Exposure to microplastics reduces attachment strength and alters the haemolymph proteome of blue mussels (Mytilus edulis)
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Abstract
The contamination of marine ecosystems with microplastics, such as the polymer polyethylene, a commonly used component of single-use packaging, is of global concern. Although it has been suggested that biodegradable polymers, such as polylactic acid, may be used to replace some polyethylene packaging, little is known about their effects on marine organisms. Blue mussels, *Mytilus edulis*, have become a “model organism” for investigating the effects of microplastics in marine ecosystems. We show here that repeated exposure, over a period of 52 days in an outdoor mesocosm setting, of *M. edulis* to polyethylene microplastics reduced the number of byssal threads produced and the attachment strength (tenacity) by ~50%. Exposure to either type of microplastic altered the haemolymph proteome and, although a conserved response to microplastic exposure was observed, overall polyethylene resulted in more changes to protein abundances than polylactic acid. Many of the proteins affected are involved in vital biological processes, such as immune regulation, detoxification, metabolism and structural development. Our study highlights the utility of mass spectrometry-based proteomics to assess the health of key marine organisms and identifies the potential mechanisms by which microplastics, both conventional and biodegradable, could affect their ability to form and maintain reefs.

Capsule
Conventional microplastics alone reduced the attachment strength of blue mussels but both conventional and biodegradable micoplastics altered the haemolymph proteome.
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1. Introduction

Microplastic particles (0.1 µm – 5 mm) are the most numerically abundant form of solid waste on Earth (Eriksen et al. 2014) and are a potential threat to marine ecosystems globally (Galloway et al. 2017). Global plastic production, which has risen from ~1.5 million metric tonnes (MTT) in 1950 to ~335 MMT in 2016, is predicted to continue to rise (Plastics Europe, 2017). The majority (39.9%) of this production is designed for use in single-use packaging, most of which is composed of polyethylene (PE) (Plastics Europe, 2017). Plastics that are able to biodegrade in composting facilities (“biodegradable”), however, have been proposed as suitable alternatives to conventional packagings, such as PE, and global production for these polymers is also growing (Bioplastics Europe, 2016). Polylactic acid (PLA), derived from e.g. starch, accounts for ~45% of the global market of biodegradable plastics and ~60% of its production is used to make packaging (Markets and Markets, 2015). Most microplastics arise from the fragmentation of larger plastic litter items rather than being directly littered as micro-sized particles (for example, microbeads). Packaging items are also the most abundant form of coastal litter (Galgani et al. 2015) and are, therefore, likely the greatest source of microplastic litter.

Current estimates of environmental concentrations of microplastics in coastal waters are biased towards larger particles because the mesh sizes used to sample are generally > 330 µm. When a smaller mesh is used, however, estimates of concentrations in seawater have been found to be three orders of magnitude greater (e.g. from ~0.005 L⁻¹ with a 335 µm net to up to ~6 L⁻¹ with grab samples filtered over a 0.45 µm filter; Barrows et al. 2017). Given that global production of waste is not expected to peak before 2100 and that the amount of plastic in the marine environment is expected to increase by an order of magnitude by 2025
(Jambeck et al. 2015), abundances of microplastics, and their potential impacts on marine organisms, are likely to be even greater in the coming decades.

Understanding the impacts of microplastics is ongoing and has been the subject of several recent reviews (such as Galloway et al. 2017, de Sá et al. 2018 and Anbumani and Kakkar 2018). Microplastics have been shown to negatively affect neural (neurotoxicity in nematodes; Lei et al 2018), cellular (oxidative stress in leucocytes of gilthead seabream; Espinosa et al. 2018) to population level (reduced reproductive output of oysters; Sussarellu et al. 2016) biological processes and functions. One of the most well studied marine organisms with respect to microplastics, is the blue mussel, *Mytilus edulis*. *M. edulis* is an important ecosystem engineer, clinging together using byssal threads (extensible proteinaceous fibres; Waite, 1991) to form reefs, which are important biogenic habitats (Seed, 1996). They are filter feeders and have been found to ingest microplastics in natural (Van Cauwenberghe et al. 2015; De Witte et al. 2014) and experimental settings (Browne et al. 2008; von Moos et al. 2012). Despite this growing body of work, our understanding of how microplastics affect the general health of *M. edulis*, ranging from its biological activity to its underlying molecular phenotype, is currently lacking.

Haemolymph is the blood-plasma equivalent of the invertebrate circulatory system, involved in the transportation of oxygen, nutrients, as well as proteins involved in important biological processes, including the nervous system, reproduction and the immune system. Within molluscs, the haemolymph has been a well-studied medium for understanding the immune complement, as well as functionality, including aspects of both the cellular (Carballal et al. 1997) and humoral immune response (Campos et al. 2015). Directly assessing the cellular and molecular composition of haemolymph, particularly proteins, provides an insight into the
general health of an invertebrate organism and can reveal the signatures of environmental stress (Brown et al. 2006; Hannam et al. 2010). Invertebrate haemolymph protein abundances may be assessed using enzyme assays, gel electrophoresis or directly using mass spectrometry-based proteomics, which results in the unbiased identification and quantification of multiple proteins in a given sample (e.g. Campos et al. 2015; McNamara et al. 2017). The increasing incorporation of -omics techniques within the study of key ecological species have improved our understanding of the immune complement (Campos et al. 2015; Wu et al. 2016), structural composition (Mann et al. 2012; Mann and Edsinger, 2014), biomarkers of disease and pollution (Wu et al. 2016; Campos et al. 2016) as well as responses of organisms to environmental change (Tomanek 2012; Tomanek 2014).

