

# Titanium (IV) oxide anatase nanoparticles as vectors for diclofenac: Assessing single and combined oxidative stress-related toxicity in the aquatic macrophyte *Egeria densa*

Maranda Esterhuizen (✉ [maranda.esterhuizen@helsinki.fi](mailto:maranda.esterhuizen@helsinki.fi))

University of Helsinki

Mariia Lutsko

Technische Universität Berlin

Youngsam Kim

Korea Institute of Science and Technology Europe (KIST Europe) Forschungsgesellschaft GmbH

Hakwon Yoon

Korea Institute of Toxicology

Chang-Beom Park

Korea Institute of Toxicology

Young Jun Kim

Korea Institute of Science and Technology Europe (KIST Europe) Forschungsgesellschaft GmbH

Stephan Pflugmacher

University of Manitoba

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** oxidative stress, biotransformation, nanoparticles, pharmaceutical pollution, primary producer, macrophyte

**Posted Date:** November 16th, 2022

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2262635/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

**Additional Declarations:** No competing interests reported.

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at Ecotoxicology on March 31st, 2023. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-023-02646-7>.

# Abstract

Titanium dioxide, frequently used in commonplace products, is now regularly detected in aquatic environments. Understanding its toxic effects on native biota is essential; however, combined toxicity with commonly occurring pollutants, such as the pharmaceutical diclofenac, may provide more insight into environmental situations. Therefore, the present study aimed to evaluate the effects of titanium dioxide and diclofenac, individually and combined, on the macrophyte *Egeria densa*. DCF uptake and removal were assessed. DCF and titanium dioxide toxicity were evaluated by assaying enzymes as bioindicators of biotransformation and oxidative stress. Cytosolic glutathione S-transferase and glutathione reductase activities were increased by diclofenac, titanium dioxide, and the combination. Both enzymes' activities were more significantly elevated by diclofenac and the combination than nanoparticles alone. Microsomal glutathione S-transferase was unaffected by diclofenac exposure but inhibited with titanium dioxide and the mixture. Diclofenac elicited the most significant response. Based on the macrophytes' vitality, the cytosolic enzymes effectively prevented damage.

## Highlights

- mGST was inhibited by  $\text{TiO}_2$ , but DCF exposure was insignificant.
- cGST and GR activities increased with DCF exposure.
- No synergistic effect on CGST and GR with combined exposure.
- DCF, rather than  $\text{TiO}_2$  was responsible for oxidative stress-related toxicity.
- Macrophytes remained healthy despite exposures at high concentrations.

## 1. Introduction

Various engineered nanomaterials are produced in hundreds of tons per year (Hendren et al. 2011). The nanotechnology industry has enormous growth prospects and opportunities for commercial development due to the vast range of applications of nanomaterials and particles. Nanoparticles (NPs), which are in the  $10^{-9}$  m range, are used in electronics, medical and pharmaceutical industries, consumer goods, food production, as well as military applications (Khan et al. 2019). NPs are of great importance for scientific studies as a middle link between bulk materials and atomic structures. These minute particles have a much larger surface-to-volume ratio than similar masses of larger-scale materials. As the surface area per mass of material increases, a more considerable amount of the material can come into contact with surrounding substances. The larger the surface area, the greater the substance's reactivity, allowing improved catalysts to be created (Lien et al. 2015); e.g., the drastic property changes of gold NPs as oxidants compared to gold macroparticles. NPs' mechanical and magnetic properties also differ from their regular-shaped counterparts, meaning that adhesion and capillary forces exceed macroscopic forces, including superparamagnetic forces (Wahajuddin and Arora 2012). Thermal and optical properties also shift; i.e., with decreasing size, surface energy increases, thus reducing melting points (Mashayekh and Dorrani 2014).

The use of titanium (IV) oxide (or titanium dioxide, TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs) is increasing due to its nanosized features, low toxicity, biocompatibility, intrinsic properties, and manufacturing techniques (Jarosz et al. 2016; Kafshgari et al. 2019; Molaeirad et al. 2015; Naseri et al. 2015). These nanomaterials are also recognized for their high refractive index, light scattering capabilities, and photocatalytic activities in the presence of UV with equal or higher energy than its bandgap energy. TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs occur in three crystalline phases, brookite, rutile, and anatase, with the latter showing a more extensive band gap and, thus, the highest photocatalytic effects (Skocaj et al. 2011). Therefore, TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs are one of the most commonly used metal oxides (Jovanovic 2015). They are widely used in paints, floor coatings, paper cosmetics, cleaning products, and sunscreens. However, Conceição et al. (2017) have shown contradictory evidence regarding the toxicity and long-term stability of these NPs.

