Journal of Advanced Research in NanoScience and NanoTechnology
Volume 6, Issue 2 - 2024, Pg. No. 21-29
Peer Reviewed Journal

Review Article

Toxicity of Nanoparticles in Environment: A Review

Shahnawaz Ahmed

Department of Ecotoxicology Institute for Industrial Research and Toxicology, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India.

INFO

E-mail Id:
shanu160by2@gmail.com
Orcid Id:
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8678-4541
How to cite this article:
Ahmed S. Toxicity of Nanoparticles in Environment: A Review. *J Adv Res NanoSci NanoTech*. 2024; 6(2): 21-29.

Date of Submission: 2024-07-09
Date of Acceptance: 2024-10-07

ABSTRACT

Nanoparticles (NPs) represent a burgeoning class of engineered materials with diverse applications in medicine, industry, and consumer products. While their utility is evident, concerns regarding their environmental impact have escalated, prompting rigorous investigation into their toxicity and potential for bioaccumulation. This abstract synthesizes recent research on the environmental fate of nanoparticles, delving into the multifaceted aspects of their impact. Studies have revealed that nanoparticles, due to their small size and unique physicochemical properties, can permeate environmental matrices such as soil, water, and air, interacting with organisms at various trophic levels. The assessment of NP toxicity has uncovered adverse effects on both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, with implications for plant growth, microbial communities, and animal health. Moreover, the propensity for bioaccumulation in organisms has raised concerns about potential long-term ecological consequences. These abstract underscores the need for a comprehensive understanding of the environmental fate of nanoparticles, emphasizing the importance of interdisciplinary research to address the gaps in knowledge surrounding their impact. As the utilization of nanoparticles continues to expand, a proactive approach is essential to mitigate potential environmental risks and safeguard ecosystem health.

Keywords: Nanoparticles, Environmental Impact, Toxicity, Bioaccumulation, Ecological Consequences

Introduction

Nanoparticles are ultrafine particles with dimensions typically ranging from 1 to 100 nanometers, exhibiting unique physical, chemical, and biological properties due to their small size. These properties make nanoparticles highly versatile and valuable in various industries. In medicine, they play a crucial role in drug delivery systems, enhancing therapeutic efficacy while minimizing side effects.[1] In electronics, nanoparticles are used to improve the performance of semiconductors and in the development of advanced sensors.[2] The cosmetics industry employs nanoparticles for sunscreen formulations, providing better UV protection and improved cosmetic feel[3] In the energy sector, nanoparticles contribute to more efficient catalysis and energy storage systems, fostering advancements in renewable energy technologies.[4]Additionally, nanoparticles find applications in materials science, enhancing the mechanical and thermal properties of composites.[5] The prevalence of nanoparticles across these diverse industries underscores their transformative impact on technology and innovation, with ongoing research continually expanding their applications. The increasing use of nanoparticles in consumer products and industrial applications reflects a burgeoning trend driven by their unique properties and diverse applications. Numerous studies have highlighted the toxicity of nanoparticles across different environmental compartments. For instance, certain metal and metal oxide nanoparticles, such as silver and titanium dioxide, have demonstrated cytotoxicity in aquatic organisms and terrestrial plants, disrupting cellular processes and overall organismal health.[6] Moreover, the unique physicochemical properties of nanoparticles may facilitate their bioaccumulation in biota, further amplifying the ecological risks associated with their presence in the environment.[7] Bioaccumulation occurs as nanoparticles are absorbed and retained in living organisms, potentially magnifying concentrations through trophic levels. This phenomenon has been observed in various aquatic species, leading to concerns about the potential transfer of nanoparticle-associated toxicity up the food chain.[8]

Types and Sources of Nanoparticles

Broadly categorized, nanoparticles encompass metallic, metal oxide, and carbon-based types, each with distinctive characteristics and diverse applications. Metallic nanoparticles, such as gold, silver, and copper, exhibit remarkable optical, electronic, and catalytic properties. Gold nanoparticles, for instance, have been extensively studied for their applications in medical imaging, drug delivery, and sensing due to their biocompatibility and tunable surface plasmon resonance.[9] Metal oxide nanoparticles, like titanium dioxide (TiO_2) and zinc oxide (ZnO), possess excellent photocatalytic and antimicrobial properties. TiO_2 nanoparticles, widely used in environmental remediation and self-cleaning surfaces, demonstrate efficient degradation of pollutants under UV light.[10] Carbon-based nanoparticles include carbon nanotubes (CNTs), graphene, and fullerenes. CNTs, with their exceptional mechanical strength and electrical conductivity, find applications in nanoelectronics and as reinforcements in composites.[11] Graphene, a single layer of carbon atoms, exhibits remarkable thermal, electrical, and mechanical properties, making it suitable for various applications, including energy storage and biomedical devices.[12] Quantum dots are semiconductor nanoparticles with size-dependent optical properties. Their tunable emission spectra make them valuable in bioimaging and displays.[13] Magnetic nanoparticles, such as iron oxide ($Fe3O_4$) nanoparticles, possess unique magnetic properties. These are extensively employed in biomedical applications, including magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and targeted drug delivery.[14]