To date, the vast majority of experiments investigating detrimental effects of microplastics exposure have used highly controlled laboratory conditions, with very high concentrations of microplastics, for example 110 (Van Cauwenberghe et al. 2015) to >1 billion (Browne et al. 2008) particles ml⁻¹, which do not simulate natural conditions of the habitats in which the organisms reside. Compared with indoor laboratories, outdoor mesocosm systems can provide a better understanding of environmentally relevant effects of contaminants on individuals, populations and communities (Miko et al. 2015). In order to estimate future risks, an outdoor mesocosm experiment was used to expose M. edulis to a relatively low concentration (~1 particle mL⁻¹ or 25 µg L⁻¹) of a range of particle sizes (~0.5 to ~330 µm) of conventional (high-density polyethylene - HDPE) or biodegradable (polylactic acid - PLA) microplastics in a natural outdoor setting for 52 days to assess impacts on (i) important biological traits as ecosystem engineers including byssal thread production and attachment strength and (ii) underlying molecular health through proteomic analysis of their haemolymph.
2. Methods

2.1. Experimental design and set-up

Mesocosm experiments were set up at the outdoor flow-through mesocosm facility at Queen’s University Marine Laboratory, Portaferry, Northern Ireland. The experimental design consisted of one fixed factor “Plastic”, with three levels: no microplastics added (control), polylactic acid (PLA) and high density polyethylene (HDPE).

Full details of the experimental set-up can be found in Green et al. (2017), but are described here in brief. Mesocosms were 10 litre polypropylene buckets (height x diameter = 25 x 25 cm). The experiment had 5 replicates (n = 5, N = 15) and to simulate the habitat where the mussels were collected from, each mesocosm contained a 5 cm layer of muddy sediment. On the 26th of August 2014, after allowing 48 hours for the sediment to settle, each mesocosm received 7 individuals of *M. edulis*. Mussels were measured, weighed and randomly allocated to treatments in order to ensure that no biases due to size were introduced into the experiment. The average (±S.E.M.) whole animal wet weight was 19.84 ± 0.51 g and there were no differences among treatments (ANOVA: F₂,12 = 0.18, P = 0.831). The average (±S.E.M) length of the mussels was 48.17 ± 0.83 mm and there were also no differences in length among treatments (ANOVA: F₂,12 = 0.87, P = 0.469). The experiment ran for 52 consecutive days (until 14th October 2014). Sand-filtered seawater, sourced from Strangford Lough (54°22’51.1”N; 5°33’04.0”W) was continuously provided to each mesocosm at constant flow rates (~500 mL minute⁻¹) via individual hoses resulting in an overlying water column of ~8 L.

2.2. Microalgal culture and microplastic dosing
Cultures of the microalgae *Isochrysis galbana* were prepared using seawater (35 psu), which was filtered with 0.45 μm aperture membranes and sterilised with UV light. PLA or HDPE microplastics were then added to 5 litre bottles with *I. galbana* and were continuously mixed with air bubblers. Fresh batches of control and microplastic-dosed *I. galbana* cultures were made weekly. Virgin (pre-production) white PLA and HDPE microplastic particles (fragments not spheres) used in the experiments had a volume-weighted mean diameter of 65.6 μm (range = 0.6–363 μm) for PLA and 102.6 μm (range = 0.48–316 μm) for HDPE. Every day, each mesocosm received 250 mL of ~2 × 10^6 cells mL⁻¹ of microalgae containing either 0 (control) or 800 μg L⁻¹ of PLA or HDPE microplastics, equating to a concentration in the mesocosms of 25 μg L⁻¹. This corresponds to approximately 1296.3 (± 182.9) and 844.9 (± 138.7) particles L⁻¹ respectively (Green et al. 2017). Although this is high relative to current environmental concentrations, due to the range of particle sizes included, these concentrations are among the lowest used experimentally to date and, therefore, among the most environmentally realistic (Lenz et al. 2016). In order to simulate a pulse of microplastics in the environment (such as from wastewater effluent), mussels were exposed for two hours per day. During dosing, the flow of water was paused and air bubblers were used to keep the water moving and aerate the mesocosms. The water flow in the mesocosms was resumed after 2 hours and fresh seawater replaced the microplastic- contaminated water which was captured for safe disposal.

