

From Riverbank to the Sea: an initial assessment of plastic pollution along the Ciliwung River, Indonesia

Muhammad Reza Cordova^{1*}, Max R. Kelly², Muhammad Hafizt¹, Singgih Prasetyo Adi Wibowo¹, Yaya Ihya Ulumuddin¹, Triyoni Purbonegoro¹, Deny Yogaswara¹, Muhammad Taufik Kaisupy¹, Riyana Subandi¹, Sofia Yuniar Sani¹, Richard C. Thompson², Susan Jobling^{3,4}

¹ Research Center for Oceanography, National Research and Innovation Agency Republic of Indonesia, BRIN Kawasan Jakarta Ancol Jl. Pasir Putih 1, Ancol, 14430 Jakarta, Indonesia

² School of Biological and Marine Sciences, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, PL4 8AA, United Kingdom

³ Environmental Sciences, Brunel University London, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

⁴ Partnership for Plastics in Indonesian Societies (PISCES) Brunel University London, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

* Corresponding authors: muhammad.reza.cordova@brin.go.id

Highlights

- Macro litter on riverbanks remains largely understudied in Global South.
- Litter is more abundant upstream than downstream.
- Riverbank litter observed was up to 30 times greater than global research.
- Macro litter accumulates in regions with limited waste management practices.
- 4.95-18.82 tons of litter could be carried from the Ciliwung Riverbank into the sea.

Abstract

This study presents the first comprehensive analysis of anthropogenic debris on the riverbanks of the Ciliwung River, covering upstream to downstream areas. The mean of debris found in each measurement was 32.79 ± 15.38 items/m² with a weight of 106.00 ± 50.23 g/m². Plastic debris accounted for over 50% of all litter items identified and represents 55% by weight, signifying a significantly high prevalence compared to global studies examining litter along riverbanks. The majority of the plastics found originated from Single-use applications and were predominantly made from Styrofoam. This investigation demonstrated the importance of actions to reduce single use applications and to improve waste management strategies. This can be achieved through proactive initiatives coupled with adaptable approaches, such as implementing effective urban planning and enhancing waste collection capacity.

Keywords: riverine, anthropogenic debris, plastic litter, Single-use plastic, Ciliwung River, Indonesia

Introduction

Plastic pollution caused by human activities is widespread in the natural environment and results in significant economic and ecological consequences. These consequences include negative impacts on tourism due to aesthetic degradation, as well as harm to ecosystems through ingestion or entanglement of wildlife (Lau et al., 2020). Anthropogenic debris refers to solid waste materials that are intentionally or unintentionally disposed of improperly, which leads to environmental pollution (Palmas et al., 2022). One of the most significant challenges caused by human-made debris stems from the adverse ecological impacts linked to plastics (Cordova et al., 2022a; Iskandar et al., 2022). Plastics, which are among the predominant forms of human-made debris, present a critical danger to rivers and oceans due to their long-lasting nature and resistance against natural deterioration (Baudena et al., 2022). The improper management of municipal solid waste leads to the introduction of anthropogenic debris into the natural environment (Lebreton and Andrady, 2019; Nurhasanah et al., 2021). The prevalence of plastic pollution can range from 13 to 25 million metric tons per year in terrestrial ecosystems and from 9 to 23 million metric tons per year in aquatic and marine ecosystems (Borrelle et al., 2020; Lau et al., 2020). Numerous authors argue that plastic pollution significantly threatens our planetary boundaries (Borrelle et al., 2020; Jambeck et al., 2015; Omeyer et al., 2023, 2022). The presence of larger plastics in rivers contributes significantly to the accumulation of microplastics (plastic size <0.5 cm) in these environments (Fan et al., 2019). Ultraviolet light and mechanical forces can break down larger-sized plastics, leading to their transformation into smaller particles (O’Brine and Thompson, 2010; Song et al., 2017). However, there still needs to be more comprehensive knowledge regarding larger plastics’ origins, destinations, and transport mechanisms within river systems despite their evident detrimental effects on the surrounding ecosystems (Andrady, 2017; De-la-Torre et al., 2021; Gardon et al., 2018).

Incipiently, the predominant focus has been on anthropogenic debris, specifically plastic litter, in marine ecosystems (Blettler et al., 2018). Rivers have increasingly been acknowledged as significant contributors of macroplastic (size >2.5 cm, (GESAMP, 2019)) debris to the oceans, with estimates suggesting that riverine inputs to the global ocean range from 800 thousand to 2.7 million metric tons (Meijer et al., 2021; van Emmerik et al., 2018). Nevertheless, recent research indicates that a considerable portion of macroplastic pollution remains within rivers for extended periods (Honingh, 2018; Tramoy et al., 2021). This prolonged presence of anthropogenic debris within river systems, including along riverbanks, exacerbates the detrimental impact of plastic litter on these environments.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of anthropogenic pollution in river ecosystems, it is essential to closely monitor and analyze its distribution patterns and accumulation zones

(González-Fernández et al., 2018). Accurate and consistent observations of anthropogenic debris provide valuable insights for policymakers and facilitate the development of effective mitigation strategies (Cordova and Nurhati, 2019; Miller et al., 2021; Owens and Kamil, 2020). While studies have primarily focused on floating anthropogenic debris, there remains a need to quantify the presence of such litter in other regions within rivers (Dobler et al., 2022; González-Fernández et al., 2018; Iskandar et al., 2021; Kiessling et al., 2019; Seo and Park, 2020). Furthermore, standardized methodologies for monitoring litter are necessary to ensure harmonization across different research efforts.

The collection of data on anthropogenic debris along riverbanks is a crucial step in developing effective strategies to mitigate marine plastic pollution (Battulga et al., 2019; Kiessling et al., 2019). While there have been documented efforts in scientific literature, there remains a significant amount of unreported information regarding the identification of riverbank debris in Asia, including in Indonesia (Owens and Kamil, 2020). Research on anthropogenic debris has predominantly focused on European rivers, such as the Adour River and Seine riverbank in France, the Elbe-Weser triangle rivers in Germany, 8 rivers in Central Italy, and the Rhine-Meuse River delta in the Netherlands (Brüge et al., 2018; Cesarini and Scalici, 2022; Roebroek et al., 2021; Schöneich-Argent et al., 2020; Tramoy et al., 2022). Studies have also been conducted on riverbank anthropogenic debris along the Selenga River in Mongolia (Battulga et al., 2019). The findings from these studies consistently highlight plastic as a dominant component of riverbank anthropogenic debris.

Understanding the composition and distribution of anthropogenic debris in rivers is crucial for identifying priority areas for intervention and developing effective strategies to reduce its presence in natural aquatic and marine ecosystems. Despite the lack of baseline data on debris items in many rivers, this study fills that gap by examining large-scale riverbank surveys conducted along the Ciliwung River, which has been heavily impacted compared to other Indonesian rivers.

The objective of this research is to firstly to identify the predominant types of anthropogenic debris found on riverbanks, and second, to analyze spatial variations in riverbank anthropogenic debris abundance within the Ciliwung River. Ultimately, these findings will inform local stakeholders on monitoring methods tailored to local conditions as part of a comprehensive strategy toward mitigating plastic pollution caused by human activity. We will examine two hypotheses in this study: a) the abundance of debris on river banks will be greater in areas with poor waste management, and b) single-use products will be the prevalent type of debris due to their widespread use.

Material and methods

Study sites

The Ciliwung River plays a vital role in providing water for fisheries, agriculture, and industry sectors in the upper region. Additionally, it serves as a source of drinking water for the communities living upstream and midstream. The Ciliwung River originates from Mount Pangrango, which sits at an altitude of 3,020 meters above sea level. The annual precipitation in the Ciliwung watershed varies between 1,500 and 3,500 millimeters.




Figure 1. Study sites in Ciliwung Watershed

The Ciliwung River covers a vast area of more than 476 km² and has a length of approximately 119 km. It flows through the administrative boundaries of West Java Province, DKI Jakarta Province, and Banten Province. The mismanagement of plastic waste in these territories is a significant concern, with an estimated annual accumulation of ~5900 tonnes (Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan, 2023). This number includes both floating and non-floating debris, contributing to the pollution levels in Jakarta Bay and The Java Sea. These seas have become heavily affected by marine plastic debris, specifically from the Ciliwung River, with estimates of 255.5-365 tonnes per year for floating plastic debris alone

(Cordova and Nurhati, 2019). The province of DKI Jakarta accounts for the largest portion (40%) of the Ciliwung Watershed. Land use patterns differ significantly across different parts of the river; upstream includes a mix of natural forest, agricultural land, and settlements, while midstream and downstream primarily consist of more developed areas including settlements and commercial infrastructure (Figure 1). The land cover within the Ciliwung watershed has undergone significant changes, mainly due to the conversion of agricultural and forest lands into built-up areas. This transition has been occurring at a rapid pace, with an annual increase of over 100% since 1990 (Abighail et al., 2022). In order to ensure the appropriateness and suitability of the sampling locations, a pre-survey was conducted prior to beginning the actual sampling process. This involved taking aerial photographs as a means of assessment. The results of this pre-survey, along with a brief analysis, are available in the supplementary materials (Figures S1-S3).