Engineered NPs have been detected in the environment at concentrations up to 48 ng/ml (Tovar-Sánchez et al. 2013); however, Environmental Fate Modeling predicts this level to be closer to 10 µg/ml (Maurer-Jones et al. 2013). These particles may enter the environment in various ways, primarily through industrial wastewater. NP-containing personal care products may also deposit in domestic wastewater and, from there, enter sewage sludge (Coll et al. 2016; Sun et al. 2015). Once in aquatic ecosystems, NPs could mix with other pollutants, including pharmaceuticals, and could affect keystone species in various ways. As the adverse effects of pharmaceuticals have already been recognized (Fent 2008; Mezzelani et al. 2022), it becomes vital to understand the impact of NPs on biota and in combinations with pharmaceuticals detected in surface waters globally. One such globally detected drug is diclofenac (DCF) (Li et al. 2014). The environmental concentration of DCF in aquatic environments varies considerably (Lonappan et al. 2016), and maximum concentrations of up to 5 ng/ml have been reported in Pakistan (Scheurell et al. 2009).

As a first step in evaluating the toxicity of NPs as well as their combined toxicity as vectors for pharmaceuticals, TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP in its anatase form was selected for this study due to its wide use. The toxicity of TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs, DCF, and a combination of the NPs and the pharmaceutical, was evaluated on the ecologically essential macrophyte species *Egeria densa*. Macrophytes serve as primary producers, as well as habitat, shelter, and breeding space for other organisms contributing to the overall biodiversity, and influence the nutrient cycles in aquatic environments (Bakker et al. 2016; Esteves 1998; Kennedy et al. 2004; Pott and Pott 2003; Thomaz et al. 2010); and are excellent bioindicators (Ravera 2001). *E. densa* was selected based on its advantageous features, including rapid growth and natural ubiquity, and due to the limited information on adverse effects on this macrophyte caused by NPs.

Toxicity is often mediated by oxidative stress, as an organism's inability to eliminate increased reactive oxygen species (ROS) at a cellular level would lead to severe adverse effects and eventual mortality (Sarkar et al. 2014). Fluctuations in the antioxidative enzyme responses are often used as bioindicators of oxidative stress (Gutteridge 1995). In the present study, glutathione reductase (GR) and glutathione S-transferase (GST) was selected as biomarkers. GR is an antioxidative defense enzyme involved in

recycling glutathione to combat ROS generated from xenobiotic exposure. GST is a crucial enzyme in phase II of the biotransformation system, which is vital in eliminating xenobiotics.

The study, therefore, aimed to evaluate the toxicity of TiO<sub>2</sub> and DCF as well as combined toxicity in *E. densa* by evaluating GST and GR as biomarkers of oxidative stress.

## 2. Materials And Methods

### 2.1 Chemicals and reagents

DCF (sodium salt,  $\geq 99\%$ ) was bought from Cayman Chemical Company (Michigan, USA). Stock solutions were prepared in pure ethanol as required, and further dilutions were conducted in the cultivation/exposure media of choice.

Anatase TiO<sub>2</sub> (100% anatase,  $< 25$  nm, specific surface area 45–50 m<sup>2</sup>/g, purity 99.7%) was purchased from Sigma Aldrich Co. Ltd. (Steinheim, Germany) and was from the same batch as used by Okupnik et al. (2015) who characterized the material in terms of size, morphology, zeta potential, z-average hydrodynamic diameter, and the polydispersity index (PDI).

All chemicals used for exposure and analysis were of analytical-grade quality and were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich Co Ltd. (Steinheim, Germany) unless stated otherwise.

### 2.2 Egeria densa

*E. densa* (strands of 10 to 20 cm) was purchased from Extraplant (Extragroup GmbH, Germany) and cultivated in a glass tank (100 cm × 60 cm × 60 cm) at 24 °C ± 1°C. The plants were grown under cool white fluorescent light with a light intensity of 38 µE/m<sup>2</sup>/s and a 14:10-h light-dark photoperiod. The culture media consisted of modified Provasoli's culture medium containing CaCl<sub>2</sub> (0.2 g/l), NaHCO<sub>3</sub> (0.106 g/l), and sea salt (0.1 g/l) in de-ionized water (Vilvert et al. 2017). The macrophytes were acclimated to laboratory conditions for seven days before the exposures. DCF uptake into *E. densa* and removal from the media were evaluated prior to the exposure experiments to establish its suitability for this investigation. Three-centimetre *E. densa* strands were exposed to 250 ng/ml DCF in beaker experiments against controls for 96 hours under the same conditions as during acclimation (n = 5). Plant and media samples were collected after 24, 48, 72, and 96 hours. DCF was extracted from the plant tissue as detailed by De Moraes Calado et al. (2019), and DCF was quantified as described in section 2.4.

### 2.3 Exposure setup

Three treatment solutions were prepared. The first consisted of DCF diluted to 250 ng/ml in the *E. densa* cultivation media. Concentrations previously reported for DCF in wastewater and the environment served as guidance for choosing this exposure concentration (Esterhuizen-Londt et al. 2017). The second exposure solution consisted of 250 ng/ml DCF combined with 1 mg/ml TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP anatase in cultivation media, and the third consisted of 1 mg/ml TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP anatase only in the cultivation media. The control

consisted of the macrophyte cultivation media without additions of other chemicals. A sample from each prepared exposure solution was collected for qualitative analysis with liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectroscopy (time 0). The solutions were stirred for 24 hours in the dark, and a second sample was taken for analysis to measure any degradation or binding (time 24).