### 2.3. Tenacity of mussels

The remaining individuals from each of the mesocosms (excluding those removed for filtration and proteomics measurements) were placed onto glass petri dishes in clean buckets with fresh flowing seawater. Feeding (without microplastics) was resumed for a further 3 days (in order to allow the mussels to attach their byssal threads) before tenacity was
measured for one randomly selected mussel from each replicate mesocosm. Tenacity was measured following the method of Denny (1987). Briefly, a portable dynometer (Pesola, Sweden), scaled 0 to 10 N, was used to measure the maximal vertical force required for the individual to become dislodged (attachment strength, N). The dynometer had a small clamp that gripped individual mussels. The maximum dislodgement force was marked by a ring on the dynamometer, which remained in place after detachment indicating the maximum extension of the spring (to the nearest 0.1 N). Shell planform area ($A_{pl}$) was approximated as an ellipse with shell height and width as major and minor axes (measured with vernier callipers to 1 mm), respectively (Bell and Gosline 1997). Tenacity was calculated as dislodgement force per unit mussel planform area, in N m$^{-2}$. The number of byssal threads deployed by each of the mussels used in tenacity measurements was also counted.

2.4. Proteomic analysis of mussels

After 50 days, haemolymph was extracted from one individual from each mesocosm. In order to minimise disturbance, exposure to the air was not longer than 3 minutes before haemolymph extraction. Prior to haemolymph extraction, the shells were temporarily opened 2-3 mm to allow for the removal of excess water from the interior. The shells were then allowed to reclose and form a tight seal. An Omnican F syringe with an integrated 30 gauge needle was inserted between the shells of the mussel into the posterior adductor muscle and haemolymph slowly collected. The syringe was then removed from the needle and the haemolymph was dispensed into a nuclease-free 1.5 ml microcentrifuge tube. The haemolymph was stored temporarily at -20°C overnight before transfer to -80°C for long-term storage. As haemocytes can be reactive to oxygen causing the production of melanin, we took additional care to remove haemocytes prior to sample preparation for mass-spectrometry.
200 µl crude haemolymph was removed and centrifuged at 8,000 × g for 5 min to pellet cellular debris. The supernatant was then removed, quantified and four independent biological replicates were analysed from each treatment: control (n=4), PLA- (n=4) and HDPE-exposed (n=4) mussels. 50 µg of each sample was precipitated using the 2D Clean-Up Kit (GE Healthcare), following the manufacturer's instructions and the resulting protein pellet was resuspended in 50 µl 6M urea, 2M thiourea, 0.1 M Tris-HCl, pH 8.0. 50mM ammonium bicarbonate was added to each sample and proteins were reduced with 0.5M dithiothreitol (DTT) at 56°C for 20 min and alkylated with 0.55M iodoacetamide (IAA) at room temperature for 15 min, in the dark. 1 µl of a 1% w/v solution of Protease Max Surfactant Trypsin Enhancer (Promega) and 0.5 µg of Sequence Grade Trypsin (Promega) was added to give a protein:trypsin ratio of 100:1. The protein/trypsin mixture was incubated at 37°C for 18 h. Digestion was terminated by adding 1 µl of 100% trifluoroacetic acid (Sigma Aldrich) and incubation at room temperature for 5 min. Samples were centrifuged for 10 min at 13,000 × g and a volume equivalent to 40 µg of pre-digested protein was removed and purified for mass spectrometry using C18 Spin Columns (Pierce), following the manufacturer's instructions. The eluted peptides were dried using a SpeedyVac concentrator (Thermo Scientific Savant DNA120) and resuspended in 2% v/v acetonitrile and 0.05% v/v trifluoroacetic acid (TFA). Samples were sonicated for 5 min to aid peptide resuspension followed by centrifugation for 5 min at 13,000 × g. The supernatant was removed and used for mass spectrometry.

2.5. Mass spectrometry

1 µg of each digested sample was loaded onto a QExactive (ThermoFisher Scientific) high-resolution accurate mass spectrometer connected to a Dionex Ultimate 3000 (RSLCnano) chromatography system. The peptides were separated by a 4% to 35% gradient of acetonitrile
on a Biobasic C18 PicoFrit™ column (100 mm length, 75 mm ID), using a 55 min reverse-phase gradient at a flow rate of 250 nL min⁻¹. All data were acquired with the mass spectrometer (MS) operating in automatic data dependent switching mode. A full MS scan at 140,000 resolution and a scan range of 400-2000 m/z were followed by an MS/MS scan, resolution 17,500 and a range of 200-2000 m/z, selecting the 10 most intense ions prior to MS/MS.

Protein identification and Label Free Quantification (LFQ) normalisation of MS/MS data were performed using MaxQuant v1.5.6.5 (http://www.maxquant.org) following the general procedures and settings outlined in Hubner et al. (2010). The Andromeda search algorithm (Cox et al. 2011) incorporated in the MaxQuant software was used to correlate MS/MS data against a predicted protein set generated from available RNA sequences for *Mytilus edulis* (Bioproject: PRJEA75259), *Mytilus gallaprovincialis* (Bioproject: PRJNA167773) and nucleotide/protein sequences available for *M. edulis* and *M. gallaprovincialis* from the National Centre for Biotechnology and Information (NCBI) repository (8,305 entries, downloaded September 2017) including the predicted protein set derived from the *M. gallaprovincialis* genome (Murgarella et al. 2016) (Bioproject: PRJNA262617). A 6-frame translation was conducted on the RNA sequences for the transcriptome resources of *Mytilus* species and an open reading frame extraction was performed. CD-Hit (Huang et al. 2010) was utilized to remove redundant sequences that were similar by 98% and above. The final predicted proteome comprised 12,453 sequences and was used in mass spectrometry searches in addition to a contaminant sequence set provided by MaxQuant.