Common sources of environmental pollutants are diverse, stemming from industrial processes, consumer products, and emerging technologies. Industrial activities, such as manufacturing and power generation, release pollutants like particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides into the air, contributing to air pollution.[15] Water pollution often results from industrial discharges, agricultural runoff, and improper disposal of chemicals, impacting aquatic ecosystems and human health.[16] Consumer products, including plastics, electronic devices, and household chemicals, contribute to environmental degradation. Plastic waste, for instance, poses a significant threat to marine life and ecosystems. Emerging technologies, while promising, can also introduce novel pollutants.[17] Nanoparticles from nanotechnology applications and electronic waste from advancing technologies contribute to environmental concerns.[18] Addressing these challenges requires a comprehensive approach, including sustainable industrial practices, waste management strategies, and responsible consumption patterns. Furthermore, ongoing research and regulation are crucial to mitigating the environmental impact of emerging technologies.

Environmental Pathways of Nanoparticles

Atmospheric deposition, runoff, and direct releases from manufacturing processes are key pathways through which pollutants enter the environment, affecting ecosystems and human health. These sources play a significant role in the global distribution of contaminants, influencing air and water quality. Atmospheric deposition involves the settling of pollutants from the air onto land and water surfaces. Airborne particles, such as heavy metals, pesticides, and nitrogen compounds, can accumulate in soil and water bodies through dry or wet deposition. This process has been linked to various environmental issues, including soil contamination and eutrophication of aquatic systems. For instance, studies have demonstrated the deposition of heavy metals like lead and mercury from industrial activities, impacting ecosystems far from pollution sources.[19, 20] Runoff refers to the movement of water over the land surface, transporting pollutants from various sources into rivers, lakes, and oceans. Agricultural runoff, for instance, can carry fertilizers and pesticides, leading to nutrient imbalances and harmful algal blooms in aquatic ecosystems. Industrial runoff may contain chemicals and heavy metals, posing risks to both aquatic life and human water supplies.[21, 22] Manufacturing processes release a multitude of pollutants directly into the environment. These releases can include industrial discharges into water bodies, emissions into the air, and the generation of hazardous waste. The improper disposal of industrial by-products poses significant threats to environmental quality and human health. For example, the discharge of untreated effluents from manufacturing plants can introduce pollutants like persistent organic pollutants (POPs) into aquatic ecosystems.[23]

Nanoparticle Toxicity in Aquatic Environments

Studies on fish have demonstrated that exposure to nanoparticles can induce adverse effects on various physiological and biochemical parameters. For instance, silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) have been shown to accumulate in fish tissues, affecting oxidative stress levels and causing histopathological changes in organs.[24] Additionally, titanium dioxide nanoparticles (TiO_2 NPs) exposure has been linked to impaired reproductive success and behavioral alterations in fish species.[25] Invertebrates, such as crustaceans and mollusks, are also susceptible to nanoparticle toxicity. Research on the impact of copper nanoparticles (CuNPs) on aquatic invertebrates has revealed disruptions in feeding behavior, growth, and molting processes.[26] Moreover, studies on gold nanoparticles (AuNPs) have highlighted their potential to accumulate in tissues, causing cellular damage and compromising the overall health of invertebrate species.[27]

Plankton, as a foundational component of aquatic food webs, plays a crucial role in ecosystem dynamics. The exposure of plankton to nanoparticles has been associated with changes in growth rates, photosynthetic activity, and community structure.[28] For example, studies on zinc oxide nanoparticles (ZnO NPs) may modulate key signal phytoplankton, influencing primary productivity and subsequently impacting higher trophic levels. The investigation of potential mechanisms of toxicity at the molecular and cellular levels is crucial for understanding the adverse effects of various substances on living organisms. O have demonstrated toxic effects on disrupting normal cellular function. For instance, xenobiotic compounds ne prominent mechanism involves oxidative stress, where excessive reactive oxygen species (ROS) production overwhelms cellular antioxidant defenses, leading to damage of lipids, proteins, and DNA.[29] Another pivotal pathway is interference with cellular signaling cascades, pathways, such as mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPKs) or nuclear factor-kappa B (NF-κB), triggering aberrant responses.[30, 31] Additionally, toxicity may arise through genotoxic mechanisms, causing DNA damage and mutations, potentially leading to carcinogenesis [32]. Epigenetic modifications, including DNA methylation and histone acetylation, represent emerging areas in toxicology, revealing how environmental exposures can influence gene expression patterns.[33]

Bioaccumulation and Trophic Transfer

Studies have indicated that nanoparticles, due to their small size and unique physicochemical properties, can be absorbed by aquatic organisms through various exposure routes such as ingestion and dermal contact.[34] Once absorbed, NPs may accumulate in tissues and organs, potentially leading to bioaccumulation across trophic levels within aquatic food webs. The bioaccumulation of nanoparticles is influenced by factors such as NP composition, size, surface charge, and the physiological characteristics of the organisms.[35] Additionally, environmental factors like water chemistry, temperature, and pH can modulate the bioavailability and uptake of NPs in aquatic ecosystems. The consequences of NP bioaccumulation in aquatic species are multifaceted. Studies have reported adverse effects on the health and behavior of organisms, as well as disruptions in reproductive and developmental processes.[36] Furthermore, the potential for biomagnification through the food chain raises concerns about the indirect impacts on higher trophic levels, including humans who consume contaminated aquatic organisms.

