

One Planet - one Health: A Call to Support the Initiative on a Global Science-Policy Body on Chemicals and Waste

Werner Brack^{1,2*}, Damia Barcelo Culleres^{3,4}, Alistair B.A. Boxall⁵, H el ene Budzinski⁶, Sara Castiglioni⁷, Adrian Covaci⁸, Valeria Dulio⁹, Beate I. Escher^{1,10}, Peter Fantke¹¹, Faith Kandie¹², Despo Fatta-Kassinos¹³, F elix J. Hern andez¹⁴, Klara Hilscherov a¹⁵, Juliane Hollender^{16,17}, Henner Hollert², Annika Jahnke^{1,18}, Barbara Kasprzyk-Hordern¹⁹, Stuart J. Khan²⁰, Andreas Kortenkamp²¹, Klaus K ummerer²², Brice Lalonde²³, Marja H. Lamoree²⁴, Yves Levi²³, Pablo Antonio Lara Mart ın²⁵, Cassiana C. Montagner²⁶, Christian Mougin²⁷, Titus Msagati²⁸, J org Oehlmann², Leo Posthuma^{29,30}, Malcolm Reid³¹, Martin Reinhard³², Susan D. Richardson³³, Pawel Rostkowski³⁴, Emma Schymanski³⁵, Flurina Schneider^{2,36}, Jaroslav Slobodnik³⁷, Yasuyuki Shibata³⁸, Shane Allen Snyder³⁹, Fernando Fabriz Sodr e⁴⁰, Ivana Teodorovic⁴¹, Kevin V. Thomas⁴², Gisela A. Umbuzeiro⁴³, Pham Hung Viet⁴⁴, Karina Gin Yew-Hoong⁴⁵, Xiaowei Zhang⁴⁶, Ettore Zuccato⁷

¹ UFZ Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Permoserstra e 15, D-04318 Leipzig, Germany

² Goethe University Frankfurt, Faculty Biological Sciences, Max-von-der-Laue-Stra e 13, D-60438 Frankfurt, Germany

³ Catalan Institute of Water Research, Carrer Emili Grahit 101, Girona 17003, Spain

⁴ Spanish National Research Council, Institute for Environmental Assessment & Water Research, Water & Soil Quality Research Group, Jordi Girona 18-26, Barcelona 08034, Spain

⁵ University of York, Dept Environment & Geography, York YO10 5DD, N Yorkshire, United Kingdom

⁶ Universit  de Bordeaux, 351 crs de la Lib eration, 33405 Talence, France

⁷ Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche Mario Negri IRCCS, Department of Environmental Sciences, Via Mario Negri 2, 20156, Milan, Italy

⁸ Toxicological Center, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

⁹ INERIS - Direction Milieu et Impacts sur le Vivant (MIV), Parc technologique ALATA, Verneuil-en-Halatte, 60550 France

¹⁰ Center for Applied Geoscience, Eberhard Karls University of T bingen, 72076 T bingen, Germany

¹¹ Quantitative Sustainability Assessment, Department of Technology, Management and Economics, Technical University of Denmark, Produktionstorvet 424, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

¹² Moi University, Department of Biological Sciences, 3900-30100 Eldoret, Kenya

¹³ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Nireas-International Water Research Center, University of Cyprus, P.O. Box 20537, CY-1678 Nicosia, Cyprus

¹⁴ Research Institute for Pesticides and Water, University Jaume I, 12006, Castellon, Spain

¹⁵ RECETOX, Faculty of Science, Masaryk University, Kotlarska 2, Brno, Czech Republic

¹⁶ Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, 8600 D bendorf, Switzerland

¹⁷ Institute of Biogeochemistry and Pollutant Dynamics, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland

¹⁸ RWTH Aachen University, Worringerweg 1, D-52074 Aachen, Germany

¹⁹ University of Bath, Bath BA2 7AY, United Kingdom

²⁰ School of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of New South Wales, NSW 2052, Australia

²¹ Brunel University London, Centre for Pollution Research and Policy, Department of Life Sciences, College of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Brunel University London, Uxbridge, UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

²² Leuphana University L neburg, Institute for Sustainable Chemistry, Universit tsallee 1, 21335 L neburg, Germany

²³ The French Water Academy 51, rue Salvador-Allende, 92027 Nanterre France

²⁴ Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department Environment & Health, De Boelelaan 1085, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

²⁵ Universidad de C diz – European Universities of the Seas, Catedr tico de Universidad, Departamento de Qu mica F sica, Facultad de Ciencias del Mar y Ambientales, Campus R o San Pedro, 11510, Puerto Real (C diz), Spain

²⁶ Institute of Chemistry, UNICAMP, Campinas, 13083-970, Brazil

²⁷ Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, UMR ECOSYS, F-78026 Versailles, France

²⁸ University of South Africa, Institute for Nanotechnology and Water Sustainability (iNanoWS), College of science, Engineering and Technology (CSET), South Africa

²⁹ RIVM-National Institute for Public health and the Environment, PO Box 1, 3720 BA Bilthoven, The Netherlands

³⁰ Radboud University Nijmegen, Department of Environmental Science, The Netherlands

³¹ Norwegian Institute for Water Research, Environmental Chemistry and Technology, Norway

³² Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-4020, USA

³³ Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA

³⁴ NILU- Norwegian Institute for Air Research, P.O. Box 100, NO-2027 Kjeller, Norway

³⁵ University of Luxembourg, 6 avenue du Swing, 4367 Belvaux, Luxembourg

³⁶ Institute for Social-Ecological Research (ISOE), Hamburger Alee 45, 60486 Frankfurt, Germany

³⁷ Environmental Institute, Okruzna 784/42, 97241 Kos, Slovak Republic

³⁸ Environmental Safety Center, Tokyo University of Science, 12-1 Ichigaya-Funagawara, Shinjuku, Tokyo 162-0826, Japan

³⁹ Nanyang Environment and Water Research Institute, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

⁴⁰ University of Brasilia, 70910-000, Brasília, DF. Brazil

⁴¹ University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Novi Sad, Serbia

⁴² Queensland Alliance for Environmental Health Sciences (QAEHS), The University of Queensland, 20 Cornwall Street, Woolloongabba, 4102 Queensland, Australia

⁴³ Faculty of Technology, UNICAMP, Limeira, 13484-332, Brazil

⁴⁴ VNU Key Laboratory of Analytical Technology for Environmental Quality, Vietnam National University, 334 Nguyen Trai, Hanoi, Vietnam

⁴⁵ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, National University of Singapore, 1 Engineering Drive 2, Singapore

⁴⁶ Centre of Chemical Safety and Risks, School of the Environment, Nanjing University, China

*correspondence to Werner Brack, UFZ Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Permoserstraße 15, D-04318 Leipzig, Germany, e-mail: werner.brack@ufz.de

Abstract:

The chemical pollution crisis severely threatens human and environmental health globally. To tackle this challenge the establishment of an overarching international science-policy body has recently been suggested. We strongly support this initiative based on the awareness that humanity has already likely left the safe operating space within planetary boundaries for novel entities including chemical pollution. Immediate action is essential and needs to be informed by sound scientific knowledge and data compiled and critically evaluated by an overarching science-policy interface body. Major challenges for such a body are (i) to foster global knowledge production on exposure, impacts and governance going beyond data-rich regions (e.g., Europe and North America), (ii) to cover the entirety of hazardous chemicals, mixtures and wastes, (iii) to follow a one-health perspective considering the risks posed by chemicals and waste on ecosystem and human health, (iv) and to strive for solution-oriented assessments based on systems thinking. Based on multiple evidence on urgent action on a global scale, we call scientists and practitioners to mobilize their scientific networks and to intensify science-policy interaction with national governments to support the negotiations on the establishment of an intergovernmental body based on scientific knowledge explaining the anticipated benefit for human and environmental health.

Keywords: Chemical pollution, science-policy body on chemicals, planetary boundaries, one-health perspective, systems thinking

A call to action

Climate change and biodiversity loss are well known to pose a threat to humankind and the global environment and are rightly in the focus of global policies and the public. However, a third major challenge on a global level of the same significance is the chemical pollution crisis that severely threatens human and environmental health globally and has not been sufficiently addressed by global and national policies. Governmental organization such as the European Commission [1, 2] and intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) [3], have developed strategies and enacted legally binding regulations and multilateral agreements to control and manage chemical pollution to foster a toxic-free environment and enacted legally binding regulations, respective host the secretariats of legally binding multilateral agreements. Recently, UNEP published the first synthetic report, in which chemical pollution and wastes was listed as one of three top-priority issues together with climate change and biodiversity loss [4]. However, while international science-policy bodies are established to address climate change (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC) and the loss of biodiversity (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, IPBES), an overarching intergovernmental science-policy body to address pollution and its negative effects on humans and the environment on a global scale commensurate with the scope of the problem is still lacking.

Such a science-policy body on chemicals and waste has recently been suggested by several renowned environmental chemists and toxicologists, striving for enhanced bidirectional communication between policy-makers and scientists on a global scale with broad involvement of the wider scientific community in order to mobilize worldwide expertise to respond to this severe threat for humankind [5]. We strongly support this initiative. We highlight the need for horizon scanning and the establishment of early warning mechanisms on risks related to chemicals and waste to cover the growing universe of compounds and keep or reduce chemical pollution well below planetary boundaries for novel entities which include synthetic chemicals [6], but also to prevent exceedance of local and regional boundaries with clear impact on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human health. Immediate action to reduce global chemical pollution is essential and needs to be informed by sound scientific knowledge and data compiled and critically evaluated by an overarching science-policy interface body with wide involvement of scientists and practitioners as suggested by Wang et al. (2021) [5].

There is an increasing awareness that humanity, particularly the population and industry in high-income countries, have already likely left the safe operating space, i.e. transgressed the planetary boundary for novel entities [7]. In addition, international assessment and regulation of chemical pollution clearly lags behind the rapid and enormous increase in production and diversity of chemicals. Therefore, we see important tasks of the new body in improving prevention of pollution, reducing and eliminating data and management gaps on a global scale, identifying pollution problems with the potential to exceed regional and global boundaries, as well as developing strategies to tackle these issues holistically and systemically. Clearly communicating science and policy needs to solve this societal problem, the body is required to conduct assessments that go beyond current approaches, which are limited in terms of the geographical regions covered, the number of chemicals considered

1 and the lack of considering ambient mixtures, the consideration of science-based and absolute
2 pollution reduction targets and the lack of systems thinking. Major challenges for a novel science-policy
3 body on chemicals and wastes are (i) to foster global knowledge production on exposure, impacts and
4 governance, and go beyond data-rich regions (e.g., Europe and North America), (ii) to cover the
5 entirety of hazardous chemicals and mixtures, (iii) to follow a one-health perspective considering the
6 risks posed by chemicals on ecosystems, ecosystem services and human health, (iv) and to strive for
7 solution-oriented assessments based on systems thinking and appreciating the complexity of driving
8 forces, pressures, states, impacts and possible responses to reduce chemical pollution to remain within
9 safe boundaries [7].
10

11 **Foster global knowledge on exposure and impacts**

12
13 Several UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aim to globally ensure healthy lives (#3), access to
14 clean water and sanitation (#6), responsible consumption and production (#12), and the protection of
15 aquatic and terrestrial life (#14 and #15). Attaining these goals requires an efficient contaminant
16 monitoring, control, and mitigation. Nine planetary boundaries have been identified including “novel
17 entities” comprising new chemical substances, new forms of existing substances and modified and new
18 life forms [8]. There is sufficient evidence for chemical impacts on environmental and human health
19 on local to global scales [9], although its quantification is challenged by complexity [10, 11]. However,
20 even if a well-defined planetary boundary for novel entities including chemical pollution is still lacking,
21 the rate of increase of chemical production and use is alarming and exceeds that of most other
22 indicators including population growth rate, emissions of carbon dioxide and agricultural land use [12].
23 A recent paper concluded that “humanity is currently operating outside the planetary boundary” on
24 novel entities and that “the increasing rate of production and releases of larger volumes and higher
25 numbers of novel entities with diverse risk potentials exceed societies’ ability to conduct safety related
26 assessments and monitoring” [7]. At the global level, three criteria have been defined to be fulfilled to
27 pose a threat to the Earth system [10]. Next to the (i) occurrence of a disruptive effect on a vital Earth-
28 system process and (ii) a lack of reversibility, they include (iii) discovery only when the problem is
29 already occurring at a global scale. One example for exceeding planetary boundaries may be plastic
30 pollution combining global distribution and irreversibility [13] of the phenomenon with potential
31 impacts on Earth systems [14, 15]. Extraordinary efforts are needed to mitigate plastic pollution and
32 transform the global plastics economy [16] aiming at zero plastic pollution [17]. The excessive
33 generation of plastic wastes generated worldwide (1.6 million tonnes per day) during the COVID-19
34 pandemic runs the risk to reverse the momentum of global efforts to reduce plastic waste production
35 [18], resulting in severe pollution problems on all continents [19, 20]. Early warning strategies informed
36 by monitoring data from many regions of the world, evaluated in assessments by the global scientific
37 community, and organized in an international science-policy body is key to ensure or re-establish that
38 the safe operating space for global societal development is not exceeded.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Current separate approaches are insufficient. Existing data clearly support that chemical pollution and
52 its impacts occur from the local to the global scale, despite current assessments and policies. Chemicals
53 can be transported over long distances via the atmosphere and water cycles and hence affect regions
54 far from where they were produced, used, or emitted (Fig 1). Persistent organic pollutants have been
55 detected in humans globally [21-24] and in their food [25], in aquatic biota even at the remotest places
56 such as polar regions, high-mountain lakes, offshore waters and deep ocean trenches [26, 27] and in
57 terrestrial food webs [28]. At the same time, there is evidence that climate change may remobilize
58 legacy pollution in sediments [29] and glaciers [30] that has been thought to be permanently removed
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

from the biosphere [31]. But, also less persistent chemicals of emerging concern (CECs), including pharmaceuticals and modern pesticides, occur ubiquitously in the global environment because of their widespread and continued use by societies all over the world [32-35].