The following search parameters were used: first search peptide tolerance of 20 ppm, second search peptide tolerance 4.5 ppm with cysteine carbamidomethylation as a fixed modification and N-acetylation of protein and oxidation of methionine as variable modifications and a
maximum of two missed cleavage sites allowed. False Discovery Rates (FDR) were set to 1% for both peptides and proteins and the FDR was estimated following searches against a target-decoy database. LFQ intensities were calculated using the MaxLFQ algorithm (Cox et al. 2014) from razor and unique peptides with a minimum ratio count of two peptides across samples.

2.6. Processing of proteomic data

Perseus v.1.5.2.6 (www.maxquant.org/) was used for data processing and visualization. The data matrix was first filtered for the removal of contaminants, decoy peptide matches and peptides identified by site. To obtain annotations for all identified proteins a fasta file was generated for the post-filtered proteins using BioEdit (Hall 1999) and BlastP searched using Blast2Go (version: 4.1.9; Conesa et al. 2005) against the NCBI non redundant database with the following search settings: number of blast hits: 20, high-scoring segment pair length cutoff: 33, Blast expect value: 1.0e^-5. These annotations were subsequently uploaded to Perseus. Normalised LFQ intensity values (quantitative measurement of protein abundance) were log2 transformed and each replicate was assigned to its corresponding sample (n=4). Proteins not found in all 4 replicates of at least one treatment were removed from the analysis.

A data-imputation step was conducted to replace non-detected values with values that simulate signals of lowest abundant proteins chosen randomly from a distribution specified by a downshift of 1.8 times the mean standard deviation (SD) of all measured values and a width of 0.3 times this SD. Volcano plots were generated in Perseus by plotting negative log p-values against log2 fold-change values for each protein to visualize two-fold changes in protein expression of the microplastic exposed mussels relative to the control mussels and microplastic exposed mussels to each other. LFQ intensity values for proteins deemed statistically significant (by ANOVA, see Statistical data analyses) were Z-score normalized and hierarchical clustering was generated in order to summarise the overall differences among
treatments. Gene Ontology mapping and functional domain analysis were performed using
Blast2GO (v.4.1.9). The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the
ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE (Vizcaíno et al. 2016) partner repository with
the dataset identifier PXD011567.

2.7. Statistical data analyses
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was done using the R environment (R v3.1.3; R core team
2015) to test the null hypotheses that there would be no difference in the (i) tenacity (ii)
number of byssal threads (with n = 5) and (iii) relative (post imputation) abundances of
individual proteins (with n = 4). The data were screened for normality (q-q plots, and Shapiro-
Wilk tests) and homogeneity of variance (Levene’s test, using the car package; Fox and
Weisberg 2011) to ascertain assumptions for ANOVA. Pairwise comparisons were computed
when the main test was significant. Statistical significance was assumed at α = 0.05. In order
to explore the possible relationships between the effects of microplastics on protein
expression and effects on the biological functioning of blue mussels, Pearson’s R correlation
coefficients were calculated.
PERMANOVA was performed on post imputation data to test the null hypothesis that the
haemolymph proteomes (composition and relative abundances of all 216 identified proteins)
of mussels exposed to PLA or HDPE microplastics or to no microplastics (controls) would
not differ. Patterns of difference in the haemolymph proteomes were visualized with
canonical analysis of principal coordinates based on Bray-Curtis resemblance matrices (using
PRIMER V6.1.12 with PERMANOVA+).

3. Results
3.1. Effects of microplastics exposure on biological functions of M. edulis
After 52 days of exposure to microplastics, the tenacity was lower ($F_{2,12} = 5.6, P = 0.019$) and there were fewer byssal threads ($F_{2,12} = 10.3, P = 0.002$) produced by mussels exposed to HDPE microplastics compared with mussels exposed to PLA or to no microplastics (Figure 1). Specifically, after exposure to HDPE, attachment strength of *M. edulis* was $\sim 3.0$ times less compared to the controls, while it was $\sim 2.2$ times less compared with mussels exposed to PLA (Figure 1a). Mirroring this, the number of byssal threads produced by mussels exposed to HDPE was $\sim 1.6$ times less compared to the controls and $\sim 1.8$ times less compared to those exposed to PLA (Figure 1b). Across all treatments, there was a significant positive relationship between attachment strength and the number of byssal threads (Pearson’s $r = 0.78$, $t = 4.46$, $P < 0.001$).