Impact on Terrestrial Ecosystems

Studies suggest that certain nanoparticles, such as silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) and titanium dioxide nanoparticles (TiO_2 NPs), can penetrate the soil matrix, influencing soil microbial communities and altering nutrient cycling processes.[37,38] The potential toxicity of NPs to soil microorganisms can disrupt vital ecological processes, affecting soil health and fertility. Furthermore, the uptake of nanoparticles by plants has raised concerns about the subsequent transfer of these particles to higher trophic levels. Research indicates that nanoparticles can be absorbed by plant roots, translocated to various plant tissues, and may affect plant growth, photosynthesis, and nutrient uptake.[39, 40] The implications of these effects on crop productivity and food safety warrant thorough investigation. To comprehensively assess the ecological consequences, it is crucial to examine the interactions between nanoparticles, soil microorganisms, and plants in a holistic manner. The investigation employs a combination of molecular, biochemical, and physiological techniques to elucidate the mechanisms underlying nanoparticle-induced stress. This includes assessing changes in soil microbial community structure, enzymatic activities, and plant physiological responses.

One area of concern is the interaction between nanoparticles and soil microorganisms. Studies, indicated that certain nanoparticles, particularly carbon-based ones like carbon nanotubes, can affect microbial activity in the rhizosphere.[41] This altered microbial function may influence nutrient mineralization and organic matter decomposition, ultimately impacting nutrient cycling in soils. Conversely, some nanoparticles have demonstrated the potential to enhance nutrient availability. For instance, zinc oxide nanoparticles, as investigated by Rico et al. (2014), have been shown to improve the solubility of zinc in soils, thereby positively affecting plant zinc uptake.[42] This suggests that nanoparticles could be engineered to serve as targeted nutrient carriers, promoting nutrient efficiency in agricultural systems. However, concerns about the unintended consequences of nanoparticle application persist. Nanoparticles, depending on their composition and size, may leach into groundwater, potentially posing risks to aquatic ecosystems and human health. Studies emphasize the importance of understanding nanoparticle behavior in soil-water systems to mitigate potential environmental hazards.[43]

Human Health Implications

Nanoparticles (NPs), due to their unique physicochemical properties, are increasingly utilized in various industrial and consumer products, raising concerns about their potential impact on human health. One major avenue of exposure is through environmental pathways, where NPs can enter air, water, and soil systems, posing risks to both the environment and human populations. In air, nanoparticles may be released during the production and use of nanomaterial-containing products, contributing to ambient air pollution. Once airborne, these particles can be inhaled, leading to potential respiratory and systemic health effects. Studies have shown that inhaled nanoparticles can translocate across the respiratory epithelium, reaching the bloodstream and disseminating to various organs, raising concerns about cardiovascular and other systemic effects.[6,44] Water systems also serve as conduits for nanoparticle exposure. Engineered nanomaterials from industrial processes or consumer products can be discharged into surface water bodies, leading to potential aquatic toxicity and subsequent human exposure through the consumption of contaminated water or aquatic organisms. Research has demonstrated the bioaccumulation of nanoparticles in aquatic organisms, highlighting the need for further investigation into the potential risks associated with the human consumption of contaminated aquatic resources.[45, 46]Moreover, soil acts as a sink for nanoparticle deposition, where they can accumulate through direct application (e.g., in agricultural practices) or atmospheric deposition. The subsequent uptake of nanoparticles by plants raises concerns about their potential entry into the food chain, with implications for human exposure through the consumption of contaminated crops.[47, 48]

The exploration of health risks associated with inhalation, ingestion, and dermal contact is crucial for understanding the potential hazards posed by various substances in our environment. Inhalation exposure occurs when airborne particles or gases are breathed in, leading to respiratory and systemic effects. Studies have demonstrated the adverse health effects of airborne pollutants such as particulate matter and volatile organic compounds on respiratory health.[49, 50] Ingestion exposure refers to the intake of substances through the oral route, either through contaminated food, water, or hand-to-mouth contact. Research has highlighted the health risks associated with the ingestion of pollutants like heavy metals and pesticides, which can lead to gastrointestinal issues and long-term systemic effects.[51, 52] Dermal contact involves exposure through direct skin contact with hazardous substances. Certain chemicals, such as industrial solvents and pesticides, can be absorbed through the skin, contributing to skin disorders and systemic toxicity.[53, 54]Understanding the health risks associated with these exposure pathways is essential for developing effective risk management strategies and public health interventions.