The treatment solutions were decanted in 100 ml beakers in replicates of five, and a  $20 \pm 1$  cm strand of *E. densa* was added to each replicate and exposed for 24 hours under the same conditions as during cultivation. After 24 hours of exposure, another sample was taken for quantitative analysis (time 48). The plant material was removed from the treatments, washed in distilled water, dried, and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen. The samples were stored at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  until further processing to evaluate the enzyme activities.

## 2.4 Quantitative analysis of diclofenac

DCF was quantified on a 1200 infinity series liquid chromatography (Agilent, Waldbronn, Germany) coupled to triple quadrupole mass spectrometry (model 6460, Agilent) (LC-MSMS) with electron spray ionization (Jet Stream, Agilent) using a Kinetex™ C18 reverse phase column ( $2.1 \times 100$  mm, 1.7 U, 100 Å, Phenomenex, Aschaffenburg, Germany). The LC-MSMS settings and protocol were detailed by Esterhuizen-Londt et al. (2017). Prior to analysis, all samples were centrifuged at  $10,000 \times g$  at  $10^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 min.

## 2.5 Enzyme extraction and activity assays

The enzymes were extracted according to Pflugmacher (2004). In short, the frozen plant material was pestled to a refined power using liquid nitrogen, and 1.5 g thereof was suspended in 0.1 M potassium phosphate buffer (pH 6.5) containing 20% glycerol, 1.4 mmol/l dithioerythritol, and 1 mmol/l ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid. The samples were stirred for 20 min before centrifugation at  $5,400 \times g$  ( $4^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) for 10 min to remove cell debris. The supernatant was centrifuged at  $86,900 \times g$  ( $4^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) for 60 min to collect the microsomal fraction. The supernatant was subjected to ammonium sulfate precipitation (35–80%), collecting the pellet after centrifugation. The cytosolic enzymes, now contained in the pellet, were suspended in a 20 mM pH 7 sodium phosphate buffer. The samples were desalted using Sephadex NAP-10 columns (GE Healthcare, Little Chalfont, UK).

The protein concentrations of the two fractions of each sample were measured according to Bradford (1976). The enzymatic activities of GST (microsomal and cytosolic) and GR (cytosolic) were measured spectrophotometrically (Infinite M200, Tecan, Männedorf, Switzerland) and expressed in the SI units of kat/mg protein. GST activity (EC 2.5.1.18) was assayed by measuring an increase in optical density at 340 nm following to conjugation of glutathione and 1-chloro-2,4-dinitrobenzene (Habig et al. 1974). GR activity (EC 1.6.4.2) was measured as a decrease at 340 nm as nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate (NADPH) was consumed (Carlberg and Mannervik 1985).

## 2.6 Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed using IBM® SPSS® Statistics 28.0.0.0 (190) (2021). The DCF concentrations quantified in the treatments were compared with the independent samples t-test, and the DCF concentrations quantified over time were compared using the paired-samples t-test. The enzyme activity data did not meet the requirements of sphericity and homogeneity, and thus, the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test with pairwise comparisons was used, observing an alpha value of 0.05 after Bonferroni correction (Sokal and Rohlf 1987).

## 3. Results And Discussion

### 3.1 Quantitative analysis

Under the experimental conditions, the DCF concentration (Fig. 1), without TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs, remained unchanged after 24 hours ( $p = 0.060$ ). However, in the presence of TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs, the DCF concentration decreased by 11.9% ( $p < 0.001$ ). DCF degradation was not found in the treatments without TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs; therefore, the undetected 11.9% in the presence of TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs was likely due to binding to the NPs. Considering the concentrations of DCF (250 ng/ml in 100 ml = 25 µg) and the TiO<sub>2</sub>-NPs (1 mg/ml in 100 ml = 100 mg) per replicate, 2.98 µg DCF was bound per 100 mg of TiO<sub>2</sub> (29.8 µg/g) after 24 hours. TiO<sub>2</sub> photocatalysis of DCF was previously demonstrated by Rizzo et al. (2009); however, degradation can be excluded as these experiments were conducted in the dark. Similar to the findings in the present study, Rizza et al. (2009) reported that after 30 min, 14% of the DCF (5 µg/ml) was adsorbed to the TiO<sub>2</sub> (0.2 mg/ml) in the dark, and thereafter saturated under the prevailing conditions. No DCF contamination was detected in the pure TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP treatments.