The selection of study sites was based on three factors: the presence of a riverbank that is prone to submersion during periods of high water levels, legal accessibility for team members, and representation of various land uses (such as vegetation, agriculture, built up area or mixed area) along the river. In total, there were 33 research locations identified as potential study sites (Figure 1). These locations included 11 in the upstream region, 17 in the midstream region, and 5 in the downstream region. Out of the total 33 locations, there are seven areas that are surrounded by vegetation and two areas in close proximity to agricultural lands. Additionally, there are ten mixed-use locations and 14 built-up areas. In terms of river morphology, the majority of these locations exhibit a curved shape (25) while the remaining have a straight shape (8). Notably, curved river sections tend to have a higher litter density compared to straight sections (Schneider et al., 2021). From an administrative standpoint, it is found that among these locations, Bogor Regency has the highest number with 13 survey sites, followed by Bogor City with seven survey sites. Meanwhile, Depok City has five survey sites, whereas South Jakarta City along with East Jakarta City also has three survey sites; Central Jakarta City merely appears twice.

Sampling procedure

During the sampling period spanning from October to September 2021, a comprehensive analysis was conducted on riverbank debris items. The riverbank survey sites (n=33) ranged from 30-50 meters and were situated parallel to the low waterline mark, as depicted in Figure 2. The width of the sampling area was determined by measuring the distance between the waterline (the point at which the water meets the bank) and the high-water line, with a maximum allowance of 20 meters from the waterline to ensure sampling was the same in each survey site. To identify this high-water line accurately, researchers look for evidence, such as debris, litter, and organic matter left behind during previous flood events. A quadrant measuring 100 × 100 cm within each sampling area is established near where deposition occurs parallel to the waterline. Data collection focuses on collecting visible debris items found within both surface layers and those buried up to five centimeters. All collected pieces are categorized based on predefined classifications. It is imperative to

acknowledge that the absence of a systematic classification system for plastic litter in rivers necessitates the adoption of beach debris categorizations from reputable sources such as NOAA and UNEP shoreline debris assessments (Cheshire et al., 2009; Lippiatt et al., 2013). Consequently, we proceeded to classify the collected riverbank debris into six distinct categories: plastics and rubber, metal, glass, processed wood, cloth, and others. These categories were further divided into sub-categories for more accurate classification. Any food waste or animal waste found during our assessment was classified within 'other' including any small or unclassifiable debris. Moreover, among all the riverbank debris sub-categories (57 in total), we further divided plastics and rubber into 30 different sub-categories using established classifications from previous studies (Cheshire et al., 2009; Cordova et al., 2022a; Kumar et al., 2016; Lippiatt et al., 2013; Simeonova and Chuturkova, 2019).




Figure 2. Overview of sampling procedure in the riverbanks

The debris found on the riverbank was meticulously rinsed and cleaned and left to dry under the sun for 10-15 minutes. Once dried, it was counted and weighed using a Harnic Heles HL-340 digital scale capable of holding up to 5 kg with an accuracy of 0.1 g. To determine the density of the debris along the riverbank, transects were utilized alongside a specific formula:

$$D = \frac{n}{\omega \times l}$$

where D represents the debris density measured as number or weight per-square meter, n , denotes the observed count (frequency) or weight (kg) of debris items, ω representing transect width (expressed in meters), and l indicating transect length (measured in meters).

Plastic debris chemical composition analysis

This study used a Fourier Transform Infrared (FT-IR) spectrometer to analyze chemical compounds in plastic debris collected from various riverbank sampling locations. Specifically, 9156 plastic items from 27 sub-categories were carefully selected for analysis using the FT-IR instrument (Agilent Cary 630), which was equipped with an Attenuated Total Reflection diamond crystal. The experimental setup involved utilizing an 8 cm single-reflection resolution mode within the wavenumber range of 600 and 3800 cm^{-1} with 16 scans conducted per analysis. We meticulously cleaned each plastic item's surface before conducting any FT-IR analysis by gently applying a sterile ethanol solution (96%) to avoid contamination. The identification of polymer types in the analyzed samples relied on distinct peaks observed at specific bands as described previously by K  ppler et al. (2015), L  der et al. (2015) and Cordova et al. (2023). Three separate tests were performed on different areas of each plastic surface for enhanced consistency in our findings. For quality control, an assessment was conducted by comparing the particle spectrum with predetermined reference standards provided by Thermo-scientific, Shimadzu, and the Research Center for Geosciences at the University of Bayreuth in Germany. By comparing the properties of the tested plastic polymers with these established benchmarks, an evaluation could be made regarding their adherence to desired quality criteria.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted to assess potential variations in each sampling areas and type of riverine debris collected. The Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann-Whitney pairwise test functions, offered by PAST software version 4.03, were employed for this purpose. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was utilized throughout these analyses as a threshold for determining statistical significance.

Results

Quantities of riverbank debris

A total of 87,656 riverbank debris items, weighing 283.34 kg, were sampled and evaluated in this study (Figure 3). The mean abundance of debris across all measurements was 32.79 ± 15.38 items/ m^2 (106.00 ± 50.23 g/ m^2). Notably, the highest concentration of riverbank debris was observed at ST 19 (mean: 56.85 ± 8.71 items/ m^2 and 150.92 ± 38.70 g/ m^2), followed by ST 17 (mean: 49.74 ± 6.88 items/ m^2 and 136.92 ± 50.397 g/ m^2), and ST 18 (mean: 48.79 ± 5.41 items/ m^2 and 122.22 ± 33.08 g/ m^2). In comparison, the minimum abundance value was identified at ST 30 (mean: 9.30 ± 2.93 items/ m^2 and 53.76 ± 13.09

g/m²), followed by ST 26 (mean: 9.47 ± 3.19 items/m² and 50.18 ± 20.43 g/m²), and ST 28 (mean: 9.64 ± 2.77 items/m² and 43.32 ± 13.97 g/m²).




Figure 3. Riverbank debris by abundance (top) and weight (bottom) in each sampling station that divided based on the nature of the river (top) and administrative area (bottom).

There was a significant variation ($p < 0.05$) in the amount and weight of riverbank debris in different areas (Figure 4). The upstream area exhibited the greatest abundance and weight of debris (mean: 38.33 ± 8.19 items/m² and 124.79 ± 46.40 g/m²), followed by the midstream region (mean: 35.83 ± 15.37 items/m² and 109.22 ± 48.94 g/m²). Conversely, relatively lesser amounts of riverbank debris were found downstream, with an mean density of approximately 10.30 ± 2.80 items/m² (53.73 ± 16.64 g/m²).





Figure 4. Riverbank debris by abundance (top) and weight (bottom) based on the nature of the river (left) and administrative area (right).

An intriguing aspect of this study pertains to the examination of riverbank debris based on the jurisdictional boundaries set by local government administration (Figure 4). In Bogor Regency, specifically in two particular areas (ST 01-06 and ST 14-20), there is a noticeably high abundance (42.82 ± 6.40 items/m²; 142.59 ± 46.65 g/m² and 47.41 ± 8.91 items/m²; 133.44 ± 45.25 g/m², respectively) of riverbank debris compared to the other locations. Followed by Depok City (36.89 ± 8.02 items/m² and 113.92 ± 37.79 g/m²) and Bogor City (32.56 ± 6.87 items/m² and 102.89 ± 37.94 g/m²). Conversely, South Jakarta City (9.84 ± 2.98 items/m² and 49.99 ± 18.89 g/m²), East Jakarta City (10.13 ± 2.98 items/m² and 51.89 ± 16.83 g/m²), and Central Jakarta City (10.56 ± 2.56 items/m² and 56.49 ± 16.43 g/m²) had the lowest levels of riverbank debris among all sampling areas.



250

251 Figure 5. Riverbank debris composition and its percentage by abundance (top) and weight
252 (bottom) in each sampling station

253 *Riverbank debris composition*

254 Most debris collected along the riverbank consisted of plastic, accounting for 53.65% by
255 count and 54.82% by weight (Figure 5). The mean density of debris stranded on the Ciliwung
256 riverbank was 32.79 ± 14.27 items/m², with a total mean weight of 106.00 ± 36.52 g/m².
257 Amongst all types of debris, plastic had the highest contribution by count (17.59 ± 7.83
258 items/m²) and weight (58.10 ± 20.51 g/m²), followed by textiles which accounted for a mean
259 abundance of 7.00 ± 3.48 items/m² and an mean weight of 19.60 ± 8.26 g/m². Although,
260 there were notable variations observed among the different categories of debris found along
261 the riverbanks. Plastic material exhibited the highest prevalence across all categories,
262 indicating a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$). On the other hand, textiles displayed
263 notable high distinctions in terms of metals, glass, lumber, other forms of debris, and
264 hazardous waste ($p < 0.05$). A consistent presence of plastic litter was observed along the
265 riverbanks at all sampling points, with proportions ranging from 47.43% to 64.35% based on
266 count and from 46.64% to 64.15% based on weight. The greatest count of plastic litter was
267 found at ST 12 (upstream in Bogor City), while the highest proportion based on weight was
268 found at ST20 (midstream in Bogor Regency). Conversely, the lowest proportions were
269 recorded for both abundance and weight at ST26 (downstream in South Jakarta City).