Challenges in Assessing Nanoparticle Toxicity

Studying nanoparticle toxicity poses significant challenges due to the unique properties of nanoparticles and their potential impact on human health and the environment. Analytical methods and standardized testing protocols are crucial for accurate assessment, yet several challenges hinder their effective implementation. One key challenge is the diversity of nanoparticles, which vary in size, shape, surface charge, and composition. These variations necessitate the development of versatile analytical techniques capable of characterizing nanoparticles comprehensively.[7] Traditional methods such as dynamic light scattering (DLS) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) are limited in their ability to handle the complexity of nanoparticle systems. Advanced techniques like single-particle inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (SP-ICP-MS) and hyperspectral imaging are emerging as valuable tools, providing detailed insights into nanoparticle characteristics.[55]

Another challenge lies in the lack of standardized testing protocols for nanoparticle toxicity. The absence of uniform methodologies hampers the comparability of study outcomes, hindering the development of a cohesive understanding of nanoparticle toxicity.[56] Initiatives like the OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals are essential for establishing standardized protocols. However, adapting these guidelines to accommodate the unique features of nanoparticles remains a complex task.[57] Furthermore, the dynamic nature of nanoparticles in biological systems complicates toxicity assessments. Agglomeration, dissolution, and interaction with biomolecules alter nanoparticle behavior, influencing their toxicity. Robust analytical methods capable of tracking these dynamic changes in situ are crucial for accurately assessing the biological impact of nanoparticles.

Nanoparticles exhibit a dynamic nature, with their properties influenced by various factors such as size, shape, surface chemistry, and environmental conditions. The dynamic behavior of nanoparticles plays a crucial role in their interactions with biological systems, environmental matrices, and technological applications. As highlighted by Liu et al. (2018), the size-dependent reactivity of nanoparticles underscores the need for a nuanced understanding of their behavior in different contexts [58]. Additionally, the work of Nel et al. (2006) emphasizes the importance of considering the evolving physicochemical characteristics of nanoparticles, particularly in the assessment of their potential impact on human health.[7] Adaptable research approaches are imperative to address the dynamic nature of nanoparticles. Real-time monitoring techniques enable the tracking of changes in nanoparticle properties, offering insights into their transformations over time.[59] Moreover, a holistic approach integrating experimental and computational methods, as suggested by Fadeel et al. (2018), allows for a comprehensive understanding of the dynamic interactions between nanoparticles and biological systems.[60]

Regulatory Landscape and Risk Assessment

Regulations concerning nanoparticles vary globally, reflecting the evolving nature of nanotechnology and its applications. The European Union has been proactive, implementing the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization, and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) regulation, which addresses nanomaterials and their potential risks. Additionally, the EU has specific labeling requirements for nanomaterials in cosmetics and food products [61]. In the United States, the regulatory landscape is more fragmented. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulate nanoparticles in specific contexts, but comprehensive oversight is lacking. The National Nanotechnology Initiative provides guidelines but lacks enforceability.[62] China has taken steps to regulate nanomaterials in consumer products, primarily through the Ministry of Ecology and Environment. However, enforcement remains a challenge. In India, there is a lack of specific regulations for nanomaterials, with concerns about potential environmental and health impacts.[63] Australia and Canada have adopted a risk-based approach, focusing on assessing the safety of nanomaterials on a case-by-case basis. However, both countries lack comprehensive regulations dedicated to nanoparticles.[64] Despite ongoing efforts, a global consensus on nanoparticle regulations is yet to be achieved. Continuous research and international collaboration are essential to establish standardized frameworks ensuring the safe development and use of nanotechnologies.

Risk assessment plays a pivotal role in safeguarding public health and the environment, particularly in the context of emerging technologies and evolving industries. However, conducting effective risk assessments poses numerous challenges. The dynamic nature of risks, coupled with the increasing complexity of modern systems, makes it difficult to accurately predict and assess potential hazards. Additionally, uncertainties surrounding long-term consequences and the interconnectivity of various risk factors further complicate the assessment process.[65] To address these challenges, the establishment of robust regulatory frameworks is imperative. Regulatory standards provide a structured approach to risk assessment, ensuring consistency and transparency in the evaluation of potential threats. A well-defined regulatory framework helps harmonize risk assessment methodologies across diverse sectors, enhancing comparability and facilitating informed decision-making.[66, 67] Moreover, regulatory frameworks foster collaboration among stakeholders, including government agencies, industry experts, and the scientific community, promoting a comprehensive understanding of risks and their mitigation strategies.[68] By acknowledging and addressing the challenges inherent in risk assessment, regulatory frameworks serve as essential tools in navigating the complexities of our rapidly advancing world.