### 3.2 Morphological and Enzymatic responses of *Egeria densa*

Studies regarding the adverse effects of DCF on macrophytes are limited. However, the available studies indicate moderate toxicity as the EC<sub>50</sub> of DCF was determined to range from 7 to 350 µg/ml for microalgae and macrophytes (Cleuvers 2003; Ferrari et al. 2003; Joachim et al. 2021). In the present study, a DCF exposure concentration of 250 ng/ml was used. DCF was internalized by the macrophyte dose-dependently over time at a rate of 3.2 ng/g/h after the first 24 hours, which decreased to 1.5 ng/g/h after 96 hours (Fig. S1). Accordingly, at the conclusion of all exposures, all plants in all treatments visually appeared healthy, and no chlorosis or necrosis could be observed. Nevertheless, DCF toxicity is said to increase under the sunlight due to the toxicity of its phototransformation byproducts, mainly 2-[(2-chlorophenyl)amino] benzaldehyde (CPAB) for which an EC<sub>50</sub> of 4.8 µg/ml was determined, which is 10-times lower than that of DCF (48.1 mg/L) for *Scenedesmus vacuolatus* (Schulze et al. 2010). For the generation of phototransformation byproducts, Schmitt-Jansen et al. (2007) indicated that for *S. vacuolatus*, maximal toxicity was achieved after 53 h of light exposure to 50 µg/ml of DCF. Furthermore, Andreozzi et al. (2003), studying the photodegradation of DCF, indicated that the half-life was around five days under constant light conditions. Thus, the relatively low DCF concentration (250 ng/ml) and the

short incubation under light (14 h) used in the present study would not induce substantial adverse effects by CPAB generation.

When exposing *E. densa* to DCF, the microsomal GST (mGST) activity was not elevated ( $p = 1$ ) at the applied concentrations; however, with exposure to the  $\text{TiO}_2$ -NP alone or in combination with DCF, the mGST activity was inhibited (Fig. 2A). Compared to the control, the *E. densa* mGST activity was reduced by 73.8% ( $p < 0.001$ ) with exposure to DCF in combination with  $\text{TiO}_2$ -NP and 59.8% with NPs ( $p = 0.050$ ). Since most microsomal enzyme substrates are lipophilic compounds (Yu 2001), the detoxification mechanism will be limited for hydrophilic compounds such as DCF. Thus, cGST is more likely to be involved.

The activity of cGST (Fig. 2B), in contrast, was significantly elevated with exposure to all three treatments. Exposure to DCF increased the enzyme activity  $16.6 \pm 0.5$ -fold with DCF as well as DCF- $\text{TiO}_2$ -NP ( $p < 0.001$ ). NP exposure caused a 6.4-fold increase in cytosolic GST (cGST) activity ( $p = 0.004$ ). In general, the phi and tau classes of plant-specific cGST are predominantly present to detoxify and restrict the effects of xenobiotics (Kumar and Trivedi, 2018). In *Solanum lycopersicum* L., GST activity increased 1.5-fold with exposure to 1.5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$  DCF (Sousa et al. 2021).

Previously, GST activity in the macrophyte *T. latifolia* associated with DCF exposure was studied by Bartha et al. (2014). Using a similar photometric analytical method, the authors reported no elevation of the GST activity after 24 hours of exposure to 1  $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$  DCF. However, the activity was significantly induced after 72 hours. In contrast to the results presented here, Alkimin et al. (2020) reported inhibition of the GST level in *L. minor* exposed to 375 ng/ml, 750 ng/ml, and 1.5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$  DCF. Changes in antioxidant enzyme activity and its related gene expression are associated with antioxidant capacity and response in time courses (Dinler et al. 2014). Interestingly, Varela-Valencia et al. (2014) reported induced expression of the GST gene with anatase  $\text{TiO}_2$  after only 6 hours. However, in the present study, only the activities of cGST increased.

GSTs are often associated with antioxidative defense mechanisms and biotransformation (reviewed by Edwards et al. (2000)). However, in the present study, these enzymes were inhibited with exposure to the NPs, which may have led to an elevated oxidative stress level. Nanomaterials have been shown to bind to some proteins, such as bovine serum albumen (Giacomelli et al. 1997), and specific enzymes, such as lysozyme (Xu et al. 2010) and lactate dehydrogenase (Maccormack et al. 2012), leading to structural changes and inhibition (Xu et al. 2010).

Changes in the GST activities hint at oxidative stress caused by diclofenac and  $\text{TiO}_2$  exposure. Therefore, the antioxidant defense enzyme GR activities were assessed after exposure to diclofenac,  $\text{TiO}_2$ , and a combination of the two.

Considering the key role GR plays in the cellular control of oxidative stress by the generation of glutathione (GSH), *E. densa*'s GR activity (Fig. 3) responded in the same manner as cGST (Fig. 2B). The

GR activity increased by 12.2-fold with exposure to DCF and a combination of DCF + NP ( $p < 0.001$ ). Exposure to the TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP only resulted in a 4.7-fold increase in activity. Since TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles are considered one of the safest and low-toxic materials, the significant increase in GR activity indicated that exposure to TiO<sub>2</sub> induced substantial effects. Okupnik et al. (2016) also reported a significant increase in the GR activity in *Hydrilla verticillata* with exposure to anataseTiO<sub>2</sub>. In the study by Bartha et al. (2014), the GR activity increased in shoots but not in roots of *T. latifolia* exposed to 1 µg/ml DCF for seven days. Sousa et al. (2021) reported increased GR activity in both roots and shoots of *S. lycopersicum* L.; however, the exposure concentration was up to 5 mg/L DCF for five weeks.