270 Table 1. Top-10 stranded riverbank debris in administrative area and in each location

Area	Top-10 plastic debris category									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ciliwung riverbank	Styrofoam (cushion)	Plastic shopping bags	Cigarettes butts	Disposable medical mask	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Food wrappers	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Plastic cups	Straw, cotton buds, pieces	Other plastic bags
% share	10.13	10.11	10.04	9.93	9.90	9.87	9.85	3.79	3.78	3.78
Bogor Regency	Cigarettes butts	Styrofoam (cushion)	Plastic shopping bags	Disposable medical mask	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Food wrappers	Other plastic bags	Plastic cups	Drinking plastic bottles
% share	10.68	10.31	9.73	8.96	8.94	8.78	8.02	3.85	3.66	3.62
Bogor City	Food wrappers	Disposable medical mask	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Plastic shopping bags	Cigarettes butts	Styrofoam (cushion)	Straw, cotton buds, pieces	Plastic cups	Drinking plastic bottles
% share	10.8	10.04	9.9	9.41	9.37	9.2	8.97	3.78	3.59	3.24

Area	Top-10 plastic debris category									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bogor Regency	Cigarettes butts	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Food wrappers	Styrofoam (cushion)	Plastic shopping bags	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Disposable medical mask	Plastic cups	Other plastic bags	Shoes, sandals, gloves, cuts
% share	9.83	9.63	9.6	9.59	9.49	9.21	9.06	4.21	3.51	3.17
Depok City	Styrofoam (cushion)	Disposable medical mask	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Food wrappers	Cigarettes butts	Plastic shopping bags	Drinking plastic bottles	Straw, cotton buds, pieces	Other plastic bags
% share	10.55	9.51	9.5	9.32	9.22	9.06	8.35	4.28	3.94	3.83
South Jakarta City	Food wrappers	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Styrofoam (cushion)	Disposable medical mask	Cigarettes butts	Plastic shopping bags	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Other plastic bags	Diapers	Plastic label, plastic lids
% share	9.84	9.35	9.3	8.77	8.71	8.66	8.56	4.85	4.27	3.86
East Jakarta City	Plastic shopping bags	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Styrofoam (cushion)	Disposable medical mask	Food wrappers	Plastic sachet (non-food)	Cigarettes butts	Drinking plastic bottles	Plastic utensil	Plastic cups

Area	Top-10 plastic debris category									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
						pack/wrapp er)				
% share	10.52	9.97	9.49	9.31	9.19	8.92	8.58	4.27	4.25	4.24
Centr al Jakart a City	Disposa ble medical mask	Plastic shopping bags	Cigarettes butts	Plastic sachet (non- food pack/wrapp er)	Food wrappers	Styrofoam (cushion)	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Straw, cotton buds, pieces	Other plastic bags	Drinking plastic bottles
% share	10.44	10.19	9.63	9.47	8.84	8.75	8.5	4.55	4.04	3.99
Upstr eam	Cigarett es butts	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Plastic shopping bags	Disposable medical mask	Styrofoam (cushion)	Food wrappers	Plastic sachet (non- food pack/wrapp er)	Straw, cotton buds, pieces	Drinking plastic bottles	Diapers
% share	10.47	9.4	9.37	9.31	9.28	9.06	8.99	3.76	3.45	3.42
Midst ream	Styrofo am (cushio n)	Plastic sachet (non- food pack/wrapp er)	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Disposable medical mask	Plastic shopping bags	Food wrappers	Cigarettes butts	Other plastic bags	Plastic cups	Straw, cotton buds, pieces

Area	Top-10 plastic debris category									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
% share	10.14	9.83	9.79	9.79	9.55	9.5	8.89	3.86	3.81	3.63
Down stream	Plastic shopping bags	Disposable medical mask	Cigarettes butts	Styrofoam (cushion)	Styrofoam (food wrapper)	Food wrappers	Plastic sachet (non-food pack/wrapper)	Drinking plastic bottles	Plastic cups	Straw, cotton buds, pieces
% share	9.98	9.43	9.43	9.23	9.11	9.08	9.03	3.99	3.9	3.86

Table 1 highlights Styrofoam (cushion) was the most abundant material among all sampling areas along the Ciliwung riverbank, accounting for 10.13% of all collected plastic debris. This was followed closely by plastic shopping bags (10.11%), cigarette butts (10.04%), disposable medical masks (9.93%), and Styrofoam used for food packaging (9.90%). Other notable categories included food wrappers, non-food plastic sachet packaging, disposable cups, pieces such as straws and cotton buds (3.76 %), and miscellaneous types of plastic bags (3.78%). Interestingly, the most prevalent category differs along both administrative areas and natural water flow in the Ciliwung riverbank (Table 1). Furthermore, the seven aforementioned types of debris collectively account for more than 60% of each area surveyed. In addition, the composition of the top 10 items differed across different sampling areas, but single-use plastic items were consistently found to be the most prevalent category of debris on riverbanks, accounting for over 80% of all collected plastic debris.




Figure 6. Proportion of polymer types in each administrative sampling area

Chemical composition of riverbank debris

A total of 9156 random plastic samples were analyzed, accounting for approximately 10.45% of the 87656 litter items studied. Figure 5 presents data on eight confirmed polymer groups that were identified in these samples. The dominant synthetic polymer group was

polyethylene, representing 31.75% of the total items analyzed (including low- and high-density polyethylene). Following this, polypropylene accounted for 25.78%, while polystyrene items comprised 19.17%. Other identified polymers included cellulose acetate (9.58%) and polyethylene terephthalate (8.41%) and a smaller fraction of polyurethane (2.99%), cellophane (1.89%), and lastly, polyacrylate (0.44%). In addition, the distribution of polymer types across different regions aligns with the overall dominance. However, there are specific areas, such as South Jakarta City, where the polyethylene group (48.6%) and polyacrylate group (9.64%) constitute a higher portion of the polymers found. Similarly, in the Depok city area, cellophane accounts for a considerable proportion (9.02%).

Discussion

Distribution and origin of riverbank litter

Here we present the first study of the spatial distribution of riverbank debris along Indonesia's most densely populated river, spanning from its upstream region to downstream. Due to the lack of comprehensive investigations quantifying and characterizing debris on riverbanks in Indonesia, comparing the results directly is challenging due to variations in methodologies and a lack of harmonization across studies. Yet, riverine plastic pollution is a widespread and presents a cross-border issue that necessitates globally standardized monitoring efforts for effective mitigation. Our research findings revealed a significantly higher accumulation of debris on riverbanks compared to similar studies in Germany, the Netherlands, Albania, and Vietnam (Table 2).

The amount of riverbank debris observed was up to 30 times greater in our study area (Table 1). Several factors may account for the significant presence of macrodebris on the riverbanks of the Ciliwung River. These include a lack of awareness regarding environmental concerns, and inadequate government focus on proper waste management practices (Ali and Shams, 2015; Santos et al., 2009; Thushari et al., 2017). Additionally, the excessive litter observed along the riverbank can be attributed to illegal dumping at unauthorized sites and unintentional disposal of waste in areas near the riverbank (Gasperi et al., 2014; Kiessling et al., 2019). The accumulation of litter in the riverbanks is exacerbated by wind or rainfall-driven surface runoff (Dris et al., 2015; Roebroek et al., 2021). Most of the litter items observed in this study likely originated from local sources.

During our research, observations were found indicating that residents in the Bogor Regency area were directly disposing of their garbage into the river. This finding aligns with similar research conducted along riversides in Wales (mean of 5.84 Items/m) and Chile (0.14 – 3.42 Items/m²), which identified illegal dumping as a prominent source of litter (Rech et al., 2015; Williams and Simmons, 1999). While other studies have suggested additional sources of river debris, such as household waste from residents (Bruge et al., 2018; Franz and Freitas, 2012) or industrial-related pollution (Cordova et al., 2022b; Deng et al., 2020; Lechner and

Ramler, 2015), these were not extensively studied in the current investigation. Please refer to Table 2 for a comparison of the average riverbank debris from previous studies. It is worth noting that industry-related litter may contribute considerably to microplastic pollution, an aspect that was not specifically addressed in this study as we aimed to identify whole litter items to help identify where targeted interventions are needed.

Once in the river system, litter items can be transported downstream and may temporarily accumulate in lower areas (Hohenblum et al., 2015; van Emmerik et al., 2019). Nonetheless, this study discovered a lower amount of waste in the downstream region. Besides improved waste management practices in these areas, it is possible that there has been an underestimation of litter accumulation along the riverbanks upstream due to most research focusing solely on river litter. Ideally, this transportation process involves floating debris at the water's surface, suspended particles along with the water column, as well as movement over the river bed (Siegfried et al., 2017; Tramoy et al., 2022). Litter deposition occurs on aquatic organisms, riparian vegetation, sediment, and alongside riverbanks (Cordova et al., 2022b; Emmerik and Schwarz, 2020; Sadri and Thompson, 2014).

Table 2. Comparison of riverbank debris with previous reports.