Fig 1: Global distribution of chemicals

The manufacture of hazardous chemicals is rapidly growing in low- and middle-income countries. Production is typically for use in high-income markets with poorly treated industrial wastewater discharged into domestic sewers [36]. Particularly high concentrations of hazardous chemicals are emitted from pesticide [37], textile [38] and drug [39] production. Manufacturing antibiotic drugs is often accompanied by very high concentrations in sewers that may act as a reservoir for antimicrobial resistant (AMR) bacteria [40]. Even if antimicrobials occurrence in the environment above Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNEC) for resistance selection [41] remains a local phenomenon, the rapid spread of AMR bacteria by global mobility, migration and trade provides an almost perfect scenario for the exceedance of global boundaries [11]. It is predicted that by 2050, the number of deaths attributable annually to AMR bacteria will reach about 10 million, exceeding those of cancer, HIV and other diseases [42]. There is increasing evidence that even regional pollution problems can thus rapidly transform to global-scale issues that cannot be tackled at national and regional scales and require global action and steering globally by an international body.

While chemical pollution data in North America and Europe is increasingly becoming available, supported by continental scale science-policy networks such as the European NORMAN network [43], there is still a substantial lack of data from many countries in Asia, Africa and South America, as shown for pharmaceuticals [33] and pesticides [44], even if monitoring studies in data-poor countries such as Brazil [45], Sri Lanka [46], Kazakhstan [47], Nigeria [48] and Kenya [49] are slowly increasing. These emerging data indicate that concentrations of hazardous chemicals in low-income countries may be

1 significantly higher than in Europe today. This is due to a combination of waste mismanagement [50]
2 and global waste trade [51], poor sanitation and water treatment, the continued use and emission of
3 high-risk chemicals phased out in high-income countries and the high use of region-specific compounds
4 such as antiretroviral and antimalarial drugs and pesticides that may provide so-far unrecognized risks
5 [52, 53].
6

7 Mitigating pollution problems in low-income countries is not only essential to protect human health,
8 biodiversity, and ecosystem functions there, but has also direct benefits for all other regions. This
9 effect may be highlighted for global trade of food, which has been shown to largely account for human
10 exposure to pesticides and other hazardous chemicals in Europe and the U.S. [54, 55]. Examples are
11 the export of fruits and vegetables from South Africa and South America to Europe and transfer of
12 meat from South America to Europe. The close nexus between unsustainable chemistry and agriculture
13 for the production of food and other sectors for consumer goods with severe impacts on human health
14 and ecosystems in producing regions, combined with the worldwide distribution of the hazardous
15 chemicals with global trade, clearly demands for strategies on sustainable chemistry [56] on a global
16 scale. An international body should carefully review existing regional strategies such as the EU
17 Chemical Strategy for Sustainability [2] – including their regulatory mechanisms and effectiveness in
18 mitigating pollution - and conclude on requirements for a toxic-free environment on a global scale.
19 This overarching goal requires, among others, incentives and initiatives to close data gaps on pollution,
20 risks and promising governance instruments in many regions of the world, supported amongst others
21 by better uptake of digitalization methods [57] to derive and prioritize needs for global prevention,
22 monitoring, regulation and mitigation.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Cover the whole range of hazardous chemicals and mixtures**

31 Since the 1970s, global production, trade and consumption of chemicals has increased substantially,
32 particularly in emerging economies [12], and increasingly complex products have been designed to
33 meet numerous functionalities [58]. A recent worldwide inventory revealed that more than 350,000
34 industrial chemicals and mixtures have been registered for production [59] and may finally end up in
35 the environment. As most regulations handle per-chemical dossiers, restrictions for specific chemicals
36 often result in their replacement by other, often equally persistent and hazardous chemicals, reflected
37 by the emerging global distribution of these new compounds [60]. Although several international
38 treaties including the Stockholm, Rotterdam, Minamata and International Maritime Organization
39 (IMO) Conventions regulate the production, use and trade of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and
40 other hazardous substances, the large majority of potentially hazardous compounds in use [59] and
41 detected in the environment [61] is not considered by any of these conventions.
42
43
44
45
46

47 Substantial progress in analytical multi-compound screening techniques opened new doors to extend
48 monitoring to a large number of potentially hazardous target chemicals complemented by more
49 exploratory non-targeted approaches and help to slowly approach the full complexity of the chemical
50 pollution problem [34, 62]. At the same time, awareness is growing that chemicals exert impact on the
51 local to the global scale as complex mixtures of a multitude of chemicals, and there is substantial
52 evidence that ignoring mixture exposure and effects significantly underestimates pollution risks and
53 impacts [63]. A better exchange on and understanding of the global ambient and human exposure to
54 complex mixtures of chemicals is supported by new approaches of FAIR and open science [64, 65],
55 openly accessible data infrastructures as provided by NORMAN [66, 67] and extensive web-based
56 applications on chemical properties and hazard data for almost one million compounds such as the US-
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 EPA CompTox Chemicals Dashboard [68] and PubChem [69]. These resources will allow for a quantum
2 leap in the global data exchange, rapid growth of accessible knowledge and derivation of key
3 management actions as required for effective assessments and the design of effective preventive and
4 management actions by the suggested international science-policy body and for political decisions on
5 pollution control and mitigation all over the world.
6

7 One of the great challenges for a novel science-policy body on chemical pollution and waste would be
8 to respond to the rapidly increasing numbers of produced and used chemicals worldwide and develop
9 strategies for a holistic approach on preventing, monitoring, regulating, and mitigating chemical
10 pollution rather than chemical by chemical. Key elements of an unbiased strategy to explore pollution
11 trends and upcoming risks may be the global promotion of non-target screening [62] and effect-based
12 methods [34, 70] in environmental and human (bio)monitoring based on harmonized criteria in quality
13 assurance [71]. These measures support grouping of chemicals for regulation and advanced
14 assessment of chemical mixtures [72-74] and the restriction of potentially hazardous chemicals to
15 essential use only [75].
16
17
18
19