### 3.2. Effects of microplastics on the haemolymph proteome of *M. edulis*

High resolution quantitative mass spectrometry identified 2,745 peptides, representing 216 high confidence proteins from *M. edulis* (Table S1). The haemolymph proteome was significantly altered by microplastics ($pseudo-F_{2,9} = 2.89, P = 0.001$), with those exposed to HDPE or to PLA having significantly different protein profiles compared to those not exposed to microplastics (HDPE vs Control: $pseudo-t = 1.91$, $P = 0.023$ and PLA vs Control: $pseudo-t = 1.48$, $P = 0.029$). The haemolymph proteome of mussels exposed to HDPE also differed to those exposed to PLA (HDPE vs PLA: $pseudo-t = 1.67$, $P = 0.030$). This is illustrated by ordination using canonical analysis of principal coordinates (Figure 2). Furthermore, $\sim 19\%$ of the haemolymph proteome (40 proteins) was significantly affected by exposure to microplastics, with the majority being expressed at greater abundances (Table 1) when microplastics were present, compared to the control.
Of the 40 statistically significant proteins, six were differentially expressed in mussels exposed to both types of microplastic compared with controls. A further 11 were differentially expressed only in those exposed to HDPE compared with controls and four were differentially expressed only in those exposed to PLA compared with controls. Nine proteins differed between HDPE and PLA while five proteins differed in expression between HDPE-exposed and both PLA-exposed and control mussels (Table 1, Figure 3). Post-hoc tests were unable to determine the differences in the remaining five proteins. Functional annotation through homology searches and gene ontology mapping assigned functional information for statistically significant differentially expressed proteins identifying proteins with putative roles in the immune system, metabolism and detoxification, as well proteins of unknown function (Table 1).

3.2.1. Effects of microplastics exposure on the mussel immune complement

Within the haemolymph of mussels exposed to microplastics, 11 putative immune-responsive proteins were differentially expressed. Exposure to HDPE resulted in increased abundance of four immune-responsive proteins, including a putative proinflammatory cytokine, macrophage migration inhibitory factor (HE609105.1), as well as three complement C1q domain-containing (C1qDC) proteins (FR715598.1; FR715581.1; HE609753.1) (Table 1, Figure 4). One of these putative C1qDC proteins (FR715598.1) was also increased in mussels exposed to PLA in comparison to the control. In addition, both microplastics treatments increased the abundance of a fibrinogen-related protein (OPL33687.1). In contrast, a second fibrinogen-related protein (OPL32613.1) was reduced within both treatments in comparison to control. Six immune proteins were differentially expressed between mussels exposed to PLA compared with those exposed to HDPE. In comparison to PLA, exposure to HDPE resulted in increased abundance of a putative pore-forming apextrin-like protein (HQ709238.1), a galectin
(AJQ21509.1), as well as a putative antimicrobial peptide, mytimycin precursor (AET85056.1). In contrast, PLA exposure increased the abundance of two C1qDC proteins (FR715612.1; HE609604.1) in comparison to HDPE.

3.2.2. Effects of microplastics exposure on the abundance of metabolic proteins

Seven putative metabolic proteins were differentially expressed in response to one or both microplastics treatments. HDPE exposure resulted in increased expression of a glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAEN01008281.1), an aminopeptidase (GAEN01005918.1) and a protein putatively involved in retinal metabolism, retinol dehydrogenase 1 (OPL33362.1) (Table 1, Figure 4). Two putative metabolic enzymes, a putative aspartate cytoplasmic protein (HE662841.1) and phosphoglycerate kinase (GAEM01000061.1) were increased within mussels exposed to PLA in comparison to both control and HDPE individuals. PLA exposure also resulted in a reduction in a metalloproteinase inhibitor (GAEM01005782.1) in comparison to mussels exposed to HDPE. Both HDPE and PLA also led to an elevated abundance of a putative peptidyl-prolyl cis-trans isomerase protein (GAEN01009083.1) compared with control mussels.

3.2.3. Potential detoxification proteins altered in response to microplastics exposure

Four proteins previously identified to have putative roles as biomarkers of detoxification within molluscs were differentially expressed in response to microplastics exposure. Exposure to either microplastics treatment resulted in the increased expression of a putative heavy metal binding protein (HE609570.1) and putative detoxification enzyme, deferrochelatase peroxidase (GAEN01007747.1) in comparison to control mussels. Furthermore, a ferritin heavy oocyte (GAEN01007405.1) was increased in response to HDPE exposure in comparison to control mussels. A fourth protein, with a putative role in
detoxification (cathepsin D; GAEM01006053.1), was also identified to be significantly affected by microplastics but post-hoc tests were not significant.

3.2.4. Additional biomarkers associated with microplastics exposure

Aside from variation in immune, metabolic and detoxification proteins, microplastics exposure changed the abundance of an additional 19 proteins. Both HDPE and PLA reduced the abundance of a protein of unknown function (OPL21291.1) compared with control mussels. Exposure to HDPE increased the expression of proteins involved in a variety of biological processes, including neurogenesis (GAEM01003123.1; OPL21044.1), structural integrity (GAEM01002086.1; GAEM01005782.1; OPL21594.1), DNA binding (CAD37821.1; CAC94907.1; GAEN01008605.1), and proteins of unknown function (OPL32817.1) in comparison to control and/or PLA treatment. In contrast, HDPE reduced the abundance of two proteins with roles in structural integrity (HE662833.1, GAEN01011200.1).