In contrast to mGST, cGST and GR activities were not inhibited with exposure to the NPs. Studies have proposed preferential binding of specific NPs to certain enzymes (Bayraktar et al. 2006; Fischer et al. 2002). Our data supports this as mGST and cGST are structurally distinct isozymes and evolutionarily diverse (Vaish et al. 2020). Some studies have also discussed the possibility that high ROS concentrations induce DNA and RNA damage, lipid peroxidation, and protein oxidation/denaturation with consequent enzyme inhibition (Alkimin et al. 2020). Furthermore, TiO<sub>2</sub> particles are known to interact with phospholipids through possible binding by hydroxyl groups of the terminal glycerol (Le et al. 2014). Another study showed that TiO<sub>2</sub> made pits in membranes (Batiuskaite et al. 2022). These studies demonstrate that TiO<sub>2</sub> affects the integrity of membranes, which is necessary for mGST to remain functional, explaining the loss of activity observed here.

To summarize the results, the activity of mGST was inhibited by the TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles, and the effect of DCF was insignificant. Oppositely, the activities of cGST and GR were increased by DCF, but no synergistic effect was found with the TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles. However, it is known that cytosolic GSTs are more involved in detoxification than mitochondrial and microsomal GSTs (Dasari et al. 2018). Therefore, it is estimated that the major contributor to oxidative stress in aquatic macrophyte *E. densa* is caused by DCF rather than TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles. In general, the macrophyte was able to cope with the adverse effects associated with exposure to these high concentrations of DCF and TiO<sub>2</sub>, as well as a combination of the two, as is evident from the health and vitality of the plants, which continued to grow throughout the exposure period.

The concentration of pollutants utilized in the present study exceeds that of currently measured concentrations; however, these concentrations of titanium dioxide and DCF may increase in the future to these values. This study provides a brief insight into the toxic effects of titanium dioxide, diclofenac, and their combined toxicity on the oxidative stress system and the biotransformation system in the model aquatic macrophyte *E. densa*. Assessing other physiological markers, such as, for example, total reactive oxygen species, chlorophyll content, gene expression of the biotransformation and oxidative stress enzymes, would provide more information on the toxicity of the individual xenobiotics and combined toxicity. Furthermore, additional information on combined toxicity is needed; therefore, ecotoxicological investigations with various combinations and mixtures are required.

## 4. Conclusion

The study shows that even at concentrations higher than environmentally detected, the macrophyte *E. densa* responds to environmental pollutants such as nanoparticles and pharmaceuticals, in this case, TiO<sub>2</sub> and DCF, adequately by elevating antioxidative responses and biotransformation processes to avoid adverse effects. Further studies are required to understand why mGST but not cGST is inhibited by the nanomaterials.

## Declarations

### Conflict of Interest

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

### Funding

This work was partly supported by the Nanomaterial Technology Development Program (NRF-2017M3A7B6052455) funded by the South Korean Ministry of Science and the National Research Council of Science & Technology (NST) grant by the Strategies for Establishing Global Research Networks. The University of Helsinki Library provided open-access funding.

### Author contributions

Stephan Pflugmacher and Maranda Esterhuizen contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by Stephan Pflugmacher, Mariia Lutsko, and Maranda Esterhuizen. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Maranda Esterhuizen and Mariia Lutsko, and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.”

### Acknowledgment

This work was partly supported by the Nanomaterial Technology Development Program (NRF-2017M3A7B6052455) funded by the South Korean Ministry of Science and the National Research Council of Science & Technology (NST) grant by the Strategies for Establishing Global Research Networks. The University of Helsinki Library provided open-access funding.

## References

1. Alkimin GD, Soares AM, Barata C, Nunes B (2020) Can salicylic acid modulate biochemical, physiological and population alterations in a macrophyte species under chemical stress by diclofenac? Sci Total Environ 739:139715. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139715>
2. Andreozzi R, Raffaele M, Nicklas P (2003) Pharmaceuticals in STP effluents and their solar photodegradation in aquatic environment. Chemosphere 50:1319–1330.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-6535\(02\)00769-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-6535(02)00769-5)