20 **Follow a one-health perspective**

21
22 Although the impact of chemical pollution on environmental and human health has historically been
23 addressed separately, “the convergence of people, animals, and our environment has created a new
24 dynamic in which the health of each group is inextricably interconnected” [76]. Environmental
25 pollution is a key driver of human health impairment and at the same time of environmental health
26 threats including losses of biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services to humans. Since humans
27 and wildlife share many targets for biologically active chemicals [77] and adverse outcome pathways
28 [78], problematic chemicals affect both, so that also innovative solutions for a pollution-free planet [3,
29 79] will protect both. Therefore, we suggest the new science-policy interface body to follow a one-
30 health perspective addressing chemical risks on humans and ecosystems.
31
32
33
34

35 Diseases caused by chemical pollution have been estimated to be responsible for 9 million premature
36 deaths in 2015, three times more than from HIV, tuberculosis and malaria together and 15 times more
37 than from war and violence [80]. For neuro-developmental toxicity, a global pandemic has been
38 uncovered with one in every six children having a neuro-developmental disability, including autism,
39 attention deficit disorder, mental retardation, and cerebral palsy. Exposure to more than 200
40 neurotoxic chemicals has been identified as possible cause including metals, POPs and organic solvents
41 [81]. Mixtures of polybrominated flame retardants have been shown to play an important role in
42 neurodevelopmental effects [82]. Human reproduction is also at risk by chemical pollution. Within the
43 last century a significant decline of total human fertility rates has occurred, while male reproductive
44 disorders have increased [83, 84]. Exposure to mixtures of endocrine disruptors is hypothesized to be
45 one of the drivers of this phenomenon [85].
46
47
48
49
50

51 Human health threats triggered by chemical pollution are typically accompanied by impairments of
52 ecosystems and a decline of biodiversity [86, 87]. For Europe it has been shown that aquatic
53 ecosystems are exposed to ambient mixtures of toxic pollution [88] at a level of which chemicals are
54 of similar importance for the impaired ecological status as other well-accepted drivers, such as habitat
55 degradation and excessive loads of nutrients [89]. In the oceans, legacy POPs still occur at
56 concentrations that cause a continuous decline of distinct predatory marine mammals such as killer
57 whales [90]. In freshwater ecosystems, continuously emitted endocrine disruptors may lead to
58 population effects at very small concentrations, as demonstrated for contraceptive drugs which may
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 cause intersex in wild fish [91] and collapse of fish populations [92]. Antifouling agents, globally used
2 in high tonnages in ship paints [93], can act as endocrine disruptors and have been shown to cause the
3 extinction of mollusc populations in harbours suffering from high exposure [94, 95]. In addition, they
4 may also impair macrophyte communities [96] and even caused regime shifts in lake ecosystems [97].
5

6 The current biodiversity crisis has severe impacts on essential ecosystem services for humankind
7 exceeding planetary boundaries for many biomes [98, 99]. This is particularly concerning for the drastic
8 decline of flying insect biomass threatening pollination of the majority of plant species in nature and
9 for food production, nutrient cycling and food sources for higher trophic levels [100]. Agriculture
10 intensification, including increased pesticide and fertilizer usage, is one of the potential reasons for the
11 decline of insects [100] and insectivorous grassland birds [101, 102]. The anti-inflammatory drug
12 diclofenac applied in cattle was shown to cause near-extinction of vultures feeding on carcasses of
13 animals treated with this compound in India and Pakistan [103], with severe effects on public health
14 [104]. A strong link between ecosystem integrity and human health was also suggested for pesticide
15 application in Africa. Pesticides has applied in Kenya have been shown not only to affect invertebrate
16 communities but also to promote tolerant hosts for parasites and thus, pave the way for transmission
17 of diseases such as schistosomiasis, with 218 million people infected worldwide and up to 280,000
18 deaths per year [105].
19
20
21
22
23

24 The close interlink between chemical pollution and impacts on human and environmental health,
25 including losses of biodiversity and impaired ecosystem functions [106, 107], strongly demands for a
26 one-health perspective from the local to the global scale. Thus, a global science-policy body on
27 chemicals and waste should adopt this perspective from the very beginning and aim to maximize
28 synergies of human and ecosystem health protection striving for a pollution-free and healthy planet
29 [3, 79]. This goal requires involvement and collaboration of experts from the different scientific
30 communities (chemistry, human health, (eco)toxicology, epidemiology, biodiversity, social sciences,
31 economy) and the close collaboration with existing intergovernmental organizations such as the
32 Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), World Health Organization
33 (WHO) and IPBES.
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Strive for solutions-oriented assessments based on systems thinking**

40
41 Already established for pollution problems at the regional scale, [108], the drivers-pressures-states-
42 impact-response (DPSIR) causal-analytical scheme may be also useful to address this challenge at a
43 global scale. Chemical emissions as a global pressure (P) for ecosystems and human health is highly
44 complex with respect to the resulting mixture composition status (S), which may be dynamic in time
45 and space but also regarding the associated potential impacts (I) on wildlife and human health. The
46 diversity of driving forces (D) and actors involved in the emissions is large, and include agriculture,
47 industry, global trade, and consumers, whilst those are in turn subjected to global change. Chemical
48 pollution thus creates a high diversity of pollution states in different regions of the world with different
49 impacts on biodiversity, ecosystem functions, exposure and health effects on human populations. It is
50 then the focus on the response opportunities and consideration of a wide range of possible responses
51 that matters for solving the problem, with potential solutions on all aspects of the DPSI-chain, i.e., on
52 drivers, states and impacts. The earlier in that chain the response is effective, the less the risks and
53 impacts.
54
55
56
57
58

59 We see the need for an international science-policy interface body on chemical pollution to take the
60 high complexity of this system and the “solutions space” of possible responses into account from the
61
62
63
64
65

1 very beginning [109]. Solution spaces can range from technical and management options for local
2 application until governance options including regulatory and financing mechanisms at the global scale
3 [110]. Systems thinking emphasizing the “how” and “why” of intervention outcomes should combine
4 complexity-aware evaluation of monitoring data (critical mixture components, influence of time etc.)
5 with broad stakeholder involvement and virtual simulation models that allow for scenario calculations
6 [111]. Existing integrated fate-exposure models such as the UN Environment scientific consensus
7 model USEtox may be used and expanded to test for different exposure and risk scenarios and possible
8 interventions [112]. The power of these models to estimate near-field human exposures has been
9 demonstrated recently by high-throughput screening of chemicals of concern in toys [113] and in
10 building materials [114]. Long-range transport models for organic chemicals have been developed to
11 understand pollution problems far from the regions where chemicals have been produced and applied
12 [115]. Consistent modelling frameworks for the distribution of chemical pollutants by global trade of
13 goods and waste are less available although first examples exist such as the global food system [54].
14
15
16
17