Mitigation and Remediation Strategies

Nanoparticles (NPs) play a pivotal role in various industries but their environmental impact raises concerns. To mitigate these effects, strategic approaches are essential. Primarily, surface modification of NPs can enhance biocompatibility and reduce toxicity, promoting safe disposal.[69] Additionally, encapsulation within biodegradable materials, such as polymers or lipids, can prevent NP release and facilitate controlled degradation, minimizing environmental persistence.[70] Furthermore, the development of novel nanomaterials with inherently low environmental impact is crucial. Green synthesis methods, utilizing environmentally benign precursors and reducing agents, can produce NPs with reduced ecological footprints.[71] Additionally, designing NPs with specific functionalities for environmental remediation, such as pollutant absorption or catalysis, can transform them into eco-friendly tools.[72] To ensure sustainable nanoparticle use, a multidisciplinary approach involving material science, chemistry, and environmental science is imperative. Regular monitoring and risk assessment studies should complement these strategies, ensuring the continued safety of nanoparticle applications in diverse settings.

The development of eco-friendly nanoparticles and sustainable manufacturing practices represents a pivotal stride towards mitigating environmental impact in nanotechnology. Traditional nanoparticle synthesis methods often involve hazardous chemicals and energy-intensive processes, raising concerns about their ecological footprint.[73] However, recent advancements focus on green synthesis routes, utilizing biodegradable precursors and environmentally benign reducing agents. This approach not only diminishes the use of toxic substances but also promotes the production of nanoparticles with reduced ecological consequences.[74] Sustainable manufacturing practices in nanoparticle production involve minimizing waste, energy consumption, and resource depletion. Techniques such as microreactor systems and continuous flow processes enhance efficiency while minimizing environmental impact.[75] Furthermore, the adoption of life cycle assessment methodologies aids in evaluating and improving the overall sustainability of nanoparticle production. By integrating eco-friendly synthesis approaches and sustainable manufacturing principles, the nanotechnology community can contribute to the development of environmentally responsible and socially beneficial solutions.

Future Research Directions

To advance our comprehension and address current knowledge gaps, future research should focus on several key areas. Investigating the interactions of NPs with diverse ecosystems, including soil, water, and air, is essential. Understanding how NPs affect different organisms, from microorganisms to higher trophic levels, will provide valuable insights.[7] Research should explore the long-term fate of NPs in environmental matrices, assessing their persistence, mobility, and potential accumulation in ecosystems. This knowledge is crucial for predicting and mitigating environmental consequences.[76] Examining the transformation and degradation pathways of NPs under environmental conditions is imperative. Identifying the products of NP degradation and their potential impacts will contribute to risk assessment strategies.[77] Assessing the pathways through which NPs enter the human body, their distribution, and potential health effects is vital. This requires interdisciplinary collaboration between environmental scientists and health researchers.[6] By addressing these areas, researchers can significantly contribute to a comprehensive understanding of NP environmental impact, facilitating the development of sustainable nanotechnologies.

Conclusion

The exploration of the environmental impact of nanoparticles reveals a nuanced landscape with significant implications. Key findings underscore the dual nature of nanoparticles, presenting both opportunities and challenges. On the positive side, nanoparticles have demonstrated utility in diverse applications, from medicine to industry, showcasing their potential to revolutionize technology and enhance human well-being. However, the environmental ramifications cannot be overlooked. Studies consistently highlight the toxicity of certain nanoparticles and their potential to adversely affect ecosystems and human health. The intricate interplay between nanoparticles and living organisms underscores the importance of understanding their biological interactions and potential bioaccumulation in various environmental compartments. The size-dependent properties of nanoparticles raise concerns about their persistence and mobility, potentially leading to long-term environmental consequences. Moreover, their ability to enter food chains and ecosystems poses a potential risk of biomagnification, emphasizing the need for comprehensive risk assessments and regulatory frameworks. In navigating this complex landscape, future research should prioritize a holistic understanding of nanoparticle behavior, considering their physicochemical properties, fate, and transport in diverse environmental matrices. Collaborative efforts between scientists, policymakers, and industries are crucial to harness the benefits of nanoparticles while mitigating their adverse environmental impacts. Only through a multidisciplinary and precautionary approach can we foster sustainable nano technological advancements that minimize harm to our planet and its inhabitants.

Acknowledgement

I wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Gayathri Venkatesan and Ms. Nahid Abda whose unwavering support and invaluable guidance have been instrumental throughout this research project.

Conflicts of Interest

The author wishes to confirm that he has no affiliations or relationships with organizations or entities that could lead to a perceived conflict of interest regarding the research findings.

