54, 1087–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2007.05.004>
- 37 Ivar Do Sul, J.A., Costa, M.F., 2014. The present and future of microplastic pollution in the
38 marine environment. *Environ. Pollut.* 185, 352–364.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.10.036>

- 1 Iwasaki, S., Isobe, A., Kako, S., Uchida, K., Tokai, T., 2017. Fate of microplastics and
2 mesoplastics carried by surface currents and wind waves: A numerical model approach in
3 the Sea of Japan. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 121, 85–96.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.05.057>
- 5 Jahnke, A., Arp, H.P.H., Escher, B.I., Gewert, B., Gorokhova, E., Kühnel, D., Ogonowski, M.,
6 Potthoff, A., Rummel, C., Schmitt-Jansen, M., Toorman, E., MacLeod, M., 2017.
7 Reducing uncertainty and confronting ignorance about the possible impacts of weathering
8 plastic in the marine environment. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 4(3), 85–90.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.7b00008>
- 10 Jalón-Rojas, I., Wang, X. H. and Fredj, E., 2019. Technical note: On the importance of a three-
11 dimensional approach for modelling the transport of neustic microplastics, *Ocean Sci.*
12 *Discuss.* <https://doi:10.5194/os-2018-136>.
- 13 Jambeck, J.R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T.R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., Narayan, R.,
14 Law, K.L., 2015. Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science* 347, 768–771.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260352>
- 16 Jang, Y.C., Hong, S., Lee, J., Lee, M.J., Shim, W.J., 2014. Estimation of lost tourism revenue
17 in Geoje Island from the 2011 marine debris pollution event in South Korea. *Mar. Pollut.*
18 *Bull.* 81, 49–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.02.021>
- 19 Johnson, S.W., 1989. Deposition, fate, and characteristics of derelict trawl web on an Alaskan
20 beach. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 20, 164–168. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X\(89\)90486-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X(89)90486-4)
- 21 Johnson, S.W., Eiler, J.H., 1999. Fate of radio-tagged trawl web on an Alaskan beach. *Mar.*
22 *Pollut. Bull.* 38, 136–141. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X\(98\)00109-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-326X(98)00109-X)
- 23 Kaiser, D., Kowalski, N., Waniek, J.J., 2017. Effects of biofouling on the sinking behavior of
24 microplastics. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 12, 124003. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa8e8b>
- 25 Kako, S., Isobe, A., Seino, S., Kojima, A., 2010. Inverse estimation of drifting-object outflows
26 using actual observation data. *J. Oceanogr.* 66, 291–297. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10872-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10872-010-0025-9)
27 [010-0025-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10872-010-0025-9)
- 28 Khatmullina, L., Isachenko, I., 2017. Settling velocity of microplastic particles of regular
29 shapes. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 114, 871–880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.024>
- 30 Koelmans, A.A., Bakir, A., Burton, G.A., Janssen, C.R., 2016. Microplastic as a vector for
31 chemicals in the aqueEnvironment: Critical review and model-supported reinterpretation
32 of empirical studies. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50(7) 3315–3326.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b06069>
- 34 Kooi, M., Van Nes, E.H., Scheffer, M., Koelmans, A.A., 2017. Ups and downs in the ocean:
35 Effects of biofouling on vertical transport of microplastics. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 51,
36 7963–7971. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b04702>

- 1 Lebreton, L.C.M., Greer, S.D., Borrero, J.C., 2012. Numerical modelling of floating debris in
2 the world's oceans. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 64, 653–661.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.10.027>
- 4 Lange, M. and Van Sebille, E., 2017. Parcels v0.9: Prototyping a Lagrangian ocean analysis
5 framework for the petascale age, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 10, 4175–4186.
6 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-4175-2017>
- 7 Liao, F., Wang, X.H., 2018. A study of low-frequency, wind-driven, coastal-trapped waves
8 along the southeast coast of Australia. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 48, 301–316.