Sampling area	Study year	Riverbanks sampling number	Method	Riverbank debris mean	Unit	References
Ciliwung River, Indonesia	2021	33	3 level of 1 m ² quadratic transect	32.79 ± 15.38	Items/m ²	This study
the Rhine, Weser and Elbe river systems, Germany	2016, 2017	250	1.5 m circle transect	0.54 ± 1.20	Items/m ²	(Kiessling et al., 2019)
the Elqui, Maipo, Maule, and BioBio rivers, Chile	2014	55	3 m radius circle transect	0.14 – 3.42	Items/m ²	(Rech et al., 2015)
The River Taff, South Wales, United Kingdom	1996	50	5 m line transect	5.84	Items/m	(Williams and Simmons, 1999)

Sampling area	Study year	Riverbanks sampling number	Method	Riverbank debris mean	Unit	References
Ishëm River, Albania	2020	2	100 m line transect	1.66 - 2.69	Items/m ²	(Gjyli et al., 2023)
Saigon River, Vietnam	2022	1	100 m line transect	0.06 - 0.21	Items/m ²	(Nguyen and Bui, 2023)
Nederrijn River, Netherlands	2017, 2019	192	100 m line transect	3.99	Items/m	(Roebroek et al., 2021)
Meuse River, Netherlands	2017, 2019	93	100 m line transect	2.43	Items/m	(Roebroek et al., 2021)
Waal River, Netherlands	2017, 2019	6	100 m line transect	1.55	Items/m	(Roebroek et al., 2021)
Erzen River, Albania	2020	2	100 m line transect	2.42	Items/m	(Gjyli et al., 2022)

345

346 Through additional analysis, we have made estimations regarding the potential amount of
347 litter on riverbanks that could enter the sea. Utilizing satellite images to identify riverbanks
348 along the Ciliwung River, a total area of 13.31 hectares was determined (Please refer to Table
349 S3 Supplementary Material 2 for the analysis). Taking into account the average accumulation
350 rate of debris on these riverbanks (as depicted in Figures 3 and 4), it is projected that
351 approximately 4.95 to 18.82 tons of litter annually may accumulate on the riverbank with
352 potential for flow into the sea; within that range, roughly 2.71 to 10.32 tons would consist
353 specifically of plastic litter. However, this calculation assumes no entanglement in vegetation
354 or structures along the riverbank and considers litter accumulation as temporary before
355 being washed away during periods of increased water flow in the river, which results in a
356 potential discrepancy between the estimated and actual amounts of litter that ends up in
357 the sea. Furthermore, our findings indicate that most of the litter observed from upstream
358 locations to downstream sampling points consists mainly of relatively new plastic litter. This
359 was evident by conducting analysis using carbonyl index calculations (Please refer to
360 Supplementary Material 3 for the analysis), determining that plastic litter at Ciliwung River's
361 bank is not older than two years. In-depth research and comprehensive monitoring are
362 necessary to effectively address this issue, as it can contribute to improved waste
363 management practices in rivers.

Single-use products, the prevalent type of debris

The results of our study reveal that plastic litter is the predominant type of litter found on the riverbanks of the Ciliwung River, with styrofoam being the most common form within this category. This emphasizes the critical need to implement systematic measures aimed at reducing plastic and Styrofoam usage in both the Ciliwung watershed and Greater Jakarta area. This study identified two types of styrofoam litter, namely cushions (most abundant) and food wrappers (5th most abundant item), which accounted for nearly 20% of the overall plastic litter observed. Foam materials have gained popularity across various industries due to their exceptional shock absorption properties, making them highly versatile in many applications (Knoblauch and Mederake, 2021). In particular, styrofoam is commonly used as a replacement for traditional organic food wraps like banana or teak leaves in packaging (Cordova and Nurhati, 2019). Once discarded in the environment, single-use styrofoam undergoes fragmentation caused by mechanical processes, UV exposure, or oxidative, leading to a decrease in its size (Andriolo et al., 2020; Chubarenko et al., 2020). Consequently, there has been an escalation in the presence of this form of plastic debris, in smaller sizes, along the riverbanks of the Ciliwung River.

The abundance of plastic litter on riverbanks is primarily attributed to the widespread production and use of single-use plastics worldwide (Adam et al., 2020). For example, single-use plastic items such as shopping bags, cigarette butts, disposable medical masks, food wrappers, non-food sachet packaging, cups, straws, and cotton buds are manufactured in large quantities globally (Quartey et al., 2015). The global production of plastic has drastically increased where approximately 360 million metric tonnes was produced in 2018; with half being accounted for by single-use plastics (PlasticsEurope and EPRO, 2021). These types of plastics often contain organic additives that have been found to contribute harmful chemicals into the environment and subsequently can be distributed throughout multiple ecosystems (Tun et al., 2023). Currently, only a small percentage (100 out of 514) of regencies and cities in Indonesia have implemented regulations to ban single-use plastics including plastic shopping bags. This environmental initiative should be adopted by more areas across the country in order to address the issue effectively.

A crucial initial step towards better understanding the distribution of various plastic types along coastlines is identifying the most prevalent polymer types and the environmental impacts they may cause. This information can then be compared with findings from studies measuring the abundances of marine microplastics, supporting the hypothesis that fragmentation is the primary source of microplastics in oceans (Dimassi et al., 2022; Thompson, 2015). The composition of riverbank plastic debris discussed in this study is linked to the large-scale plastics entering Jakarta Bay (Cordova and Nurhati, 2019) and the presence of microplastics in the Ciliwung river (Cordova et al., 2022c, 2020). The predominant synthetic polymers found in this study are polyethylene, polystyrene, and polypropylene which are commonly used materials for single-use plastic products

(PlasticsEurope and EPRO, 2021). In addition, Joly and Coulis (2018) stated the amounts of cellulose acetate polymers found are often derived from discarded cigarette butts.

The improper disposal of cigarette butts, which are commonly discarded worldwide without specific disposal systems, poses significant environmental concerns; particularly, the presence of microfibers made from cellulose acetate as the main component (Green et al., 2019; Haske-Cornelius et al., 2017). These microfibers contain toxic chemicals such as persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals that have the potential to cause genetic mutations and cancerous effects to wildlife (Rebischung et al., 2018; Shen et al., 2021; Torkashvand et al., 2020). Moreover, knowledge about specific polymers and their associated additives can prove beneficial in terms of assessing environmental risk and ecotoxicology. Conducting thorough back tracing to identify sources of marine plastic debris becomes more feasible when considering these unique characteristics inherent to different polymers (Int-Veen et al., 2021).

The relationship between riverbank litter and local waste management

The findings of this study reveal a strong relationship between waste management services (Collection rate based on SIPSN data (2023)) and the presence of riverbank debris (please see Supplementary materials Table S3 and Figures S4-S5). The data indicates a positive correlation between the rate of waste collection in each region and both a lower the abundance and weight of debris found on riverbanks ($R^2=0.934$ for abundance, $R^2=0.948$ for weight, $p<0.05$). Regions with higher waste collection rates tend to have lower levels of riverbank debris which indicates waste management services can help reduce the debris accumulations along the riverbank. Bogor Regency has the lowest waste collection rate at 41.4%, while areas in Jakarta, i.e., South Jakarta City, East Jakarta City, and Central Jakarta City boast rates exceeding 95%.

Waste management in Indonesia is primarily the responsibility of local governments. However, their expenditure on waste management is generally low, with an average of 0.07% of the regional budget allocated for this purpose (Wardhana, 2020). Ideally, allocating around 3-4% of the total regional budget would ensure adequate resources for managing municipal solid waste effectively (Cordova et al., 2022a). Moreover, there is a significant disparity in budget allocation for waste management across different regions. For instance, Jakarta has allocated more than 5% of its regional budget towards waste management, whereas Bogor Regency, Bogor City and Depok City have allocated less than 1% (Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan, 2023). To effectively manage municipal solid waste and improve waste management practices, it is crucial to increase the budget dedicated to transportation and infrastructure facilities (Damanhuri and Padmi, 2009).

Collaboration with private sector entities can also play a role in enhancing waste management efforts (Damanhuri, 2017; Nurhasanah et al., 2021). The relatively lower number of debris on the riverbanks in Jakarta, compared to neighboring municipalities during our study period, cannot be solely attributed to variations in river discharge. This

suggests that improved river cleanup programs implemented by the capital city in 2015 may have contributed to this outcome. For example, the introduction of specialized cleaning teams, such as the 'orange troops' or 'pasukan oranye' and 'blue troops' or 'pasukan biru,' through Jakarta Governor Regulation No. 169/2015 has proven effective in maintaining cleanliness along rivers within Jakarta.

In addition to implementing high waste collection rates, it is also crucial to implement measures aimed at controlling waste entering river areas, including the riverbank zone (Cordova and Nurhati, 2019). Such measures should encompass efforts to change public attitudes and habits regarding proper waste disposal while also bolstering land- and water-based cleaning personnel (Simmons and Fielding, 2019; Williams and Rangel-Buitrago, 2019). Moreover, implementing regular and ongoing monitoring of river debris using reproducible methods, like the one utilized in this study, can serve as a valuable tool for evaluating the efficacy of river clean-up initiatives. Replicating similar monitoring efforts within the region, particularly in cities with major rivers and in developing countries, can provide policymakers with scientifically-backed and evidence-based information to address waste management issues that ultimately contribute to ocean pollution.