3. Bakker ES, Wood KA, Pagès JF, Veen GC, Christianen MJ, Santamaría L, et al. (2016) Herbivory on freshwater and marine macrophytes: a review and perspective. *Aquat Bot* 135:18–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.04.008>
4. Bartha B, Huber C, Schröder P (2014) Uptake and metabolism of diclofenac in *Typha latifolia*—how plants cope with human pharmaceutical pollution. *Plant Sci* 227:12–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2014.06.001>
5. Batiuskaite D, Bruzaite I, Snitka V, Ramanavicius A (2022) Assessment of TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticle impact on surface morphology of Chinese hamster ovary cells. *Materials* 15:4570. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ma15134570>
6. Bayraktar H, Ghosh PS, Rotello VM, Knapp MJ (2006) Disruption of protein-protein interactions using nanoparticles: Inhibition of cytochrome C peroxidase. *Chem. Comm.* 2006:1390–1392. <https://doi.org/10.1039/B516096K>
7. Bradford MM (1976) A rapid and sensitive method for the quantification of microgram quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. *Anal Biochem* 72:248–254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697\(76\)90527-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(76)90527-3)
8. Carlberg I, Mannervik B (1985) Glutathione reductase. *Methods Enzymol* 113:484–490.
9. Cleuvers M (2003) Aquatic ecotoxicity of pharmaceuticals including the assessment of combination effects. *Toxicol Lett* 142:185–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4274\(03\)00068-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4274(03)00068-7)
10. Coll C, Notter D, Gottschalk F, Sun T, Som C, Nowack B (2016) Probabilistic environmental risk assessment of five nanomaterials (nano-TiO<sub>2</sub>, nano-Ag, nano-ZnO, CNT, and fullerenes). *Nanotoxicol* 10:436–444. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17435390.2015.1073812>
11. Conceição DS, Graça CAL, Ferreira DP, Ferraria AM, Fonseca IM, do Rego AB, Teixeira ACS, Ferreira LV (2017) Photochemical insights of TiO<sub>2</sub> decorated mesoporous SBA-15 materials and their influence on the photodegradation of organic contaminants. *Micropor Mesopor Mat* 253:203–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micromeso.2017.07.013>
12. Dasari S, Ganjari MS, Meriga B (2018) Glutathione S-transferase is a good biomarker in acrylamide induced neurotoxicity and genotoxicity. *Interdiscip Toxicol* 11:115. <https://doi.org/10.2478/intox-2018-0007>
13. De Moraes Calado SL, Esterhuizen-Londt M, Cristina Silva de Assis H, Pflugmacher S (2019) Phytoremediation: green technology for the removal of mixed contaminants of a water supply reservoir. *Int J Phytoremediation* 21:372–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15226514.2018.1524843>
14. Dinler BS, Antoniou C, Fotopoulos V (2014) Interplay between GST and nitric oxide in the early response of soybean (*Glycine max* L.) plants to salinity stress. *J Plant Physiol* 171:1740–1747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2014.07.026>
15. Edwards R, Dixon DP, Walbot V (2000) Plant glutathione S-transferases: enzymes with multiple functions in sickness and in health. *Trends Plant Sci* 5:193–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S1360->


16. Esteves FA (1998) Fundamentos de Limnologia. 2nd Edition. Interciencia, Rio de Janeiro.
17. Esterhuizen-Londt M, Hendel AL, Pflugmacher S (2017) Mycoremediation of diclofenac using *Mucor hiemalis*. Toxicol Environ Chem 99:795–808. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02772248.2017.1296444>
18. Ferrari B, Paxéus N, Giudice RL, Pollio A, Garric J (2003) Ecotoxicological impact of pharmaceuticals found in treated wastewaters: Study of carbamazepine, clofibrac acid, and diclofenac. Ecotoxicol Environ Safe 55:359–370. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-6513\(02\)00082-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-6513(02)00082-9)
19. Fischer NO, McIntosh CM, Simard JM, Rotello VM (2002) Inhibition of chymotrypsin through surface binding using nanoparticle-based receptors. Proc Nat Acad Sci USA 99:5018–5023. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.082644099>
20. Fent K (2008) Effects of pharmaceuticals on aquatic organisms. In: Kümmerer K (ed) Pharmaceuticals in the environment. Springer Verlag, Berlin, pp 175–203. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74664-5\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74664-5_12)
21. Giacomelli CE, Avena MJ, De Pauli CP (1997) Adsorption of bovine serum albumin onto TiO<sub>2</sub> particles. J Colloid Interface Sci 188:387–395. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcis.1996.4750>
22. Gutteridge JMC (1995) Lipid peroxidation and antioxidants as biomarkers of tissue damage. Clin Chem 41:1819–1828. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clinchem/41.12.1819>
23. Habig WH, Pabst MJ, Jakoby WB (1974) Glutathione S-transferase: The first step in mercapturic acid formation. J Bio Chem 249:1730–1739.
24. Jarosz M, Pawlik A, Szuwarzyński M, Jaskuła M, Sulka GD (2016) Nanoporous anodic titanium dioxide layers as potential drug delivery systems: Drug release kinetics and mechanism. Colloids Surf B: Biointerfaces 143:447–454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2016.03.073>
25. Joachim S, Beaudouin R, Daniele G, Geffard A, Bado-Nilles A, Tebby C, Palluel O, Dedourge-Geffard O, Fieu M, Bonnard M, Palos-Ladeiro M (2021) Effects of diclofenac on sentinel species and aquatic communities in semi-natural conditions. Ecotoxicol Environ Safe 211:111812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111812>
26. Jovanović B (2015). Critical review of public health regulations of titanium dioxide, a human food additive. Integr Environ Assess Manag 11:10–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.1571>
27. Hendren CO, Mesnard X, Dröge J, Wiesner MR (2011) Estimating production data for five engineered nanomaterials as a basis for exposure assessment. Environ Sci Technol 45(7):2562–2569. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es103300g>
28. Kafshgari MH, Mazare A, Distaso M, Goldmann WH, Peukert W, Fabry B, Schmuki P (2019) Intracellular drug delivery with anodic titanium dioxide nanotubes and nanocylinders. ACS Appl Mater Interfaces 11:14980–14985. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsami.9b01211>
29. Khan I, Saeed K, Khan I (2019) Review nanoparticles: properties, applications and toxicities. Arab. J Chem 12:908–931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2017.05.011>