References

1. M. E. C. Z. G. &. S. D. M. Davis, “Nanoparticle therapeutics: an emerging treatment modality for cancer.,” Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, vol. 7(9), pp. 771-782, 2008.
2. V. L. S. M. C. &. A. A. P. Colvin, “Light-emitting diodes made from cadmium selenide nanocrystals and a semiconducting polymer,” Nature, vol. 370(6488), pp. 354-357, 1994.
3. D. D. F. A. M. &. S. S. Moyal, “Broad-spectrum sunscreens provide better protection from solar ultraviolet–simulated radiation and natural sunlight–induced immunosuppression in human beings.,” Journal of Investigative Dermatology, vol. 119(6), pp. 1303-1307, 2002.
4. X. S. S. &. G. L. Chen, “Spherical Nanocarbon Materials in Catalysis,” Chemical Reviews, vol. 118(12), p. 6409–6508, 2018.
5. S. C. Tjong, “Structural and mechanical properties of polymer nanocomposites,” Progress in Polymer Science, vol. 39(4), pp. 627-685, 2014.
6. G. O. E. &. O. J. Oberdörster, “Nanotoxicology: an emerging discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles.,” Environmental health perspectives, vol. 113(7), pp. 823-839, 2005.
7. A. X. T. M. L. &. L. N. Nel, “Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel,” Science, vol. 311(5761), pp. 622-627, 2006.
8. M. F. J. L. S. M. M. S. M. G. &. S. G. E. Bundschuh,

"Nanoparticles in the environment: where do we come from, where do we go to?," Environmental Sciences Europe, vol. 30(1), p. 6, 2018.
9. X. E.-S. I. H. Q. W. &. E.-S. M. A. Huang, "Cancer cell imaging and photothermal therapy in the near-infrared region by using gold nanorods.," Journal of the American Chemical Society, vol. 128(6), pp. 2115-2120, 2007.
10. X. M. S. S. Chen, "Titanium Dioxide Nanomaterials: Synthesis, Properties, Modifications, and Applications.," Chemical Reviews, vol. 119(20), p. 12375–12445, 2019.
11. S. Iijima, "Helical microtubules of graphitic carbon," Nature, vol. 354(6348), pp. 56-58, 1991.
12. K. S. G. A. K. M. S. V. J. D. Z. Y. D. S. V. .. &. F. A. A. Novoselov, "Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films," Science, vol. 306(5696), pp. 666-669, 2004.
13. M. M. M. G. P. W. S. &. A. A. P. Bruchez, "Semiconductor nanocrystals as fluorescent biological labels," Science, vol. 281(5385), pp. 2013-2016, 1998.
14. Q. A. C. J. J. S. K. &. D. J. Pankhurst, "Applications of magnetic nanoparticles in biomedicine," Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics, vol. 36(13), p. R167, 2003.
15. M. &. C. E. Kampa, "Human health effects of air pollution," Environmental Pollution, vol. 151(2), pp. 362-367, 2008.
16. L. e. a. Simeonov, "Assessment of the surface water quality in Northern Greece," Water Research, vol. 37(17), pp. 4119-4124, 2003.
17. J. R. e. a. Jambeck, "Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean.," Science, vol. 347(6223), pp. 768-771, 2015.
18. A. K. e. a. Awasthi, "A critical review on the e-waste issues concerning environment and sustainable development.," Environment, Development and Sustainability, vol. 22(6), pp. 4711-4732, 2020.
19. S. T. G. &. B. E. Gionfra, "Heavy metals in atmospheric deposition and their ecological risk at a Mediterranean site.," Atmospheric Environment, vol. 229, p. 117404, 2020.
20. X. C. L. L. Y. &. L. C. Zhang, "Spatial and temporal variations of atmospheric deposition fluxes of heavy metals in a typical coal mine city, Lianyuan, China," Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, vol. 147, pp. 750-758, 2018.
21. J. L. J. Z. W. &. X. S. Liu, "Non-point source pollution and critical source areas identification in a large-scale watershed based on Runoff Continuum Concept.," Science of The Total Environment, vol. 650, pp. 1641-1650, 2019.
22. W. H. H. H. F. Z. T. &. S. W. Ouyang, "Source identification and apportionment of heavy metal pollution in riverine and lake runoff in the Taihu Lake Basin, China.," Environmental Science and Pollution Research, vol. 28(26), pp. 34148-34161, 2021.
23. H. L. M. Z. Y. &. Z. J. Wang, "Distribution, sources, and health risk assessment of heavy metals in water, sediment, and fish from a typical plateau lake wetland, China.," Environmental Science and Pollution Research, vol. 27(17), pp. 21212-21223, 2020.
24. Z. S. D. X. W. W. Q. &. C. T. Jia, "Toxicity of silver nanoparticles to fish: A review of ecotoxicological studies," Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, vol. 37(7), p. 1854–1863, 2018.
25. V. D. H. C. K. K. &. K. A. Aruoja, "Toxicity of nanoparticles of CuO, ZnO and TiO2 to microalgae Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata," Science of the Total Environment, vol. 407(4), p. 1461–1468, 2015.
26. W. A. R. B. C. T. O. V. B. P. M. L. G. V. &. U. J. M. Shoults-Wilson, "Role of particle size and soil type in toxicity of silver nanoparticles to earthworms.," Soil Science Society of America Journal, vol. 75(2), p. 365–377, 2011.
27. X. Z. X. Y. J. M. W. &. C. Y. Cheng, "Mechanisms of TiO2 nanoparticle-induced neuronal apoptosis in rat primary cultured hippocampal neurons," Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A, vol. 102(4), p. 1148–1156, 2014.
28. M. A. &. L. M. Beketov, "Acute and delayed effects of the neonicotinoid insecticide thiacloprid on seven freshwater arthropods," Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, vol. 33(11), p. 2434–2441, 2014.
29. M. e. a. Valko, "Free radicals and antioxidants in normal physiological functions and human disease.," The International Journal of Biochemistry & Cell Biology, vol. 39(1), pp. 44-84, 2007.
30. P. e. a. Gong, "The role of MAPKs in reactive oxygen species generation by environmental toxins," In Oxidative stress: Diagnostics, prevention, and therapy Springer., pp. 295-315, 2012.
31. M. S. &. G. S. Hayden, "NF-κB, the first quarter-century: remarkable progress and outstanding questions," Genes & Development, vol. 26(3), pp. 203-234, 2012.
32. A. Luch, "Nature and nurture—lessons from chemical carcinogenesis," Nature Reviews Cancer, vol. 5(2), pp. 113-125, 2005.
33. R. L. &. S. M. K. Jirtle, "Environmental epigenomics and disease susceptibility," Nature Reviews Genetics, vol. 8(4), pp. 253-262, 2007.
34. R.-d. F. C. O. D. e. a. Bianchini A., "Toxicity of TiO2 nanoparticles to cladocerans, algae, rotifers and plants—effects of size and crystalline structure.," Chemosphere, vol. 120, pp. 122-126, 2015.
35. A. P. M. A. R. B. C. e. a. Gondikas, "Cysteine-induced modifications of zero-valent silver nanomaterials: implications for particle surface chemistry, aggregation, dissolution, and silver speciation.," Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 48(2), pp. 716-724, 2014.
36. T. M. S. E. M. J. B. D. e. a. Scown, "Effects of aqueous