18 **Our call to support the initiative on a global science-policy body**

19
20 Along the lines discussed above, we see a clear need for the establishment of a global science-policy
21 body on chemicals and waste, as suggested by Wang et al. [5], bringing together global scientific
22 expertise on chemical pollution and governance, ecosystem and human health, as well as biodiversity
23 to “strengthen the science-policy interface and the use of science in monitoring progress, priority-
24 setting, solution focus and policy making throughout the life cycle of chemicals and waste” as
25 suggested in the UNEP Global Chemicals Outlook II [79]. This is a call to scientists and practitioners to
26 mobilize their scientific networks and to intensify science-policy interaction with national governments
27 to support the negotiations on the establishment of an intergovernmental body based on scientific
28 knowledge, explaining the urgency of global action on chemical pollution and discussing the
29 anticipated benefit for human and environmental health on the way towards a pollution-free planet
30 and a sustainable economic development within the safe operating space of the planetary boundaries.
31 This initiative can only be successful if scientists and policy-makers join forces and combine expert and
32 practical knowledge across continents and institutional silos in the suggested global panel to close the
33 dramatic data gaps on chemical pollution in many parts of the world, identify the most important
34 pollution problems and develop solution strategies to tackle them based on close science-policy
35 interfacing and broad stakeholder involvement. A strong mandate and support from national
36 governments and the international community are required to give prevention and mitigation of
37 pollution an adequate weight in regulation, industry, and private behaviour to protect our common
38 one health on our one planet.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Declarations**

49 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

50 Not applicable.

51 **Consent for publication**

52 Not applicable.

53 **Availability of data and materials**

54 Not applicable

1 Competing interests

2 The authors declare that they have no competing interests. HH is Editor-in-Chief of this Journal.

4 Funding

5 Not applicable

8 Authors' contributions

9 WB conceptualized and drafted the manuscript. All other authors helped to further elaborate the
10 manuscript and contributed specific aspects. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

15 Acknowledgements

16 All authors thank multiple funding agencies and their institutes for long-term support in fundamental
17 and applied research on chemical pollution.

20 Corresponding author

21 Correspondence to [Werner Brack](#).

24 References

- 25 1. European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the*
26 *European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the*
27 *Committee of the Regions. The European Green Deal. COM(2019) 640 final. 2019.*
- 28 2. European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the*
29 *Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.*
30 *Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability. Towards a Toxic-Free Environment. COM(2020) 667 final.*
31 *2020.*
- 32 3. United Nations Environment Programme, *Towards a pollution-free planet. Background report.*
33 *[https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/report/towards-pollution-free-planet-](https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/report/towards-pollution-free-planet-background-report)*
34 *background-report. 2017: Nairobi, Kenya.*
- 35 4. United Nations Environment Programme, *Making Peace With Nature,*
36 *<https://www.unep.org/resources/making-peace-nature>. 2021.*
- 37 5. Wang, Z., et al., *We need a global science-policy body on chemicals and waste.* *Science*, 2021.
38 **371**(6531): p. 774-776. doi: 10.1126/science.abe9090
- 39 6. Rockström, J., et al., *A safe operating space for humanity.* *Nature*, 2009. **461**(7263): p. 472-
40 475. doi.org/10.1038/461472a
- 41 7. Persson, L., et al., *Outside the Safe Operating Space of the Planetary Boundary for Novel*
42 *Entities.* *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2022. doi/10.1021/acs.est.1c04158
- 43 8. Steffen, W., et al., *Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet.*
44 *Science*, 2015. **347**(6223). doi/10.1126/science.1259855
- 45 9. Diamond, M.L., et al., *Exploring the planetary boundary for chemical pollution.* *Environment*
46 *International*, 2015. **78**: p. 8-15. doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.02.001
- 47 10. Persson, L.M., et al., *Confronting Unknown Planetary Boundary Threats from Chemical*
48 *Pollution.* *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2013. **47**(22): p. 12619-12622.
49 doi/10.1021/es402501c
- 50 11. MacLeod, M., et al., *Identifying Chemicals That Are Planetary Boundary Threats.*
51 *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2014. **48**(19): p. 11057-11063. doi/10.1021/es501893m
- 52 12. Bernhardt, E.S., E.J. Rosi, and M.O. Gessner, *Synthetic chemicals as agents of global change.*
53 *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 2017. **15**(2): p. 84-90. doi.org/10.1002/fee.1450

13. MacLeod, M., et al., *The global threat from plastic pollution*. Science, 2021. **373**(6550): p. 61-65. doi/10.1126/science.abg5433
14. Jahnke, A., et al., *Reducing Uncertainty and Confronting Ignorance about the Possible Impacts of Weathering Plastic in the Marine Environment*. Environmental Science & Technology Letters, 2017. **4**(3): p. 85-90. doi/abs/10.1021/acs.estlett.7b00008
15. Arp, H.P.H., et al., *Weathering Plastics as a Planetary Boundary Threat: Exposure, Fate, and Hazards*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2021. **55**(11): p. 7246-7255. doi/10.1021/acs.est.1c01512
16. Borrelle, S.B., et al., *Predicted growth in plastic waste exceeds efforts to mitigate plastic pollution*. Science, 2020. **369**(6510): p. 1515-1518. DOI: [10.1126/science.aba3656](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba3656)
17. Lau, W.W.Y., et al., *Evaluating scenarios toward zero plastic pollution*. Science, 2020. **369**(6510): p. 1455-1461. DOI: [10.1126/science.aba9475](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba9475)
18. Benson, N.U., D.E. Basse, and T. Palanisami, *COVID pollution: impact of COVID-19 pandemic on global plastic waste footprint*. Heliyon, 2021. **7**(2). DOI: [10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06343](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06343)
19. Benson, N.U., et al., *COVID-19 pandemic and emerging plastic-based personal protective equipment waste pollution and management in Africa*. Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering, 2021. **9**(3). doi: [10.1016/j.jece.2021.105222](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2021.105222)
20. Arduso, M., et al., *COVID-19 pandemic repercussions on plastic and antiviral polymeric textile causing pollution on beaches and coasts of South America*. Science of the Total Environment, 2021. **763**. DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144365](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144365)
21. Fromme, H., et al., *Perfluorinated compounds - Exposure assessment for the general population in western countries*. International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 2009. **212**(3): p. 239-270. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijheh.2008.04.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2008.04.007)
22. Katsikantami, I., et al., *A global assessment of phthalates burden and related links to health effects*. Environment International, 2016. **97**: p. 212-236. DOI: [10.1016/j.envint.2016.09.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.09.013)
23. Honda, M. and K. Kannan, *Biomonitoring of chlorophenols in human urine from several Asian countries, Greece and the United States*. Environmental Pollution, 2018. **232**: p. 487-493. DOI: [10.1016/j.envpol.2017.09.073](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.09.073)
24. Fiedler, H. and M. Sadia, *Regional occurrence of perfluoroalkane substances in human milk for the global monitoring plan under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants during 2016-2019*. Chemosphere, 2021. **277**. doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.130287
25. Weber, R., et al., *Reviewing the relevance of dioxin and PCB sources for food from animal origin and the need for their inventory, control and management*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2018. **30**(1): p. 42. doi.org/10.1186/s12302-018-0166-9
26. Jamieson, A.J., et al., *Bioaccumulation of persistent organic pollutants in the deepest ocean fauna*. Nature Ecology & Evolution, 2017. **1**(3). doi.org/10.1038/s41559-016-0051
27. Houde, M., et al., *Monitoring of Perfluorinated Compounds in Aquatic Biota: An Updated Review PFCs in Aquatic Biota*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2011. **45**(19): p. 7962-7973. doi/10.1021/es104326w
28. Malarvannan, G., G. Poma, and A. Covaci, *Interspecies comparison of the residue levels and profiles of persistent organic pollutants in terrestrial top predators*. Environmental Research, 2020. **183**: p. 109187. • DOI: [10.1016/j.envres.2020.109187](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.109187)
29. Crawford, S.E., et al., *Remobilization of pollutants during extreme flood events poses severe risks to human and environmental health*. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 2022. **421**. doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.126691
30. Pawlak, F., K. Koziol, and Z. Polkowska, *Chemical hazard in glacial melt? The glacial system as a secondary source of POPs (in the Northern Hemisphere). A systematic review*. Science of the Total Environment, 2021. **778**. doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145244
31. Nizzetto, L., et al., *Past, Present, and Future Controls on Levels of Persistent Organic Pollutants in the Global Environment*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2010. **44**(17): p. 6526-6531. doi/10.1021/es100178f