30. Kennedy H, Gaci E, Kennedy DP, Papadimitriou S, Duarte CM (2004) Organic carbon sources to SE Asian coastal sediments. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 60:59–68.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2003.11.019>
31. Kumar S, Trivedi PK (2018) Glutathione S-transferases: role in combating abiotic stresses including arsenic detoxification in plants. *Front Plant Sci* 9:751. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00751>
32. Lateef A, Gueguim-Kana EB, Dasgupta N, Ranjan S (2021) *Microbial nanobiotechnology: Principles and applications*. Springer Nature, Berlin.
33. Le QC, Ropers MH, Terrisse H, Humbert B (2014) Interactions between phospholipids and titanium dioxide particles. *Colloids Surf B: Biointerfaces* 123:150–157.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2014.09.010>
34. Li WC (2014) Occurrence, sources, and fate of pharmaceuticals in aquatic environment and soil. *Environ Pollut* 187:193–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2014.01.015>
35. Lien DH, Retamal JRD, Ke JJ, Kang CF, He JH (2015) Surface effects in metal oxide-based nanodevices. *Nanoscale* 7:19874–19884. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5NR06494E>
36. Lonappan L, Brar SK, Das RK, Verma M, Surampalli RY (2016) Diclofenac and its transformation products: environmental occurrence and toxicity-a review. *Environ Int* 96:127–138.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.09.014>
37. MacCormack TJ, Clark RJ, Dang MK, Ma G, Kelly JA, Veinot JG, Goss GG (2012) Inhibition of enzyme activity by nanomaterials: potential mechanisms and implications for nanotoxicity testing. *Nanotoxicol* 6:514–525. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17435390.2011.587904>
38. Maurer-Jones MA, Gunsolus IL, Murphy CJ, Haynes CL (2013) Toxicity of engineered nanoparticles in the environment. *Anal Chem* 85:3036–3049. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac303636s>
39. Mezzelani M, Regoli F (2022) The biological effects of pharmaceuticals in the marine environment. *Ann Rev Mar Sci* 14:105–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-040821-075606>
40. Molaeirad A, Janfaza S, Karimi-Fard A, Mahyad B (2015) Photocurrent generation by adsorption of two main pigments of *Halobacterium salinarum* on TiO<sub>2</sub> nanostructured electrode. *Biotechnol Appl Biochem* 62:121–125. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bab.1244>
41. Mashayekh M, Dorrnian D (2014) Size-dependent nonlinear optical properties and thermal lens in silver nanoparticles. *Optik* 125:5612–5617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijleo.2014.07.066>
42. Naseri N, Janfaza S, Irani R (2015) Visible light switchable br/tio2 nanostructured photoanodes for bio-inspired solar energy conversion. *RSC Adv* 5:18642–18646.  
<https://doi.org/10.1039/C4RA16188B>
43. Okupnik A, Contardo-Jara V, Pflugmacher S (2015) Potential role of engineered nanoparticles as contaminant carriers in aquatic ecosystems: Estimating sorption processes of the cyanobacterial toxin microcystin-LR by TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles. *Colloids Surf A: Physicochem Eng Asp* 481:460–467.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2015.06.013>