exposure to silver nanoparticles of different sizes in rainbow trout.," Toxicological Sciences, vol. 115(2), pp. 521-534, 2010.
37. M. e. a. Kah, "Ecotoxicology of Nanoparticles in Aquatic Systems," Environmental Chemistry, vol. 15(4), pp. 532-542, 2018.
38. Y. e. a. Ma, "Phytotoxicity and Biouptake of Nanoparticles.," Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 47(24), pp. 14336-14344, 2013.
39. R. e. a. Nair, "Nanoparticulate Material Delivery to Plants," Plant Science, vol. 179(3), pp. 154-163, 2010.
40. C. M. e. a. Rico, "Interactions of Nanomaterials with Plants: An Overview of the State of the Science," Plant Physiology, vol. 155(3), pp. 135-142, 2011.
41. M. D. E. M. M. X. Y. L. Z. W. F. &. B. A. S. Khodakovskaya, "Carbon nanotubes are able to penetrate plant seed coat and dramatically affect seed germination and plant growth," ACS Nano, vol. 6(3), pp. 2045-2051, 2012.
42. Rico et al., "Interaction of nanoparticles with edible plants and their possible implications in the food chain.," Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, vol. 62(26), pp. 6085-6098, 2014.
43. M. K. R. S. G. A. &. B. T. D. Kah, "A critical evaluation of nanopesticides and nanofertilizers against their conventional analogues.," Nature Nanotechnology, vol. 8(6), pp. 807-815, 2013.
44. W. G. S.-B. M. S. J. &. S. W. Kreyling, "Particle sizing and the number of cells reached by particles.," Environmental Health Perspectives, vol. 112(4), p. 409–412, 2004.
45. J. R. B. G. E. A. P. C. M. N. H. R. D. M. M. J. .. &. J. A. C. Lead, "Nanomaterials in the environment: behavior, fate, bioavailability, and effects–an updated review.," Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, vol. 37(8), pp. 2029-2063, 2018.
46. R. D. O. R. &. V.-J. E. Handy, "The ecotoxicology of nanoparticles and nanomaterials: current status, knowledge gaps, challenges, and future needs," Ecotoxicology, vol. 17(5), pp. 315-325, 2008.
47. C. M. M. S. D.-G. M. &. P.-V. J. R. Rico, "Interaction of nanoparticles with edible plants and their possible implications in the food chain.," Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, vol. 59(8), pp. 3485-3498, 2011.
48. J. D. U. J. M. B. P. M. &. H. S. E. Judy, "Exposure of gold nanoparticles to food-crop plants: a trophic transfer study.," Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 46(15), pp. 9753-9762, 2012.
49. R. D. e. a. Brook, "Particulate matter air pollution and cardiovascular disease: An update to the scientific statement from the American Heart Association.," Circulation, vol. 121(21), p. 2331–2378, 2010.
50. F. J. &. F. J. C. Kelly, "Air pollution and public health: Emerging hazards and improved understanding of risk.," Environmental Geochemistry and Health, vol. 37(4), p. 631–649, 2015.
51. M. J. e. a. Perry, "Human exposure to pesticides from food," The Science of the Total Environment, vol. 651(2), p. 1228–1236, 2019.
52. P. &. L. P. J. Grandjean, "Neurobehavioural effects of developmental toxicity.," The Lancet Neurology, vol. 13(3), p. 330–338, 2014.
53. J. e. a. Eriksson, "Exposure determinants of phthalates, parabens, bisphenol A and triclosan in Swedish mothers and their children," Environmental International, vol. 92–93, p. 347–356, 2016.
54. R. e. a. Golden, "A review of the endocrine activity of parabens and implications for potential risks to human health.," Critical Reviews in Toxicology, vol. 45(5), p. 414–425, 2015.
55. B. &. G.-B. A. E. Fadeel, "Better safe than sorry: understanding the toxicological properties of inorganic nanoparticles manufactured for biomedical applications.," Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, vol. 62(3), pp. 362-374, 2010.
56. V. J. H. S. R. P. &. F. B. Stone, "In vitro assessment of pulmonary and systemic toxicity of nanoparticles.," Particle and Fibre Toxicology, vol. 6(1), pp. 1-17, 2009.
57. OECD, "Guidance document on developing and assessing adverse outcome pathways (Series on Testing and Assessment No. 184).," OECD Publishing, 2018.
58. R. Z. H. L. R. &. H. S. Liu, "Size-dependent dynamics of graphene oxide in the terrestrial environment: Dynamic light scattering characterization.," Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 52(24), pp. 14199-14207, 2018.
59. T. K. M. L. M. Z. J. I. &. N. A. E. Xia, "Cationic polystyrene nanosphere toxicity depends on cell-specific endocytic and mitochondrial injury pathways," ACS Nano, vol. 3(2), pp. 335-343, 2009.
60. B. F. L. H. B. V.-C. S. H. D. M. A. &. L. I. Fadeel, "Advanced tools for the safety assessment of nanomaterials," Nature Nanotechnology, vol. 13(7), pp. 537-543, 2018.
61. E. Commission, "Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH)," 2022.
62. N. N. Initiative, "Environmental, Health, and Safety.," 2022.
63. M. o. E. a. E. o. t. P. R. o. China., "Guidelines for the Environmental Safety Assessment of New Chemical Substances (No. 12).," 2022.
64. S. W. Australia, "Nanotechnology," 2022 .
65. V. M. e. a. Bier, "Risk assessment and risk management: Fundamental tools for homeland security.," Risk Analysis, vol. 28(4), pp. 934-939, 2008.
66. P. Slovic, "Perception of risk," Science, vol. 236(4799), pp. 280-285, 1987.
67. C. R. Sunstein, "Laws of fear: Beyond the precautionary