Exposure to PLA increased the expression of a putative growth factor protein (GAEN01008261.1) and a protein of unknown function (HE609843.1) in comparison to control and HDPE-exposed individuals, respectively. One putative titin-like protein (GAEN01023435.1) was reduced within mussels exposed to PLA in comparison to control mussels. Post-hoc tests were unable to determine the direction of differences in four additional proteins found to be significantly affected, including proteins involved in structural integrity (GAEN01011004.1; GAEN01007066.1), translation (GAEN01008711.1) and a protein of unknown function (GAEN01005668.1).

4. Discussion
After long-term (52 days) exposure to ~1 particle mL$^{-1}$ of HDPE microplastics, the number of byssal threads produced and the tenacity of *M. edulis* were reduced by approximately 50% when compared with mussels not exposed to microplastics. Tenacity is paramount to the ability of mussels to form and maintain reefs without being dislodged by hydrodynamic forces (Bell and Gosline, 1997). The ability to produce byssal threads and to form aggregations also increases fertilization success, makes mussels more resistant to predation and, overall, increases the probability of their survival (Christensen et al, 2015). Weakened attachment strength in response to conventional microplastics could, therefore, result in cascading ecological (by reducing the habitat availability for intertidal communities that depend on mussel reefs) and economic (by reducing yields of suspension culturing of mussels in aquaculture) consequences. For example, the mussel aquaculture industry is already worth ~3-4 billion USD globally per year (FAO 2015) and is expected to grow in the coming decades. Reductions in the tenacity of two similar species of mussel, *Mytilus trossulus* (O'Donnell et al. 2013) and *Mytilus coruscus* (Zhao et al. 2017) have also been found in response to ocean acidification. Given that the concentrations of microplastics in the oceans (Jambeck et al. 2015) and the acidity of seawater (IPCC 2014) are both likely to increase in the coming decades, future research should assess their combined effect on the health and tenacity of mussels.

In order to complement the measures of tenacity and to provide a detailed assessment of mussel health in response to microplastics exposure, we assessed changes in the proteome of the mussel haemolymph. We chose the haemolymph because it plays an important role as a crucial transporter of nutrients and oxygen, as well as being a primary site of immune activity and xenobiotic detoxification (Malagoli et al. 2007). Information regarding the effects of microplastic exposure on an organism’s proteome are limited, but Sussarellu et al. (2016) found
that exposure to polystyrene microplastics altered proteins in the oocytes of oysters and that this corresponded to a reduction in fertility. In the current study, exposure to HDPE or PLA microplastics resulted in complex changes in a number of key biological processes, including immunity, metabolism and detoxification.

Exposure of mussels to either PLA or HDPE microplastics resulted in changes in the immunological profiles of their haemolymph. The immune system represents an important obstacle to infection and disease, and has been extensively studied and characterised in mussels (Campos et al. 2015; Wu et al. 2016) and while interactions between microplastics and aspects of the mussel cellular immune response have been previously documented (von Moos et al. 2012; Avio et al. 2015; Paul-Pont et al. 2016), here we provide evidence of changes within the humoral components of the mussel haemolymph in response to microplastics exposure. Specifically, members of the C1qDC protein family were affected by exposure to microplastics. C1qDC genes function in pathogen recognition (Gerdol et al. 2011) with certain genes elevated in response to bacterial challenge (Gestal et al. 2010). Additionally, two pathogen recognition molecules, galectin-2 and apextrin were upregulated in mussels exposed to HDPE compared with PLA microplastics. Within molluscs, galectin-2 and apextrin have been characterised to promote phagocytosis (Vasta et al. 2015) and function in membrane pore formation (Estevez-Calvar et al. 2011) respectively. Other effector molecules altered by microplastics exposure, included an increase in the antimicrobial peptide, myticin (Mitta et al. 1999), while fibrinogen-related proteins, functional in antigen recognition (Romero et al. 2011), were either up- or down- regulated in response to microplastics exposure. These immunological changes may be due to physical abrasion from the microplastics after being ingested by the mussels. Previous research by Avio et al. (2015) on a similar species of mussel to those used in the current study, *Mytilus galloprovincialis*, found similar immunological
responses to virgin and contaminated microplastics (polyethylene and polystyrene) thus suggesting physical abrasion as the cause of response. It is possible that microplastics can translocate into tissues such as the gills and digestive tract (von Moos et al. 2012; Avio et al. 2015; Paul-Pont et al. 2016), as well as the haemolymph (Browne et al. 2008; Avio et al. 2015). Although microplastics in the haemolymph were not quantified in the present study, it is possible that physical abrasion of the tissue may have triggered the observed immunological responses but further research is required.