32. Fang, W.D., et al., *A critical review of synthetic chemicals in surface waters of the US, the EU and China*. Environment International, 2019. **131**. DOI: [10.1016/j.envint.2019.104994](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.104994)
33. aus der Beek, T., et al., *Pharmaceuticals in the environment - global occurrences and perspectives*. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 2016. **35**(4): p. 823-835. doi/10.1002/etc.3339
34. Escher, B.I., H.M. Stapleton, and E.L. Schymanski, *Tracking complex mixtures of chemicals in our changing environment*. Science, 2020. **367**(6476): p. 388-392. doi: [10.1126/science.aay6636](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay6636)
35. Tran, N.H., M. Reinhard, and K.Y.-H. Gin, *Occurrence and fate of emerging contaminants in municipal wastewater treatment plants from different geographical regions-a review*. Water Research, 2018. **133**: p. 182-207. • DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2017.12.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.12.029)
36. Kookana, R.S., et al., *Potential ecological footprints of active pharmaceutical ingredients: an examination of risk factors in low-, middle- and high-income countries*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences, 2014. **369**(1656). doi/10.1098/rstb.2013.0586
37. Dsikowitzky, L., et al., *A combined chemical and biological assessment of industrial contamination in an estuarine system in Kerala, India*. Science of the Total Environment, 2014. **485**: p. 348-362. • DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.03.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.03.034)
38. Yaseen, D.A. and M. Scholz, *Textile dye wastewater characteristics and constituents of synthetic effluents: a critical review*. International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology, 2019. **16**(2): p. 1193-1226. doi.org/10.1007/s13762-018-2130-z
39. Larsson, D.G.J., *Pollution from drug manufacturing: review and perspectives*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences, 2014. **369**(1656). doi/10.1098/rstb.2013.0571
40. Marathe, N.P., et al., *A Treatment Plant Receiving Waste Water from Multiple Bulk Drug Manufacturers Is a Reservoir for Highly Multi-Drug Resistant Integron-Bearing Bacteria*. Plos One, 2013. **8**(10). doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077310
41. Bengtsson-Palme, J. and D.G.J. Larsson, *Concentrations of antibiotics predicted to select for resistant bacteria: Proposed limits for environmental regulation*. Environment International, 2016. **86**: p. 140-149. doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.10.015
42. O'Neill, J., *The Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. Antimicrobial Resistance: Tackling a crisis for the health and wealth of nations*. <https://amr-review.org/>. 2014.
43. Dulio, V., et al., *The NORMAN Association and the European Partnership for Chemicals Risk Assessment (PARC): let's cooperate!* Environmental Sciences Europe, 2020. **32**(1). doi.org/10.1186/s12302-020-00375-w
44. Stehle, S. and R. Schulz, *Agricultural insecticides threaten surface waters at the global scale*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2015. **112**(18): p. 5750-5755. doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1500232112
45. Sposito, J.C.V., et al., *Emerging contaminants in Brazilian rivers: Occurrence and effects on gene expression in zebrafish (Danio rerio) embryos*. Chemosphere, 2018. **209**: p. 696-704. DOI: [10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.06.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.06.046)
46. Guruge, K.S., et al., *First nationwide investigation and environmental risk assessment of 72 pharmaceuticals and personal care products from Sri Lankan surface waterways*. Science of the Total Environment, 2019. **690**: p. 683-695. DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.042](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.042)
47. Aubakirova, B., R. Beisenova, and A.B.A. Boxall, *Prioritization of Pharmaceuticals Based on Risks to Aquatic Environments in Kazakhstan*. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management, 2017. **13**(5): p. 832-839. DOI: [10.1002/ieam.1895](https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.1895)
48. Ogunbanwo, O.M., et al., *High Concentrations of Pharmaceuticals in a Nigerian River Catchment*. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry. 2020. doi/10.1002/etc.4879
49. Kandie, F.J., et al., *Occurrence and risk assessment of organic micropollutants in freshwater systems within the Lake Victoria South Basin, Kenya*. Science of the Total Environment, 2020. **714**. • DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136748](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136748)