Similar patterns of riverbank debris distribution were observed at all the sampling locations along the Ciliwung River. The dominant proportion of macroplastic debris on the riverbank, both in terms of abundance (53.65%) and weight (54.82%), is consistent with other regions globally (de Lange et al., 2023; Gjyli et al., 2023; Kiessling et al., 2019; Nguyen and Bui, 2023; Roebroek et al., 2021). For instance, comparable proportions (Table 2) have been reported in the Rhine, Weser, and Elbe River systems in Germany (50.5%), the Dutch Rhine-Meuse River system (55.8%), the Rhine, IJssel, and Meuse River systems (70%), Ishëm and Rhone River in Albania (77%), as well as in Vietnam's Saigon River (86.54%). The findings of this study, along with other literature (Ali and Shams, 2015; Battulga et al., 2019; Cordova et al., 2021; Eerkes-Medrano et al., 2015; Palmas et al., 2022), confirm that plastic litter is the predominant form of debris in aquatic ecosystems, although there may be slight variations depending on where the samples were collected.

Based on the enduring nature and wide distribution of plastics in aquatic and marine habitats, it can be inferred that these materials have a cumulative effect (Int-Veen et al., 2021). This includes adverse effects on water quality, endangerment of plant and animal species, and pollution of outdoor spaces vital for tourism and recreation (Beaumont et al., 2019; Gall and Thompson, 2015). Additionally, macroplastic debris contributes to the issue of small-sized plastic particles known as microplastics, whose hazards remain largely ambiguous but nonetheless concerning (Bucci et al., 2020; Toussaint et al., 2019; Wright and Kelly, 2017).

Way forward

The results of this study will provide valuable insights into the fate and distribution of litter on riverbanks, aiding waste management processes in Indonesia. Moreover, the riverbank

debris dataset provided in this research has the potential to serve as a foundational resource for a global database. The establishment of such a database is crucial for enhancing monitoring and modeling initiatives focused on litter assessment. However, conducting comparative studies on different regions of Indonesia presents challenges due to variations in approaches and classifications used. Additionally, there is inconsistency in the measurement units for litter densities among various studies, and some research has yet to undergo peer-reviewed publication. Therefore, it is recommended to establish standardized methods that will enable better comparisons and understanding of anthropogenic debris contamination along riverbanks in Indonesia. This local data can subsequently be expanded to encompass regional or even global contexts. Effective waste management is a long-term process requiring proactive measures rather than reactive actions. In the context of this Indonesian riverine region, it is important to adopt flexible solutions for litter control to improve environmental quality. The presence of litter has negative consequences that affect various sectors interconnected with economic activities throughout the study area (Watkins et al., 2015). These impacts, directly and indirectly, affect local and national revenues, underscoring the critical nature of effective litter control for economic development in the region (McIlgorm et al., 2022; Omeyer et al., 2022). While completely eliminating waste and litter may be challenging given current production and consumption patterns, reducing inputs into the environment is a feasible goal that requires global efforts toward innovative management strategies and solutions. Hence, implementing effective urban planning and enhancing waste collection capacity are vital approaches to mitigate plastic leakage. Additionally, prioritizing direct river cleanup initiatives is crucial in eliminating the current presence of plastic litter. All proposed solutions should aim to minimize the significant negative effects of littering, while also delivering various benefits that contribute to positive outcomes.

Conclusion

This study presents the first quantitative and descriptive analysis of anthropogenic debris items on the riverbanks of the Ciliwung River, spanning from upstream to downstream. Plastic debris constitutes approximately 53.65% of all litter items found, indicating a notable high abundance, by up to 30 times greater, compared to previous similar studies on riverbank litter globally. The presence of riverbank debris has the potential to contribute between 4.95 to 18.82 tons per year towards marine pollution, with an estimated 2.71 to 10.32 tons being plastic waste specifically. Riverbank debris is more prevalent in upstream areas compared to other locations along the river, and it tends to accumulate in regions with low collection rates for waste management practices. Amongst various types of litter, single-use plastics are dominant, particularly Styrofoam products. The riverbank debris dataset presented in this research holds great potential as a foundational resource for a waste management database within Indonesia and on a global scale. This dataset can be utilized to pinpoint the specific sources of anthropogenic debris and provide valuable support to

521 policymakers in implementing targeted prevention measures. Additionally, the
522 establishment of such a comprehensive database plays a critical role in enhancing
523 monitoring and modeling initiatives focused on litter assessment. Furthermore, this locally
524 derived data has the ability to extend its scope to regional or even global contexts. The
525 framework provided by riverbank debris analysis serves as an invaluable tool for academia
526 and stakeholders seeking assistance in developing and optimizing effective strategies for
527 monitoring riverbank debris that align with local conditions and aspirations.

529 **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

530 **Muhammad Reza Cordova:** Conceptualization, Writing - Original draft, Resources,
531 Investigation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Visualization, Data Curation, Funding
532 acquisition, Project acquisition, Supervision.

533 **Max R. Kelly:** Writing - Original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Data
534 Curation

535 **Muhammad Hafizt:** Methodology, Investigation, Visualization, Resources, Validation

536 **Singgih Prasetyo Adi Wibowo:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

537 **Yaya Ihya Ulumuddin:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

538 **Triyoni Purbonegoro:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

539 **Deny Yogaswara:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

540 **Muhammad Taufik Kaisupy:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

541 **Riyana Subandi:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

542 **Sofia Yuniar Sani:** Investigation, Resources, Validation

543 **Richard Thompson:** Resources, Funding acquisition, Project acquisition, Supervision.

544 **Susan Jobling:** Resources, Funding acquisition, Project acquisition, Supervision.

546 **Declaration of competing interest**

547 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
548 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

550 **Acknowledgment**

551 We express our gratitude towards waste pickers, fishers, students, and volunteers whose
552 valuable contributions facilitated the implementation of sample operations for this study.
553 The research was made possible through the support of "A Systems Analysis Approach to
554 Reduce Plastic Waste in Indonesian Societies (PISCES)", funded by UK Research and
555 Innovation (UKRI) and UK Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) (Grant Ref:
556 NE/V006428/1). PISCES aims to inform, complement, and catalyze national and global action
557 programs to solve the plastic challenge (<https://www.piscespartnership.org/>).

558

559 **Data availability**

560 Data will be made available on request.

561

562 **References**

563 Abighail, S.H., Kridasantausa, I., Farid, M., Moe, I.R., 2022. Pemodelan Banjir akibat
564 Perubahan Tata Guna Laha di Daerah Aliran Sungai Ciliwung. *J. Tek. Sipil* 29.
565 <https://doi.org/10.5614/jts.2022.29.1.6>

566 Adam, I., Walker, T.R., Bezerra, J.C., Clayton, A., 2020. Policies to reduce single-use plastic
567 marine pollution in West Africa. *Mar. Policy* 116.
568 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103928>

569 Ali, R., Shams, Z.I., 2015. Quantities and composition of shore debris along Clifton Beach,
570 Karachi, Pakistan. *J. Coast. Conserv.* 19, 527–535. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-015-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-015-0404-x)
571 [0404-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-015-0404-x)

572 Andrady, A.L., 2017. The plastic in microplastics: A review. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 119, 12–22.
573 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.01.082>

574 Andriolo, U., Gonçalves, G., Bessa, F., Sobral, P., 2020. Mapping marine litter on coastal
575 dunes with unmanned aerial systems: A showcase on the Atlantic Coast. *Sci. Total*
576 *Environ.* 736. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139632>

577 Battulga, B., Kawahigashi, M., Oyuntsetseg, B., 2019. Distribution and composition of plastic
578 debris along the river shore in the Selenga River basin in Mongolia. *Environ. Sci. Pollut.*
579 *Res.* 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-04632-1>

580 Baudena, A., Ser-Giacomi, E., Jalón-Rojas, I., Galgani, F., Pedrotti, M.L., 2022. The streaming
581 of plastic in the Mediterranean Sea. *Nat. Commun.* 13.
582 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30572-5>

583 Beaumont, N.J., Aanesen, M., Austen, M.C., Börger, T., Clark, J.R., Cole, M., Hooper, T.,
584 Lindeque, P.K., Pascoe, C., Wyles, K.J., 2019. Global ecological, social and economic
585 impacts of marine plastic. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 142, 189–195.
586 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.03.022>

587 Blettler, M.C.M., Abrial, E., Khan, F.R., Sivri, N., Espinola, L.A., 2018. Freshwater plastic
588 pollution: Recognizing research biases and identifying knowledge gaps. *Water Res.* 143,
589 416–424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.015>

590 Borrelle, S.B., Ringma, J., Lavender Law, K., Monnahan, C.C., Lebreton, L., McGivern, A.,
591 Murphy, E., Jambeck, J., Leonard, G.H., Hilleary, M.A., Eriksen, M., Possingham, H.P., De
592 Frond, H., Gerber, L.R., Polidoro, B., Tahir, A., Bernard, M., Mallos, N., Barnes, M.,
593 Rochman, C.M., 2020. Predicted growth in plastic waste exceeds efforts to mitigate
594 plastic pollution. *Science* (80-.). 369, 1515–1518.
595 <https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ABA3656>

596 Bruge, A., Barreau, C., Carlot, J., Collin, H., Moreno, C., Maison, P., 2018. Monitoring litter
597 inputs from the Adour river (southwest France) to the marine environment. *J. Mar. Sci.*
598 Eng. 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse6010024>

599 Bucci, K., Tulio, M., Rochman, C.M., 2020. What is known and unknown about the effects of
600 plastic pollution: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Ecol. Appl.* 30, 1–16.
601 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2044>

602 Cesarini, G., Scalici, M., 2022. Riparian vegetation as a trap for plastic litter. *Environ. Pollut.*
603 292, 118410. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.118410>

604 Cheshire, A.C., Adler, E., Barbière, J., Cohen, Y., Evans, S., Jarayabhand, S., Jeftic, L., Jung,
605 R.T., Kinsey, S., Kusui, E.T., Lavine, I., Manyara, P., Oosterbaan, L., Pereira, M.A.,
606 Sheavly, S., Tkalin, A., Varadarajan, S., Wenneker, B., Westphalen, G., 2009. UNEP/IOC
607 Guidelines on Survey and Monitoring of Marine Litter. UNEP Regional Seas Reports and
608 Studies No. 186.