- 9 Ling, S.D., Sinclair, M., Levi, C.J., Reeves, S.E., Edgar, G.J., 2017. Ubiquity of microplastics
10 in coastal seafloor sediments. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 121, 104–110.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.05.038>
- 12 Liu, Y., Weisberg, R.H., 2011. Evaluation of trajectory modeling in different dynamic regions
13 using normalized cumulative Lagrangian separation. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 116,
14 C09013. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JC006837>
- 15 Liu, Y., Weisberg, R.H., Vignudelli, S., Mitchum, G.T., 2014. Evaluation of altimetry-derived
16 surface current products using Lagrangian drifter trajectories in the eastern Gulf of
17 Mexico. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 119, 2827–2842. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JC009710>
- 18 Liubartseva, S., Coppini, G., Lecci, R., Clementi, E., 2018. Tracking plastics in the
19 Mediterranean: 2D Lagrangian model. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 129, 151–162.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.02.019>
- 21 Liubartseva, S., Coppini, G., Lecci, R., Creti, S., 2016. Regional approach to modeling the
22 transport of floating plastic debris in the Adriatic Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 103, 115–127.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.12.031>
- 24 Lobelle, D., Cunliffe, M., 2011. Early microbial biofilm formation on marine plastic debris.
25 *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 62, 197–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.10.013>
- 26 Loeb, G.I., Neihof, R.A., 1975. Marine conditioning films, in: *Advances in Chemistry*, pp.
27 319–335. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ba-1975-0145>
- 28 Long, M., Moriceau, B., Gallinari, M., Lambert, C., Huvet, A., Raffray, J., Soudant, P., 2015.
29 Interactions between microplastics and phytoplankton aggregates: Impact on their
30 respective fates. *Mar. Chem.* 175, 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marchem.2015.04.003>
- 31 Macleod, A.K., Stanley, M.S., Day, J.G., Cook, E.J., 2016. Biofouling community composition
32 across a range of environmental conditions and geographical locations suitable for
33 floating marine renewable energy generation. *Biofouling* 32, 261–276.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08927014.2015.1136822>
- 35 Mansui, J., Molcard, A., Ourmières, Y., 2015. Modelling the transport and accumulation of
36 floating marine debris in the Mediterranean basin. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 91, 249–257.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.11.037>

- 1 Martinez, E., Maamaatuaiahutapu, K., Taillandier, V., 2009. Floating marine debris surface
2 drift: Convergence and accumulation toward the South Pacific subtropical gyre. *Mar.*
3 *Pollut. Bull.* 58, 1347–1355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.04.022>
- 4 Mellor, G.L., 1998. Users Guide for a Three-dimensional, Primitive-equation, Numerical
5 Ocean Model, Program in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, Princeton University.
- 6 Morét-Ferguson, S., Law, K.L., Proskurowski, G., Murphy, E.K., Peacock, E.E., Reddy, C.M.,
7 2010. The size, mass, and composition of plastic debris in the western North Atlantic
8 Ocean. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 60, 1873–1878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.07.020>
- 9 Müller, R.J., Kleeberg, I., Deckwer, W.D., 2001. Biodegradation of polyesters containing
10 aromatic constituents. *J. Biotechnol.* 86(2), 87-95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1656(00)00407-7)
11 [1656\(00\)00407-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1656(00)00407-7)
- 12 Murray, C.C., Maximenko, N., Lippiatt, S., 2018. The influx of marine debris from the Great
13 Japan Tsunami of 2011 to North American shorelines. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 132, 26–32.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.01.004>
- 15 Neumann, D., Callies, U., Matthies, M., 2014. Marine litter ensemble transport simulations in
16 the southern North Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 86, 219–228.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.07.016>
- 18 PlasticsEurope, 2013. *Plastics – the Facts 2013*. Brussels, Belgium.
- 19 Röhrs, J., Christensen, K.H., Hole, L.R., Broström, G., Drivdal, M., Sundby, S., 2012.