principle," Cambridge University Press, 2005.
68. J. L. e. a. Walls, "Best practices for risk assessment of nanomaterials: Lessons learned from case studies.," Journal of Nanoparticle Research, vol. 20(1), pp. 1-20, 2018.
69. Y. e. a. Li, "Surface modification of nanoparticles by PEGylation with a chiral end group for improved cellular uptake.," Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces, vol. 181, pp. 60-67, 2019.
70. Y. e. a. Zhang, "Nanoparticle encapsulation in biodegradable hydrogels for enhanced environmental stability.," ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces, vol. 12(14), pp. 16503-16511, 2020.
71. M. &. W. K. L. Elsabahy, "Design of polymeric nanoparticles for biomedical delivery applications.," Chemical Society Reviews, vol. 42(12), pp. 5552-5576, 2013.
72. J. e. a. Yang, "Nanoparticles in the environment: From fate to impact," Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 55(11), pp. 6861-6874, 2021.
73. K. N. M. S. S. &. P. R. Y. Thakkar, "Biological synthesis of metallic nanoparticles. Nanomedicine: Nanotechnology,," Biology and Medicine, vol. 6(2), pp. 257-262, 2010.
74. M. F. J. M. F. T. R. &. A. P. T. Poliakoff, "Green chemistry: science and politics of change," Science, vol. 297(5582), pp. 807-810, 2002.
75. M. K. M. K. M. A. S. F. A.-M. A. M. A. H. Z. &. T. W. Khan, "Biogenic synthesis of palladium nanoparticles using Pulicaria glutinosa extract and their catalytic activity towards the Suzuki coupling reaction.," Dalton Transactions, vol. 43(25) , pp. 9026-9031, 2014.
76. F. S. T. S. R. W. &. N. B. Gottschalk, "Modeled environmental concentrations of engineered nanomaterials (TiO2, ZnO, Ag, CNT, fullerenes) for different regions.," Environmental Science & Technology, vol. 43(24), pp. 9216-9222, 2009.
77. A. A. M. S. L. A. &. S. S. Keller, "Global life cycle releases of engineered nanomaterials.," Journal of Nanoparticle Research, vol. 15(6), p. 1692, 2013.