609 Chubarenko, I., Efimova, I., Bagaeva, M., Bagaev, A., Isachenko, I., 2020. On mechanical
610 fragmentation of single-use plastics in the sea swash zone with different types of
611 bottom sediments: Insights from laboratory experiments. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 150.
612 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.110726>

613 Cordova, M.R., Bernier, N., Yogaswara, D., Subandi, R., Wibowo, S.P.A., Kaisupy, M.T.,
614 Haulussy, J., 2023. Land-derived litter load to the Indian Ocean: a case study in the
615 Cimandiri River, southern West Java, Indonesia. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 195, 1251.
616 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-023-11831-4>

617 Cordova, M.R., Iskandar, M.R., Muhtadi, A., Nurhasanah, Saville, R., Riani, E., 2022a. Spatio-
618 temporal variation and seasonal dynamics of stranded beach anthropogenic debris on
619 Indonesian beach from the results of nationwide monitoring. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 182,
620 114035. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2022.114035>

621 Cordova, M.R., Nurhati, I.S., 2019. Major sources and monthly variations in the release of
622 land-derived marine debris from the Greater Jakarta area, Indonesia. *Sci. Rep.* 9, 18730.
623 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-55065-2>

624 Cordova, M.R., Nurhati, I.S., Riani, E., Nurhasanah, Iswari, M.Y., 2021. Unprecedented
625 plastic-made personal protective equipment (PPE) debris in river outlets into Jakarta
626 Bay during COVID-19 pandemic. *Chemosphere* 268, 129360.
627 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.129360>

628 Cordova, M.R., Nurhati, I.S., Shiimoto, A., Hatanaka, K., Saville, R., Riani, E., 2022b.
629 Spatiotemporal macro debris and microplastic variations linked to domestic waste and
630 textile industry in the supercritical Citarum River, Indonesia. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 175,
631 113338. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2022.113338>

632 Cordova, M.R., Riani, E., Shiimoto, A., 2020. Microplastics ingestion by blue panchax fish
633 (*Aplocheilichthys* sp.) from Ciliwung Estuary, Jakarta, Indonesia. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 161,
634 111763. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.111763>

635 Cordova, M.R., Ulu-muddin, Y.I., Purbonegoro, T., Puspitasari, R., Afianti, N.F., Rositasari, R.,
636 Yogaswara, D., Hafizt, M., Iswari, M.Y., Fitriya, N., Widyastuti, E., Harmesa, Lestari,

637 Kampono, I., Kaisupy, M.T., Wibowo, S.P.A., Subandi, R., Sani, S.Y., Sulistyowati, L.,
638 Nurhasanah, Muhtadi, A., Riani, E., Cragg, S.M., 2022c. Seasonal heterogeneity and a
639 link to precipitation in the release of microplastic during COVID-19 outbreak from the
640 Greater Jakarta area to Jakarta Bay, Indonesia. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 181, 113926.
641 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2022.113926>

642 Damanhuri, E., 2017. Country Chapter: The Republic of Indonesia, State of the 3Rs in Asia
643 and the Pacific. Nakamura-ku, Nagoya.

644 Damanhuri, E., Padmi, T., 2009. Current Situation of Waste Recycling in Indonesia, in:
645 Kojima, M. and E.D. (Ed.), 3R Policies for Southeast and East Asia. ERIA, Jakarta,
646 Indonesia, pp. 23–52.

647 De-la-Torre, G.E., Dioses-Salinas, D.C., Pizarro-Ortega, C.I., Santillán, L., 2021. New plastic
648 formations in the Anthropocene. *Sci. Total Environ.* 754.
649 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142216>

650 de Lange, S.I., Mellink, Y., Vriend, P., Tasserion, P.F., Begemann, F., Hauk, R., Aalderink, H.,
651 Hamers, E., Jansson, P., Joosse, N., Löhr, A.J., Lotcheris, R., Schreyers, L., Vos, V., van
652 Emmerik, T.H.M., 2023. Sample size requirements for riverbank macrolitter
653 characterization. *Front. Water* 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2022.1085285>

654 Deng, H., Wei, R., Luo, W., Hu, L., Li, B., Di, Y., Shi, H., 2020. Microplastic pollution in water
655 and sediment in a textile industrial area. *Environ. Pollut.* 258.
656 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113658>

657 Dimassi, S.N., Hahladakis, J.N., Yahia, M.N.D., Ahmad, M.I., Sayadi, S., Al-Ghouthi, M.A., 2022.
658 Degradation-fragmentation of marine plastic waste and their environmental
659 implications: A critical review. *Arab. J. Chem.* 15.
660 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2022.104262>

661 Dobler, D., Maes, C., Martinez, E., Rahmania, R., Gautama, B.G., Farhan, A.R., Dounias, E.,
662 2022. On the Fate of Floating Marine Debris Carried to the Sea through the Main Rivers
663 of Indonesia. *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.* <https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse10081009>

664 Dris, R., Imhof, H., Sanchez, W., Gasperi, J., Galgani, F., Tassin, B., Laforsch, C., 2015. Beyond
665 the ocean: Contamination of freshwater ecosystems with (micro-)plastic particles.
666 *Environ. Chem.* 12, 539–550. <https://doi.org/10.1071/EN14172>

667 Eerkes-Medrano, D., Thompson, R.C., Aldridge, D.C., 2015. Microplastics in freshwater
668 systems: A review of the emerging threats, identification of knowledge gaps and
669 prioritisation of research needs. *Water Res.* 75, 63–82.
670 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.02.012>

671 Emmerik, T., Schwarz, A., 2020. Plastic debris in rivers, in: WIREs Water.
672 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1398>

673 Fan, Y., Zheng, K., Zhu, Z., Chen, G., Peng, X., 2019. Distribution, sedimentary record, and
674 persistence of microplastics in the Pearl River catchment, China. *Environ. Pollut.* 251,
675 862–870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.056>

676 Franz, B., Freitas, M.A.V., 2012. Generation and impacts of floating litter on urban canals
677 and rivers: Rio de Janeiro megacity case study. *WIT Trans. Ecol. Environ.* 167, 321–332.

678 <https://doi.org/10.2495/ST110291>

679 Gall, S.C., Thompson, R.C., 2015. The impact of debris on marine life. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 92,
680 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.12.041>

681 Gardon, T., Reisser, C., Soyez, C., Quillien, V., Le Moullac, G., 2018. Microplastics Affect
682 Energy Balance and Gametogenesis in the Pearl Oyster *Pinctada margaritifera*. *Environ.*
683 *Sci. Technol.* 52, 5277–5286. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b00168>

684 Gasperi, J., Dris, R., Bonin, T., Rocher, V., Tassin, B., 2014. Assessment of floating plastic
685 debris in surface water along the Seine River. *Environ. Pollut.* 195, 163–166.
686 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2014.09.001>

687 GESAMP, 2019. Guidelines for the monitoring and assessment of plastic litter in the ocean
688 (Kershaw P.J., Turra A. and Galgani F. editors), GESAMP.

689 Gjyli, L., Kolitari, J., Miri, F., 2023. Macrolitter: Riverine Plastic Pollution at the Mouth of
690 Ishëm River (Albania), in: *The 7th International Conference of Recent Trends in*
691 *Environmental Science and Engineering (RTESE 2023)*. Ottawa, Canada, p. RTESE 171-1.
692 <https://doi.org/10.11159/rtese23.171>

693 Gjyli, L., Kolitari, J., Miri, F., Liedermann, M.G., Lala, B., 2022. Assessment of the abundance,
694 composition, and sources of riverine macrolitter of the Erzen River (Albania). pp. 271–
695 285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-323-85378-1.00014-3>

696 González-Fernández, D., Hanke, G., Kideys, A., Navarro-Ortega, A., Sanchez-Vidal, A.,
697 Brugère, A., Oztürk, B., Palma, C., Santinelli, C., Duijsings, D., Barcelo, D., Dimitiriu, E.,
698 Rojo-Nieto, E., Ferreira, F., Bessa, F., Suaria, G., Castro-Jiménez, J., Siedlewicz, G.,
699 Germano, J., Pereira, J., Rigueira, J., Pazdro, K., Cabrera, M., Pogojeva, M., Köck, M.,
700 Constant, M., Canals, M., Paraboschi, M., Tourgeli, M., Machitadze, N., Ratola, N.,
701 Savenko, O., Kerhervéc, P., Sempere, R., Bakiu, R., Crosti, R., Schoeneich-Argent, R.,
702 Landry, S., Agostinho, T., Segal, Y., Galletti, Y., 2018. Floating Macro Litter in European
703 Rivers -Top Items. Luxembourg. <https://doi.org/10.2760/316058>

704 Green, D.S., Boots, B., Da Silva Carvalho, J., Starkey, T., 2019. Cigarette butts have adverse
705 effects on initial growth of perennial ryegrass (gramineae: *Lolium perenne* L.) and white
706 clover (leguminosae: *Trifolium repens* L.). *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 182.
707 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2019.109418>

708 Haske-Cornelius, O., Pellis, A., Tegl, G., Wurz, S., Saake, B., Ludwig, R., Sebastian, A.,
709 Nyanhongo, G.S., Guebitz, G.M., 2017. Enzymatic systems for cellulose acetate
710 degradation. *Catalysts* 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/catal7100287>

711 Hohenblum, P., Frischenschlager, H., Reisinger, H., Konecny, R., Uhl, M., Mühlegger, S.,
712 Habersack, H., Liedermann, M., Gmeiner, P., Weidenhiller, B., Fischer, N., Rindler, R.,
713 2015. *Plastik in der Donau*. Vienna, Austria.