20 Observation-based evaluation of surface wave effects on currents and trajectory forecasts.
21 *Ocean Dyn.* 62, 1519–1533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-012-0576-y>
- 22 Rummel, C.D., Jahnke, A., Gorokhova, E., Kühnel, D., Schmitt-Jansen, M., 2017. Impacts of
23 biofilm formation on the fate and potential effects of microplastic in the aquatic
24 environment. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 4(7), 258-267.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.7b00164>
- 26 Sayol, J.M., Orfila, A., Simarro, G., Conti, D., Renault, L., Molcard, A., 2014. A Lagrangian
27 model for tracking surface spills and SaR operations in the ocean. *Environ. Model. Softw.*
28 52, 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.10.013>
- 29 Smith, S.D.A., 2012. Marine debris: A proximate threat to marine sustainability in Bootless
30 Bay, Papua New Guinea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 64, 1880–1883.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.06.013>
- 32 Sun, Y.J., Jalón-Rojas, I., Wang, X.H., Jiang, D., 2018. Coastal upwelling by wind-driven
33 forcing in Jervis Bay, New South Wales: A numerical study for 2011. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf*
34 *Sci.* 206, 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.11.022>
- 35 Talley, L.D., Pickard, G.L., Emery, W.J., Swift, J.H., 2011. Dynamical processes for
36 descriptive ocean circulation, in: *Descriptive Physical Oceanography*, pp. 1–72.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-4552-2.10019-8>

- 1 Thompson, R.C., 2004. Lost at Sea: Where is all the plastic? *Science*, 304, 838–838.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1094559>
- 3 Wakata, Y., Sugimori, Y., 1990. Lagrangian motions and global density distributions of
4 floating matter in the ocean simulated using shipdrift data. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 20, 125–
5 138. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485\(1990\)020<0125:LMAGDD>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1990)020<0125:LMAGDD>2.0.CO;2)
- 6 Wang, X.H., Symonds, G., 1999. Coastal embayment circulation due to atmospheric cooling. *J.*
7 *Geophys. Res.* 104, 29801–29816. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JC900183>
- 8 Wang, X.H., 2001. A numerical study of sediment transport in a coastal embayment during
9 winter storms. *J. Coast. Res.*, ICS 2000 Proceedings, 414–427.
- 10 Weinstein, J.E., Crocker, B.K., Gray, A.D., 2016. From macroplastic to microplastic:
11 Degradation of high-density polyethylene, polypropylene, and polystyrene in a salt marsh
12 habitat. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 35, 1632–1640. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3432>
- 13 Ye, S., Andrady, A.L., 1991. Fouling of floating plastic debris under Biscayne Bay exposure
14 conditions. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 22, 608–613. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X\(91\)90249-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X(91)90249-R)
15 **R**
- 16 Yoon, J.H., Kawano, S., Igawa, S., 2010. Modeling of marine litter drift and beaching in the
17 Japan Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 60, 448–463.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.09.033>
- 19 Zardus, J.D., Nedved, B.T., Huang, Y., Tran, C., Hadfield, M.G., 2008. Microbial biofilms
20 facilitate adhesion in biofouling invertebrates. *Biol. Bull.* 214, 91–98.
21 <https://doi.org/214/1/91> [pii]
- 22 Zettler, E.R., Mincer, T.J., Amaral-Zettler, L.A., 2013. Life in the “plastisphere”: Microbial
23 communities on plastic marine debris. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47, 7137–7146.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es401288x>
- 25 Zhang, H., 2017. Transport of microplastics in coastal seas. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 197, 74–
26 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.09.032>
- 27 Zhiyao, S., Tingting, W., Fumin, X., Ruijie, L., 2008. A simple formula for predicting settling
28 velocity of sediment particles. *Water Sci. Eng.* 1, 37–43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1674-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1674-2370(15)30017-X)
29 **2370(15)30017-X**