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
50. Ferronato, N. and V. Torretta, *Waste Mismanagement in Developing Countries: A Review of Global Issues*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2019. **16**(6). DOI: [10.3390/ijerph16061060](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16061060)
 51. Brooks, A.L., S.L. Wang, and J.R. Jambeck, *The Chinese import ban and its impact on global plastic waste trade*. Science Advances, 2018. **4**(6). DOI: [10.1126/sciadv.aat0131](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aat0131)
 52. Fekadu, S., et al., *Pharmaceuticals in freshwater aquatic environments: A comparison of the African and European challenge*. Science of the Total Environment, 2019. **654**: p. 324-337. • DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.072](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.072)
 53. K'Oreje, K.O., et al., *Occurrence and treatment of contaminants of emerging concern in the African aquatic environment: Literature review and a look ahead*. Journal of Environmental Management, 2020. **254**. DOI: [10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109752](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109752)
 54. Ng, C.A. and N. Goetz, *The Global Food System as a Transport Pathway for Hazardous Chemicals: The Missing Link between Emissions and Exposure*. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2017. **125**(1): p. 1-7. DOI: [10.1289/EHP168](https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP168)
 55. Ecobichon, D.J., *Pesticide use in developing countries*. Toxicology, 2001. **160**(1-3): p. 27-33. DOI: [10.1016/s0300-483x\(00\)00452-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0300-483x(00)00452-2)
 56. Kümmerer, K., et al., *Key Characteristics of Sustainable Chemistry. Towards a Common Understanding of Sustainable Chemistry*, https://www.isc3.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Documentations_Report_PDFs/ISC3_Sustainable_Chemistry_key_characteristics_20210113.pdf. 2021, International Sustainable Chemistry Collaborative Centre.
 57. Fantke, P., et al., *Transition to sustainable chemistry through digitalization*. Chem, 2021. **7**(11): p. 2866-2882. doi.org/10.1016/j.chempr.2021.09.012
 58. Kümmerer, K., et al., *A path to clean water*. Science, 2018. **361**(6399): p. 222-224. DOI: [10.1126/science.aau2405](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau2405)
 59. Wang, Z.Y., et al., *Toward a Global Understanding of Chemical Pollution: A First Comprehensive Analysis of National and Regional Chemical Inventories*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2020. **54**(5): p. 2575-2584. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.9b06379](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b06379)
 60. Pan, Y.T., et al., *Worldwide Distribution of Novel Perfluoroether Carboxylic and Sulfonic Acids in Surface Water*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2018. **52**(14): p. 7621-7629. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.8b00829](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b00829)
 61. Gago-Ferrero, P., et al., *Wide-scope target screening of > 2000 emerging contaminants in wastewater samples with UPLC-Q-ToF-HRIVIS/MS and smart evaluation of its performance through the validation of 195 selected representative analytes*. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 2020. **387**. DOI: [10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121712](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121712)
 62. Brack, W., et al., *High-resolution mass spectrometry to complement monitoring and track emerging chemicals and pollution trends in European water resources*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2019. **31**(1): p. 62. doi.org/10.1186/s12302-019-0230-0
 63. Kortenkamp, A. and M. Faust, *Regulate to reduce chemical mixture risk*. Science, 2018. **361**(6399): p. 224-226. DOI: [10.1126/science.aat9219](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat9219)
 64. Schymanski, E.L. and A.J. Williams, *Open Science for Identifying "Known Unknown" Chemicals*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2017. **51**(10): p. 5357-5359.
 65. Schymanski, E.L. and E.E. Bolton, *FAIR chemical structures in the Journal of Cheminformatics*. Journal of Cheminformatics, 2021. **13**(1): p. 50. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.7b01908](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01908)
 66. Alygizakis, N.A., et al., *NORMAN digital sample freezing platform: A European virtual platform to exchange liquid chromatography high resolution-mass spectrometry data and screen suspects in "digitally frozen" environmental samples*. Trac-Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 2019. **115**: p. 129-137. doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2019.04.008
 67. Slobodnik, J., et al., *Establish data infrastructure to compile and exchange environmental screening data on a European scale*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2019. **31**(1): p. 65. doi.org/10.1186/s12302-019-0237-6

68. Williams, A.J., et al., *Sourcing data on chemical properties and hazard data from the US-EPA CompTox Chemicals Dashboard: A practical guide for human risk assessment*. Environment International, 2021. **154**. DOI: [10.1016/j.envint.2021.106566](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106566)
69. Kim, S., et al., *PubChem in 2021: new data content and improved web interfaces*. Nucleic Acids Res, 2021. **49**(D1): p. D1388-d1395. • DOI: [10.1093/nar/gkaa971](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkaa971)
70. Brack, W., et al., *Effect-based methods are key. The European Collaborative Project SOLUTIONS recommends integrating effect-based methods for diagnosis and monitoring of water quality*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2019. **31**(1): p. 10. doi.org/10.1186/s12302-019-0192-2
71. Caballero-Casero, N., et al., *Towards harmonised criteria in quality assurance and quality control of suspect and non-target LC-HRMS analytical workflows for screening of emerging contaminants in human biomonitoring*. Trac-Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 2021. **136**. doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2021.116201
72. Bopp, S.K., et al., *Current EU research activities on combined exposure to multiple chemicals*. Environment International, 2018. **120**: p. 544-562. DOI: [10.1016/j.envint.2018.07.037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.07.037)
73. Drakvik, E., et al., *Statement on advancing the assessment of chemical mixtures and their risks for human health and the environment*. Environment International, 2020. **134**.
74. Posthuma, L., et al., *Improved component-based methods for mixture risk assessment are key to characterize complex chemical pollution in surface waters*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2019. **31**(1): p. 70. DOI: [10.1016/j.envint.2019.105267](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105267)
75. Cousins, I.T., et al., *The concept of essential use for determining when uses of PFASs can be phased out*. Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 2019. **21**(11): p. 1803-1815. DOI: [10.1039/c9em00163h](https://doi.org/10.1039/c9em00163h)
76. American Veterinary Medical Association, *One Health: A New Professional Imperative*. 2008.
77. Gunnarsson, L., et al., *Evolutionary Conservation of Human Drug Targets in Organisms used for Environmental Risk Assessments*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2008. **42**(15): p. 5807-5813. DOI: [10.1021/es8005173](https://doi.org/10.1021/es8005173)
78. Edwards, S.W., et al., *Adverse Outcome Pathways-Organizing Toxicological Information to Improve Decision Making*. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 2016. **356**(1): p. 170-181. DOI: [10.1124/jpet.115.228239](https://doi.org/10.1124/jpet.115.228239)
79. United Nations Environment Programme, *Global Chemicals Outlook II. From Legacies to innovative solutions. Implementing the 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. <https://www.unep.org/resources/report/global-chemicals-outlook-ii-legacies-innovative-solutions>. 2019.
80. Landrigan, P.J., et al., *The Lancet Commission on pollution and health*. Lancet, 2018. **391**(10119): p. 462-512. • DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)32345-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32345-0)
81. Grandjean, P. and P.J. Landrigan, *Developmental neurotoxicity of industrial chemicals*. Lancet, 2006. **368**(9553): p. 2167-2178. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(06\)69665-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69665-7)
82. Martin, O.V., et al., *A Human Mixture Risk Assessment for Neurodevelopmental Toxicity Associated with Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers Used as Flame Retardants*. Environ Health Perspect, 2017. **125**(8): p. 087016. DOI: [10.1289/EHP826](https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP826)
83. Skakkebaek, N.E., et al., *Male reproductive disorders and fertility trends: influences of environment and genetic susceptibility*. Physiological Reviews, 2016. **96**(1): p. 55-97. doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00017.2015
84. Mocarelli, P., et al., *Dioxin exposure, from infancy through puberty, produces endocrine disruption and affects human semen quality*. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2008. **116**(1): p. 70-77. DOI: [10.1289/ehp.10399](https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.10399)
85. Karwacka, A., et al., *Exposure to modern, widespread environmental endocrine disrupting chemicals and their effect on the reproductive potential of women: an overview of current epidemiological evidence*. Hum Fertil (Camb), 2019. **22**(1): p. 2-25. DOI: [10.1080/14647273.2017.1358828](https://doi.org/10.1080/14647273.2017.1358828)
86. Vorosmarty, C.J., et al., *Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity*. Nature, 2010. **467**(7315): p. 555-561. DOI: [10.1038/nature09440](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09440)