714 Honingh, D., 2018. Riverine debris: interactions between waste and hydrodynamics: Field
715 measurements and laboratory experiments for the Cikapundung River, Bandung. Delft
716 University of Technology.

717 Int-Veen, I., Nogueira, P., Isigkeit, J., Hanel, R., Kammann, U., 2021. Positively buoyant but
718 sinking: Polymer identification and composition of marine litter at the seafloor of the

719 North Sea and Baltic Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 172.
720 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.112876>

721 Iskandar, M.R., Cordova, M.R., Park, Y.-G., 2022. Pathways and destinations of floating
722 marine plastic debris from 10 major rivers in Java and Bali, Indonesia: A Lagrangian
723 particle tracking perspective. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 185, 114331.
724 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2022.114331>

725 Iskandar, M.R., Surinati, D., Cordova, M.R., Siong, K., 2021. Pathways of floating marine
726 debris in Jakarta Bay, Indonesia. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 169.
727 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.112511>

728 Jambeck, J.R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T.R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., Narayan, R.,
729 Law, K.L., 2015. Plastic Waste Input from Land into The Ocean. *Mar. Pollut.* 1655–1734.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415386.010>

731 Joly, F.X., Coulis, M., 2018. Comparison of cellulose vs. plastic cigarette filter decomposition
732 under distinct disposal environments. *Waste Manag.* 72, 349–353.
733 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.11.023>

734 K  ppler, A., Windrich, F., L  der, M.G.J., Malanin, M., Fischer, D., Labrenz, M., Eichhorn, K.J.,
735 Voit, B., 2015. Identification of microplastics by FTIR and Raman microscopy: a novel
736 silicon filter substrate opens the important spectral range below 1300 cm⁽⁻¹⁾ for FTIR
737 transmission measurements. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 407, 6791–6801.
738 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-8850-8>

739 Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan, 2023. Sistem Informasi Pengelolaan
740 Sampah Nasional (SIPSN) [WWW Document]. Sist. Inf. Pengelolaan Sampah Nas. URL
741 <https://sipsn.menlhk.go.id/sipsn/> (accessed 12.20.23).

742 Kiessling, T., Knickmeier, K., Kruse, K., Brennecke, D., Nauendorf, A., Thiel, M., 2019. Plastic
743 Pirates sample litter at rivers in Germany – Riverside litter and litter sources estimated
744 by schoolchildren. *Environ. Pollut.* 245, 545–557.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.11.025>

746 Knoblauch, D., Mederake, L., 2021. Government policies combatting plastic pollution. *Curr.*
747 *Opin. Toxicol.* 28, 87–96. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cotox.2021.10.003>

748 Kumar, A.A., Sivakumar, R., Reddy, Y.S.R., Bhagya Raja, M. V., Nishanth, T., Revanth, V.,
749 2016. Preliminary study on marine debris pollution along Marina beach, Chennai, India.
750 *Reg. Stud. Mar. Sci.* 5, 35–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsma.2016.01.002>

751 Lau, W.W.Y., Shiran, Y., Bailey, R.M., Cook, E., Stuchtey, M.R., Koskella, J., Velis, C.A.,
752 Godfrey, L., Boucher, J., Murphy, M.B., Thompson, R.C., Jankowska, E., Castillo, A.C.,
753 Pilditch, T.D., Dixon, B., Koerselman, L., Kosior, E., Favoino, E., Gutberlet, J., Baulch, S.,
754 Atreya, M.E., Fischer, D., He, K.K., Petit, M.M., Sumaila, U.R., Neil, E., Bernhofen, M. V.,
755 Lawrence, K., Palardy, J.E., 2020. Evaluating scenarios toward zero plastic pollution.
756 *Science* (80-.). 369. <https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ABA9475>

757 Lebreton, L.C.M., Andrady, A., 2019. Future scenarios of global plastic waste generation and
758 disposal. *Palgrave Commun.* 5. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0212-7>

759 Lechner, A., Ramler, D., 2015. The discharge of certain amounts of industrial microplastic

760 from a production plant into the River Danube is permitted by the Austrian legislation.
761 Environ. Pollut. 200, 159–160.
762 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.02.019>

763 Lippiatt, S., Opfer, S., Arthur, C., 2013. Marine Debris Monitoring and Assessment. NOAA
764 Technical Memorandum NOS-OR&R-46. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOS-OR&R-46 82.

765 Löder, M.G.J., Kuczera, M., Mintenig, S., Lorenz, C., Gerdts, G., 2015. Focal plane array
766 detector-based micro-Fourier-transform infrared imaging for the analysis of
767 microplastics in environmental samples. Environ. Chem. 12, 563–581.
768 <https://doi.org/10.1071/EN14205>

769 McIlgorm, A., Raubenheimer, K., McIlgorm, D.E., Nichols, R., 2022. The cost of marine litter
770 damage to the global marine economy: Insights from the Asia-Pacific into prevention
771 and the cost of inaction. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 174.
772 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.113167>

773 Meijer, L.J.J., van Emmerik, T., van der Ent, R., Schmidt, C., Lebreton, L., 2021. More than
774 1000 rivers account for 80% of global riverine plastic emissions into the ocean. Sci. Adv.
775 7, eaaz5803. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz5803>

776 Miller, E., Sedlak, M., Lin, D., Box, C., Holleman, C., Rochman, C.M., Sutton, R., 2021.
777 Recommended best practices for collecting, analyzing, and reporting microplastics in
778 environmental media: Lessons learned from comprehensive monitoring of San
779 Francisco Bay. J. Hazard. Mater. 409, 124770.
780 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.124770>

781 Nguyen, K.L.P., Bui, T.K.L., 2023. Riverbank macro-litters monitoring in downstream of
782 Saigon river, Ho Chi Minh City. Case Stud. Chem. Environ. Eng. 7.
783 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cscee.2023.100306>

784 Nurhasanah, Cordova, M.R., Riani, E., 2021. Micro- and mesoplastics release from the
785 Indonesian municipal solid waste landfill leachate to the aquatic environment: Case
786 study in Galuga Landfill Area, Indonesia. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 163, 111986.
787 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.111986>

788 O’Brine, T., Thompson, R.C., 2010. Degradation of plastic carrier bags in the marine
789 environment. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 60, 2279–2283.
790 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.08.005>

791 Omeyer, L.C.M., Duncan, E.M., Abreo, N.A.S., Acebes, J.M. V., AngSinco-Jimenez, L.A., Anuar,
792 S.T., Aragones, L. V., Araujo, G., Carrasco, L.R., Chua, M.A.H., Cordova, M.R., Dewanti,
793 L.P., Espiritu, E.Q., Garay, J.B., Germanov, E.S., Getliff, J., Horcajo-Berna, E., Ibrahim,
794 Y.S., Jaafar, Z., Janairo, J.I.B., Gyi, T.K., Krebs, D., Lim, C.L., Lyons, Y., Mustika, P.L.K., Neo,
795 M.L., Ng, S.Z.H., Pasaribu, B., Pariatamby, A., Peter, C., Porter, L., Purba, N.P., Santa
796 Cruz, E.T., Shams, S., Thompson, K.F., Torres, D.S., Westerlaken, R., Wongtawan, T.,
797 Godley, B.J., 2023. Interactions between marine megafauna and plastic pollution in
798 Southeast Asia. Sci. Total Environ. 874, 162502.
799 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162502>

800 Omeyer, L.C.M., Duncan, E.M., Aiamsomboon, K., Beaumont, N., Bureekul, S., Cao, B.,
801 Carrasco, L.R., Chavanich, S., Clark, J.R., Cordova, M.R., Couceiro, F., Cragg, S.M.,