Despite some differences in the effects of PLA and HDPE on the proteome, a number of proteins responded similarly to both types of microplastic including complement C1q domain-containing proteins (discussed above) and detoxification proteins, such as a peroxidase and a heavy metal-binding protein. Aside from direct immunological activity, immune-responsive proteins within the haemolymph may have roles in detoxification. Within Mytilus species, Cq1DC protein expression has been identified to change in response to heavy metal exposure suggesting a role in detoxification (Liu et al. 2014). Within the present study, a heavy metal binding protein, which contained a complement-like domain, was increased in response to both types of microplastics, indicating a potential conserved biomarker of microplastics exposure. Heavy metal-binding proteins with strong reactivity to metal pollutants have been previously characterised within the mussel haemolymph (Renwrantz and Werner 2007). While organisms require metal ions in trace amounts, excessive quantities can be toxic (Mejáre and Bülow 2001) and require removal. Changes in immune proteins, as well as metal binding proteins, have been characterized previously in mussels in response to other pollutants, highlighting the role of the immune response as an indicator of a stressed phenotype (Coles et al. 1995). The ability of mussels to detoxify microplastics and associated by-products has been investigated through the measurement of detoxification enzyme activity (Paul-Pont et al. 2016), transcriptional
responses in antioxidant genes (Avio et al. 2015), as well as the assessment of oxidative damage within exposed individuals (von Moos et al. 2012; Paul-Pont et al. 2016). We identified one such detoxification enzyme, a peroxidase, to be increased within both microplastic treatments. Peroxidases are vital enzymes involved in the degradation of by-products of respiration (Brigelius-Flohé and Maiorino 2013) and have been identified to have increased enzyme activity within mussels in response to exposure to other pollutants (Vidal-Liñán et al. 2015) and within the marine copepod, Paracyclopina nana, in response to microplastics (Jeong et al. 2017). While the exact role of this peroxidase within Mytilus is unknown (Tomanek 2015), it has previously been found to change in abundance in response to fluctuations in temperature, which suggests a role in oxidative stress (Fields et al. 2012). The generation of immune and detoxification defenses can be metabolically costly, placing additional demands on a stressed host. Within mussels, exposure to microplastics can affect metabolic enzymes, involved in essential processes, such as energy metabolism and respiration. For example, metabolic enzymes involved in glycolysis have been found to increase in response to microplastics exposure, which has been suggested to be associated with mounting a detoxification response (Paul-Pont et al. 2016). In the current experiment, the filtration rates of M. edulis were reduced by exposure to either HDPE or PLA microplastics, compared with controls (results reported in Green et al. 2017). Other contaminants can also cause similar responses, for example, in response to anthracene, Mediterranean clams (Ruditapes decussatus) also had reduced filtration rates and altered proteomes (Sellami et al. 2015). The reduction in the abundance of metabolic proteins may, therefore, be associated with reduced feeding but further research is needed to establish this causal link.

Myosin was reduced within mussels exposed to HDPE compared with controls. Myosin is involved in generating muscle contraction in bivalves (Yamada et al. 2000) and has been found
to be altered by exposure to silver nanoparticles in a related mussel, *M. galloprovincialis* (Gomes et al. 2013). The deficiency in myosin, coupled with the expression of immune and detoxification proteins associated with mussels exposed to HDPE microplastics, may have contributed to less byssal threads being secreted. The tenacity of mussels is primarily related to byssal threads, either based on the number of threads or to their thickness (Carrington 2002). The byssus proteome of another marine mussel of the same genus, *M. coruscus*, has been previously characterised and a selection of other structural proteins (collagen-like) were identified (Qin et al. 2016) and suggested to provide adjustable tension allowing for stable attachment within dynamic rocky intertidal environments (Qin and Waite 1995).