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
87. Groh, K., et al., *Anthropogenic Chemicals As Underestimated Drivers of Biodiversity Loss: Scientific and Societal Implications*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2022. **56**: p. 707-710. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.1c08399](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c08399)
88. Malaj, E., et al., *Organic chemicals jeopardise freshwater ecosystems health on the continental scale*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 2014. **111**(26): p. 9549-9554. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1321082111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1321082111)
89. Lemm, J.U., et al., *Multiple stressors determine river ecological status at the European scale: Towards an integrated understanding of river status deterioration*. Global Change Biology, 2021. **27**(9): p. 1962-1975. DOI: [10.1111/gcb.15504](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15504)
90. Desforges, J.P., et al., *Predicting global killer whale population collapse from PCB pollution*. Science, 2018. **361**(6409): p. 1373-1376. DOI: [10.1126/science.aat1953](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat1953)
91. Jobling, S., et al., *Widespread sexual disruption in wild fish*. Environmental Science & Technology, 1998. **32**(17): p. 2498-2506. doi/10.1021/es9710870
92. Kidd, K.A., et al., *Collapse of a fish population after exposure to a synthetic estrogen*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2007. **104**(21): p. 8897-8901. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.0609568104](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0609568104)
93. Secretariat for the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, *Decision Guidance Document for Tributyltin Compounds*. 2008, United Nations Environment Programme.
94. Oehlmann, J., et al., *Endocrine disruption in prosobranch molluscs: evidence and ecological relevance*. Ecotoxicology, 2007. **16**(1): p. 29-43. DOI: [10.1007/s10646-006-0109-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-006-0109-x)
95. Oetken, M., et al., *Evidence for endocrine disruption in invertebrates*, in *International Review of Cytology - a Survey of Cell Biology, Vol 236*, K.W. Jeon, Editor. 2004. p. 1-44. DOI: [10.1016/S0074-7696\(04\)36001-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696(04)36001-8)
96. Machate, O., et al., *Evidence for antifouling biocides as one of the limiting factors for the recovery of macrophyte communities in lakes of Schleswig-Holstein*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2021. **33**(1): p. 57. doi.org/10.1186/s12302-021-00500-3
97. Sayer, C.D., et al., *TBT causes regime shift in shallow lakes*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2006. **40**(17): p. 5269-5275. DOI: [10.1021/es060161o](https://doi.org/10.1021/es060161o)
98. Hooper, D.U., et al., *Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: A consensus of current knowledge*. Ecological Monographs, 2005. **75**(1): p. 3-35. doi.org/10.1890/04-0922
99. Newbold, T., et al., *Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment*. Science, 2016. **353**(6296): p. 288-291. DOI: [10.1126/science.aaf2201](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf2201)
100. Hallmann, C.A., et al., *More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas*. Plos One, 2017. **12**(10). DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0185809](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185809)
101. Mineau, P. and M. Whiteside, *Pesticide Acute Toxicity Is a Better Correlate of US Grassland Bird Declines than Agricultural Intensification*. Plos One, 2013. **8**(2). DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0057457](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0057457)
102. Hallmann, C.A., et al., *Declines in insectivorous birds are associated with high neonicotinoid concentrations*. Nature, 2014. **511**(7509): p. 341. DOI: [10.1038/nature13531](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13531)
103. Oaks, J.L., et al., *Diclofenac residues as the cause of vulture population decline in Pakistan*. Nature, 2004. **427**(6975): p. 630-633. DOI: [10.1038/nature02317](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02317)
104. Balmford, A., *Pollution, Politics, and Vultures*. Science, 2013. **339**(6120): p. 653-654. DOI: [10.1126/science.1234193](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1234193)
105. Becker, J.M., et al., *Pesticide pollution in freshwater paves the way for schistosomiasis transmission*. Scientific Reports, 2020. **10**(1): p. 3650. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-020-60654-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60654-7)
106. Johnston, E.L., M. Mayer-Pinto, and T.P. Crowe, *Chemical contaminant effects on marine ecosystem functioning*. Journal of Applied Ecology, 2015. **52**(1): p. 140-149. doi/10.1111/1365-2664.12355

107. Wang, J., et al., *Towards a systematic method for assessing the impact of chemical pollution on ecosystem services of water systems*. Journal of Environmental Management, 2021. **281**. DOI: [10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111873](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111873)
108. Meybeck, M., et al., *Historical perspective of heavy metals contamination (Cd, Cr, Cu, Hg, Pb, Zn) in the Seine River basin (France) following a DPSIR approach (1950-2005)*. Science of the Total Environment, 2007. **375**(1-3): p. 204-231. DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2006.12.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2006.12.017)
109. Posthuma, L., et al., *Exploring the 'solution space' is key: SOLUTIONS recommends an early-stage assessment of options to protect and restore water quality against chemical pollution*. Environmental Sciences Europe, 2019. **31**(1): p. 73. doi.org/10.1186/s12302-019-0253-6
110. Backhaus, T., M. Scheringer, and Z.Y. Wang, *Developing SAICM into a framework for the international governance of chemicals throughout their Lifecycle: Looking beyond 2020*. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management, 2018. **14**(4): p. 432-433. DOI: [10.1002/ieam.4052](https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4052)
111. McAlister, M.M., et al., *Systems Thinking for Effective Interventions in Global Environmental Health*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2022. **56**(2): p. 732-738. doi/10.1021/acs.est.1c04110
112. Fantke, P., et al., *Exposure and toxicity characterization of chemical emissions and chemicals in products: global recommendations and implementation in USEtox*. The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment, 2021. **26**(5): p. 899-915. • DOI: [10.1007/s11367-021-01889-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-021-01889-y)
113. Aurisano, N., et al., *Chemicals of concern in plastic toys*. Environment International, 2021. **146**. DOI: [10.1016/j.envint.2020.106194](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.106194)
114. Huang, L., et al., *Chemicals of concern in building materials: A high-throughput screening*. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 2022. **424**. DOI: [10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.127574](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.127574)
115. Scheringer, M., *Long-range transport of organic chemicals in the environment*. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 2009. **28**(4): p. 677-690. DOI: [10.1897/08-324R.1](https://doi.org/10.1897/08-324R.1)



Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
One health_4.png