802 Dickson, N., Failler, P., Ferraro, G., Fletcher, S., Fong, J., Ford, A.T., Gutierrez, T., Shahul
 803 Hamid, F., Hiddink, J.G., Hoa, P.T., Holland, S.I., Jones, L., Jones, N.H., Koldewey, H.,
 804 Lauro, F.M., Lee, C., Lewis, M., Marks, D., Matallana-Surget, S., Mayorga-Adame, C.G.,
 805 McGeehan, J., Messer, L.F., Michie, L., Miller, M.A., Mohamad, Z.F., Nor, N.H.M.,
 806 Müller, M., Neill, S.P., Nelms, S.E., Onda, D.F.L., Ong, J.J.L., Pariatamby, A., Phang, S.C.,
 807 Quilliam, R., Robins, P.E., Salta, M., Sartimbul, A., Shakuto, S., Skov, M.W., Taboada,
 808 E.B., Todd, P.A., Toh, T.C., Valiyaveetil, S., Viyakarn, V., Wonnapijit, P., Wood, L.E.,
 809 Yong, C.L.X., Godley, B.J., 2022. Priorities to inform research on marine plastic pollution
 810 in Southeast Asia. *Sci. Total Environ.* 841, 156704.
 811 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156704>

812 Owens, K.A., Kamil, P.I., 2020. Adapting Coastal Collection Methods for River Assessment to
 813 Increase Data on Global Plastic Pollution: Examples From India and Indonesia. *Front.*
 814 *Environ. Sci.* 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2019.00208>

815 Palmas, F., Cau, A., Podda, C., Musu, A., Serra, M., Pusceddu, A., Sabatini, A., 2022. Rivers of
 816 waste: Anthropogenic litter in intermittent Sardinian rivers, Italy (Central
 817 Mediterranean). *Environ. Pollut.* 302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119073>

818 PlasticsEurope, EPRO, 2021. Plastics - the Facts 2021 an analysis of European plastics
 819 production, demand and waste data. Plastics Europe (the Association of Plastics
 820 Manufacturers in Europe) and EPRO (the European Association of Plastics Recycling and
 821 Recovery Organisations), Brussels, Belgium.

822 Quartey, E.T., Tosefa, H., Danquah, K.A.B., Obrisalova, I., 2015. Theoretical framework for
 823 plastic waste management in Ghana through extended producer responsibility: Case of
 824 sachet water waste. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 12, 9907–9919.
 825 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120809907>

826 Rebischung, F., Chabot, L., Biaudet, H., Pandard, P., 2018. Cigarette butts: A small but
 827 hazardous waste, according to European regulation. *Waste Manag.* 82, 9–14.
 828 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.09.038>

829 Rech, S., Macaya-Caquilpán, V., Pantoja, J.F., Rivadeneira, M.M., Campodónico, C.K., Thiel,
 830 M., 2015. Sampling of riverine litter with citizen scientists — findings and
 831 recommendations. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 187. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4473-y)
 832 [4473-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4473-y)

833 Roebroek, C.T.J., Hut, R., Vriend, P., De Winter, W., Boonstra, M., Van Emmerik, T.H.M.,
 834 2021. Disentangling Variability in Riverbank Macrolitter Observations. *Environ. Sci.*
 835 *Technol.* 55, 4932–4942. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c08094>

836 Sadri, S.S., Thompson, R.C., 2014. On the quantity and composition of floating plastic debris
 837 entering and leaving the Tamar Estuary, Southwest England. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 81, 55–
 838 60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.02.020>

839 Santos, I.R., Friedrich, A.C., Ivar do Sul, J.A., 2009. Marine debris contamination along
 840 undeveloped tropical beaches from northeast Brazil. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 148, 455–
 841 462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-008-0175-z>

842 Schneider, F., Kunz, A., Hu, C.S., Yen, N., Lin, H.T., 2021. Rapid-survey methodology to assess
 843 litter volumes along large river systems—a case study of the Tamsui river in Taiwan.

844 Sustain. 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13168765>

845 Schöneich-Argent, R.I., Dau, K., Freund, H., 2020. Wasting the North Sea? – A field-based
846 assessment of anthropogenic macrolitter loads and emission rates of three German
847 tributaries. *Environ. Pollut.* 263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114367>

848 Seo, S., Park, Y.-G., 2020. Destination of floating plastic debris released from ten major rivers
849 around the Korean Peninsula. *Environ. Int.* 138, 105655.
850 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105655>

851 Shen, M., Li, Y., Song, B., Zhou, C., Gong, J., Zeng, G., 2021. Smoked cigarette butts:
852 Unignorable source for environmental microplastic fibers. *Sci. Total Environ.* 791.
853 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148384>

854 Siegfried, M., Koelmans, A.A., Besseling, E., Kroeze, C., 2017. Export of microplastics from
855 land to sea. A modelling approach. *Water Res.* 127, 249–257.
856 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.10.011>

857 Simeonova, A., Chuturkova, R., 2019. Marine litter accumulation along the Bulgarian Black
858 Sea coast: Categories and predominance. *Waste Manag.* 84, 182–193.
859 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.11.001>

860 Simmons, E.C., Fielding, K.S., 2019. Psychological predictors of fishing and waste
861 management intentions in Indonesian coastal communities. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 65.
862 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2019.101324>

863 Song, Y.K., Hong, S.H., Jang, M., Han, G.M., Jung, S.W., Shim, W.J., 2017. Combined Effects of
864 UV Exposure Duration and Mechanical Abrasion on Microplastic Fragmentation by
865 Polymer Type. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 51, 4368–4376.
866 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b06155>

867 Thompson, R.C., 2015. Microplastics in the marine environment: Sources, consequences and
868 solutions, in: Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M. (Eds.), *Marine Anthropogenic Litter*.
869 Springer, Cham, pp. 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3_7

870 Thushari, G.G.N., Chavanich, S., Yakupitiyage, A., 2017. Coastal debris analysis in beaches of
871 Chonburi Province, eastern of Thailand as implications for coastal conservation. *Mar.*
872 *Pollut. Bull.* 116, 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.12.056>

873 Torkashvand, J., Farzadkia, M., Sobhi, H.R., Esrafil, A., 2020. Littered cigarette butt as a well-
874 known hazardous waste: A comprehensive systematic review. *J. Hazard. Mater.* 383,
875 121242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121242>

876 Toussaint, B., Raffael, B., Angers-Loustau, A., Gilliland, D., Kestens, V., Petrillo, M., Rio-
877 Echevarria, I.M., Van den Eede, G., 2019. Review of micro- and nanoplastic
878 contamination in the food chain. *Food Addit. Contam. - Part A Chem. Anal. Control.*
879 *Expo. Risk Assess.* 36, 639–673. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2019.1583381>

880 Tramoy, R., Blin, E., Poitou, I., Noûs, C., Tassin, B., Gasperi, J., 2022. Riverine litter in a small
881 urban river in Marseille, France: Plastic load and management challenges. *Waste*
882 *Manag.* 140, 154–163. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2022.01.015>

883 Tramoy, R., Gasperi, J., Colasse, L., Noûs, C., Tassin, B., 2021. Transfer dynamics of

884 macroplastics in estuaries – New insights from the Seine estuary: Part 3. What fate for
885 macroplastics? *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.112513>

886 Tun, T.Z., Nurlatifah, Htwe, A.T., Than, N.N., Khine, M.M., Chavanich, S., Viyakarn, V., Isobe,
887 A., Nakata, H., 2023. Polymer types and additive concentrations in single-use plastic
888 products collected from Indonesia, Japan, Myanmar, and Thailand. *Sci. Total Environ.*
889 889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.163983>

890 van Emmerik, T., Kieu-Le, T.C., Loozen, M., Oeveren, K. van, Strady, E., Bui, X.T., Egger, M.,
891 Gasperi, J., Lebreton, L., Nguyen, P.D., Schwarz, A., Slat, B., Tassin, B., 2018. A
892 methodology to characterize riverine macroplastic emission into the ocean. *Front. Mar.*
893 *Sci.* 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00372>

894 van Emmerik, T., Tramoy, R., van Calcar, C., Alligant, S., Treilles, R., Tassin, B., Gasperi, J.,
895 2019. Seine Plastic Debris Transport Tenfolded During Increased River Discharge. *Front.*
896 *Mar. Sci.* 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00642>

897 Wardhana, Y.M.A., 2020. Dana lingkungan untuk pengelolaan sampah via pembangkit listrik
898 tenaga sampah [WWW Document]. URL
899 [https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20200613/9/1252175/dana-lingkungan-untuk-](https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20200613/9/1252175/dana-lingkungan-untuk-pengelolaan-sampah-via-pembangkit-listrik-tenaga-sampah)
900 [pengelolaan-sampah-via-pembangkit-listrik-tenaga-sampah](https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20200613/9/1252175/dana-lingkungan-untuk-pengelolaan-sampah-via-pembangkit-listrik-tenaga-sampah) (accessed 4.1.21).

901 Watkins, E., ten Brink, P., Withana, S., Mutafoğlu, K., Schweitzer, J.-P., Russi, D., Kettunen,
902 M., 2015. Marine litter: socio-economic study. Scoping report, Institute for European
903 Environmental Policy.

904 Williams, A.T., Rangel-Buitrago, N., 2019. Marine litter: Solutions for a major environmental
905 problem. *J. Coast. Res.* 35, 648–663. <https://doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-18-00096.1>

906 Williams, A.T., Simmons, S.L., 1999. Sources of riverine litter: The river Taff, South Wales,
907 UK. *Water. Air. Soil Pollut.* 112, 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005000724803>

908 Wright, S.L., Kelly, F.J., 2017. Plastic and Human Health: A Micro Issue? *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
909 51, 6634–6647. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b00423>

910