44. Okupnik A, Pflugmacher S (2016) Oxidative stress response of the aquatic macrophyte *Hydrilla verticillata* exposed to TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles. Environ Toxicol Chem 35:2859–2866.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3469>
45. Pflugmacher S (2004) Promotion of oxidative stress in the aquatic macrophyte *Ceratophyllum demersum* during biotransformation of the cyanobacterial toxin microcystin-LR. Aquat Toxicol 70:169–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2004.06.010>
46. Pott VJ, Pott A (2003) Dinâmica da vegetação aquática do Pantanal. Ecologia e manejo de macrófitas aquáticas 1:145–162.
47. Ravera O (2001) Monitoring of the aquatic environment by species accumulator of pollutants: a review. J Limnol 60:63–78. <https://doi.org/10.4081/jlimnol.2001.s1.63>
48. Rizzo L, Meric S, Kassinos D, Guida, M, Russo F, Belgiorno V (2009) Degradation of diclofenac by TiO<sub>2</sub> photocatalysis: UV absorbance kinetics and process evaluation through a set of toxicity bioassays. Water Res 43:979–988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2008.11.040>
49. Sarkar A, Ghosh M, Sil PC (2014) Nanotoxicity: oxidative stress mediated toxicity of metal and metal oxide nanoparticles. J Nanosci Nanotechnol 14:730–743. <https://doi.org/10.1166/jnn.2014.8752>
50. Scheurell M, Franke S, Shah RM, Hühnerfuss H (2009) Occurrence of diclofenac and its metabolites in surface water and effluent samples from Karachi, Pakistan. Chemosphere 77:870–876.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2009.07.066>
51. Schmitt-Jansen M, Bartels P, Adler N, et al. (2007) Phytotoxicity assessment of diclofenac and its phototransformation products. Anal Bioanal Chem 387:1389–1396.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-006-0825-3>
52. Schulze T, Weiss S, Schymanski E, von der Ohe PC, Schmitt-Jansen M, Altenburger R, Streck G, Brack W (2010) Identification of a phytotoxic photo-transformation product of diclofenac using effect-directed analysis. Environ Pollut 158:1461–1466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2009.12.032>
53. Skocaj M, Filipic M, Petkovic J, Novak S (2011) Titanium dioxide in our everyday life; is it safe? Radiol Oncol 45:227–247. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10019-011-0037-0>
54. Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ (1987) Biostatistics. Francise & Co, New York.
55. Sousa B, Lopes J, Leal A, Martins M, Soares C, Azenha M, Fidalgo F, Teixeira J (2021) Specific glutathione-S-transferases ensure an efficient detoxification of diclofenac in *Solanum lycopersicum* L. plants. Plant Physiol Biochem 168:263–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2021.10.019>
56. Sun TY, Bornhöft NA, Hungerbühler K, Nowack B (2016) Dynamic probabilistic modeling of environmental emissions of engineered nanomaterials. Environ Sci Technol 50:4701–4711.  
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05828>
57. Thomaz SM, Cunha ERD (2010) The role of macrophytes in habitat structuring in aquatic ecosystems: methods of measurement, causes and consequences on animal assemblages' composition and biodiversity. Acta Limnol Brasil 22:218–236.  
<https://doi.org/10.4322/actalb.02202011>


58. Tovar-Sánchez A, Sánchez-Quiles D, Basterretxea G, Benedé JL, Chisvert A, Salvador A, Moreno-Garrido I, Blasco J (2013) Sunscreen products as emerging pollutants to coastal waters. PLoS One 8:e65451. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0065451>
59. Vaish S, Gupta D, Mehrotra R, Mehrotra S, Basantani MK (2020) Glutathione S-transferase: A versatile protein family. 3 Biotech 10:1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-020-02312-3>
60. Varela-Valencia R, Gómez-Ortiz N, Oskam G, de Coss R, Rubio-Pina J, del Río-García M, Albores-Medina A, Zapata-Perez O (2014) The effect of titanium dioxide nanoparticles on antioxidant gene expression in tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). J Nanoparticle Res 16:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11051-014-2369-3>
61. Vilvert E, Contardo-Jara V, Esterhuizen-Londt M, Pflugmacher S (2017) The effect of oxytetracycline on physiological and enzymatic defense responses in aquatic plant species *Egeria densa*, *Azolla caroliniana*, and *Taxiphyllum barbieri*. Toxicol Environ Chem 99:104–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02772248.2016.1165817>
62. Wahajuddin, Arora S (2012). Superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles: magnetic nanoplatforms as drug carriers. Int J Nanomed 7:3445. <https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S30320>
63. Xu Z, Liu XW, Ma YS, Gao HW (2010) Interaction of nano-TiO<sub>2</sub> with lysozyme: insights into the enzyme toxicity of nanosized particles. Environ Sci Pollut Res 17:798–806. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-009-0153-1>
64. Yu SJ (2002) Biochemical characteristics of microsomal and cytosolic glutathione S-transferases in larvae of the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith). Pestic Biochem Physiol 72:100–110. <https://doi.org/10.1006/pest.2001.258>

## Figures




**Figure 1**

Quantitative analysis of soluble diclofenac (DCF) at the start and end of the 24-hour incubation period on its own (DCF, positive control), in the presence of titanium dioxide (DCF+NP), and the nanoparticles on its own (NP, negative control). Bars represent average DCF concentration  $\pm$  standard deviation as measured by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectroscopy (n = 3)



**Figure 2**

Activities of the A) microsomal and B) cytosolic glutathione S-transferase (GST) of *Egeria densa* exposed to diclofenac (DCF), TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP pre-exposed to DCF (DCF+NP), and TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP. Bars present average enzyme activity  $\pm$  standard deviation (n = 5)



**Figure 3**

Glutathione reductase (GR) activity of *Egeria densa* exposed to diclofenac (DCF), TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP pre-exposed to DCF (DCF+NP), and TiO<sub>2</sub>-NP. Bars present average enzyme activity  $\pm$  standard deviation (n = 5)

## Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [FigS1d1.tif](#)