Within the present study, exposure to conventional microplastics, HDPE, as well as a biodegradable alternative, PLA, resulted in changes to the haemolymph proteome, including proteins associated with stressed phenotypes. Certain proteins involved in immunity and detoxification, affected by both microplastics, provide candidate biomarkers for further research. Overall HDPE alone resulted in more proteomic changes in comparison to PLA. Despite being less severe, the effects of PLA microplastics on the proteome of *M. edulis* provides additional support to the growing body of literature on the potential issues of biodegradable alternatives. For example, PLA microplastics have also been found to reduce the biodiversity and abundance of organisms in marine invertebrate communities (Green 2016) and to decrease the biomass of benthic primary producers (Green et al. 2017; Green et al. 2016). Biodegradable plastics are set to become more dominant as packaging in the future, possibly replacing some conventional plastics (Markets and Markets 2015). They are, therefore, also more likely to become litter. Current testing methods, even those developed specifically for marine habitats (ASTM D7991-15), are limited in their ability to predict the break-down and ecological impacts of biodegradable plastics in the real world (Bioplastics Europe 2016).
Multidisciplinary research combining molecular, ecophysiological and traditional ecological techniques is recommended in order to gain a more holistic understanding of the potential impacts of conventional and biodegradable polymers.
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Table 1. Proteins in *M. edulis* haemolymph with significantly different relative abundances in individuals exposed to HDPE, PLA microplastics or to no microplastics (CONT). Fold differences are indicated by “δfold”, and are in **bold** when significantly different according to post-hoc tests. ANOVA (with F and P values) and pairwise post-hoc tests with *indicating significant differences at P<0.05). The source of the information on protein annotation is detailed in Table S2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein ID</th>
<th>Protein Annotation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>δfold HDPE vs CONT</th>
<th>δfold PLA vs CONT</th>
<th>δfold HDPE vs PLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immune</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR715598.1</td>
<td>C1Q DomainContaining 1Q19</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>7.0*</td>
<td>5.4*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE609753.1</td>
<td>Complement C1Q 4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPL33687.1</td>
<td>Fibrinogen-Related</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>3.6*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJQ21590.1</td>
<td>Galectin 2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ709238.1</td>
<td>Apexrin</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR715612.1</td>
<td>C1Q DomainContaining 1Q33</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE609604.1</td>
<td>Complement C1Q 2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-4.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR715581.1</td>
<td>Complement C1Q Tumor Necrosis Factor</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE609105.1</td>
<td>Macrophage Migration Inhibitory Factor</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AET85056.1</td>
<td>Mytimycin precursor</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>5.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPL32613.1</td>
<td>Microfibril-Associated Glyco 4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>-4.0*</td>
<td>-5.2*</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metabolism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01005918.1</td>
<td>Aminopeptidase N</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>3.3*</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE662841.1</td>
<td>Aspartate Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7*</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01009083.1</td>
<td>Peptidyl-Prolyl Cis-Trans Isomerase</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01008281.1</td>
<td>Glyceraldehyde-3-Phosphate Dehydrogenase</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEM01005782.1</td>
<td>Metallo Ase Inhibitor 3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEM01000061.1</td>
<td>Phosphoglycerate Kinase</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEM01005782.1</td>
<td>Retinal Dehydrogenase 1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEM01002086.1</td>
<td>Shell -5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE662833.1</td>
<td>Calponin -1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-3.1*</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01011200.1</td>
<td>Myosin Essential Light Chain</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-1.2*</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPL21594.1</td>
<td>Singed Isoform X3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01011004.1</td>
<td>Myosin Heavy Non-Muscle-Like</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01023435.1</td>
<td>Titin-Like</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.7*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01007066.1</td>
<td>Myosin Regulatory Light Chain Smooth Adductor-Muscle-Like Isoform X3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detoxification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE609570.1</td>
<td>Heavy Metal-Binding Protein</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01007747.1</td>
<td>Probable Deferrochelatase Peroxidase</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
<td>2.5*</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEM01006053.1</td>
<td>Cathepsin D</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td>q-Value</td>
<td>Fold Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01007405.1</td>
<td>Ferritin Heavy Oocyte Isoform</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD37821.1</td>
<td>Histone H2A</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01008605.1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic A3A</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC94907.1</td>
<td>Histone H1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01008711.1</td>
<td>60S Ribosomal L7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPL21291.1</td>
<td>Hypothetical Protein Am593_06205</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.9*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE6099843.1</td>
<td>Alpha-Crystallin A Chai</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPL32817.1</td>
<td>Hypothetical Protein Am593_04753</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01005668.1</td>
<td>Hypothetical Protein Brafdraft_84721</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEM01003123.1</td>
<td>Fatty Acid-Binding Brain</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>4.7*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEN01008261.1</td>
<td>Hypothetical Conserved 327</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPL21044.1</td>
<td>Atrial Natriuretic Peptide Receptor A</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>4.9*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Mean (±S.E.M.) tenacity (a) and number of byssal threads (b) of *M. edulis* after 52 days of repeated exposure to 25 µg L\(^{-1}\) of PLA (polylactic acid) or HDPE (high-density polyethylene), or no microplastics (control). Letters denote significantly different treatments determined by posthoc tests (Tukey’s).
Figure 2. Canonical analysis of principal coordinates (m=5, 75% of samples correctly allocated) of the composition and structure of haemolymph proteomes (using all 216 identified proteins) from *M. edulis* after 52 days of repeated exposure to 25 µg L⁻¹ HDPE (high density polyethylene) microplastics (■), PLA (polylactic acid) microplastics (△), or no microplastics (○).
Figure 3. Venn Diagram depicting the number of proteins in mussel haemolymph altered in abundance by exposure to either HDPE or PLA microplastics. For both treatments, the number of proteins with A) increased expression, or B) decreased expression relative to control treatment is shown.
Figure 4. Volcano plots based on post-imputation relative abundance of all identified proteins comparing A) Control versus PLA, B) Control versus HDPE and C) PLA versus HDPE. Each
symbol represents a specific protein with those above the red line being considered statistically significant (p-value <0.05 based on post-hoc tests after ANOVA) and those to the right and left of the vertical lines indicate relative fold changes of ≥ 2.

Supporting Information

Table S1: 216 proteins identified with high confidence in the haemolymph of control and HDPE- and PLA-exposed *M. edulis*. Normalised label free quantitative (LFQ) intensities were determined for four biological replicates for each group and log2 transformed. Missing LFQ values were replaced through imputation. PEP, peptide error probability; MS/MS, number of second mass spectra determined for each peptide. Additional protein annotations were obtained by BLAST2Go analysis.