

# RESSALVA

Atendendo solicitação do autor,  
o texto completo desta tese será  
disponibilizado somente a partir  
de 8/03/2026



Universidade Estadual Paulista  
Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas  
Departamento de Ciências Biológicas  
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Biodiversidade



NATAN GUILHERME DOS SANTOS

**Suscetibilidade do zooplâncton ao uso do solo, às aplicações de agrotóxicos e  
vinhaça: análise da diversidade funcional e taxonômica**

São José do Rio Preto, SP  
2024

NATAN GUILHERME DOS SANTOS

**Susceptibility of zooplankton to land use, pesticide and vinasse applications: analysis of functional and taxonomic diversity**

Tese apresentada como parte dos requisitos para obtenção do título de Doutor em Biodiversidade, junto ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Biodiversidade do Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas da Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho”, Câmpus de São José do Rio Preto.

Financiadora: CNPq – Proc. 141102/2020-9  
FAPESP  
CAPES

**Advisor:** Prof. Dra. Maria Stela Maioli Castilho Noll  
**CoAdvisor** Prof. Dr. Evaldo Luiz Gaeta Espíndola

São José do Rio Preto  
2024

S237s

Santos, Natan Guilherme dos

Susceptibility of zooplankton to land use, pesticide and vinasse applications: analysis of functional and taxonomic diversity / Natan Guilherme dos Santos. -- São José do Rio Preto, 2024

310 p. : il., tabs., fotos, mapas

Tese (doutorado) - Universidade Estadual Paulista (Unesp), Instituto de Biociências Letras e Ciências Exatas, São José do Rio Preto

Orientadora: Maria Stela Maioli Castillho-Noll

Coorientador: Evaldo Luiz Gaeta Espíndola

1. Impacto Ambiental. 2. Agrotóxicos. 3. Cladocera. 4. Copepoda. 5. Rotífera. I. Título.

Sistema de geração automática de fichas catalográficas da Unesp. Biblioteca do Instituto de Biociências Letras e Ciências Exatas, São José do Rio Preto. Dados fornecidos pelo autor(a).

Essa ficha não pode ser modificada.

NATAN GUILHERME DOS SANTOS

**Susceptibility of zooplankton to land use, pesticide and vinasse applications:  
analysis of functional and taxonomic diversity**

Tese apresentada como parte dos requisitos para  
obtenção do título de Doutor em Biodiversidade,  
junto ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em  
Biodiversidade do Instituto de Biociências,  
Letras e Ciências Exatas da Universidade  
Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho”,  
Câmpus de São José do Rio Preto.

Financiadora: CNPq – Proc. 141102/2020-9  
FAPESP  
CAPES

Comissão Examinadora

Profa. Dra. Maria Stela Maioli Castilho Noll  
Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP/IBILCE) - Orientadora

Profa. Dra. Eneida Maria Eskinazi Sant’Anna  
Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto (UFOP) – (Membro Titular)

Prof. Dra. María Florencia Gutierrez  
CONICET Instituto Nacional de Limnologia (CONICET-UNL) – (Membro Titular)

Prof. Dr. Gilmar Perbiche-Neves  
Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar) – (Membro Titular)

Profa. Dra. Claudia Bonecker  
Universidade Estadual de Maringá (UEM) – (Membro Titular)

Profa. Dra. Raquel Aparecida Moreira  
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (FURG) – (Membro Suplente)

Profa. Dra. Francieli de Fátima Bomfim  
Universidade Federal do Pará (UFPA) – (Membro Suplente)

Prof. Dr. Nadson Ressayé Simões  
Universidade Federal do Sul da Bahia (UFSB) – (Membro Suplente)

São José do Rio Preto  
08 de março de 2024

Dedico esta tese a minha mãe, a minha irmã e ao meu pai,  
pelo apoio diário durante a minha trajetória de vida e  
por sempre serem o suporte as minhas decisões e escolhas.

## EPÍGRAFES

Andar com fé eu vou que a fé não  
costuma faiá (Gilberto Gil)

Don't stop me, don't stop me Have  
a good time good time (Queen)

All you need is love, love.  
Love is all you need (The Beatles)

Se a educação sozinha não transforma  
a sociedade, sem ela tampouco a  
sociedade muda (Paulo Freire)

Não diga que a canção está perdida  
Tenha fé em Deus, tenha fé na vida  
Tente outra vez (Raul Seixas)

We are the champions, my friends and  
we'll keep on fighting till the end (Queen)

Sou feliz, alegre e forte  
Tenho amor e sorte  
Aonde quer que eu vá (Marisa Monte)

Quem tem um amigo tem tudo  
Se o poço devorar, ele busca no fundo  
(Emicida)

Você é o único representante  
Do seu sonho na face da terra (Emicida)

Ser você é a única forma de viver

Tenho sangrado demais  
Tenho chorado pra cachorro  
Ano passado eu morri  
Mas esse ano eu não morro (Belchior)

## AGRADECIMENTOS

São inúmeras as pessoas que gostaria de agradecer por ter conseguido concluir este doutorado. Aqui, registro algumas que foram essenciais durante esse período. Talvez eu possa esquecer algumas, mas elas sabem que também foram importantes para mim.

À minha fé, por me manter firme diante de todas as dificuldades e por me fazer sempre acreditar em um mundo melhor.

À minha família, minha mãe, minha irmã e meu pai, que sempre me apoiaram nos estudos, mesmo as vezes nem entendendo o que é o zooplâncton.

À minha eterna UNESP, que durante a graduação e pós-graduação me proporcionou incontáveis amizades que perduram até os dias de hoje.

À minha orientadora pela orientação, conhecimento e ensinamentos durante o meu doutorado. Obrigado por me fazer enxergar a importância do ensino, pesquisa e extensão para me tornar um futuro professor de excelência.

Aos meus amigos lezados, membros do Laboratório de Ecologia de Zooplâncton da Unesp/Ibilce. Laura, Pedrinho, Camila Godoy, Turcs, Brendown, Liboni, Calixto, Pedrão, Camila Soares, Larissa, Lauana e Taís, por toda experiência de vida, como coletas, confraternização, risadas, que tornaram o caminhar do doutorado mais leve.

A todos os meus filhos científicos, Laura, Pedrinho, Camila Godoy, Turcs, Brendown, Liboni, Calixto e Camila Soares. Em especial, os meus filhos científicos primogênitos, Laura e Pedrinho, que despertaram a paixão de orientar e sempre toparam as minhas loucuras científicas. Ao Brendown e Liboni por me ajudarem na organização das referências e tabelas.

Ao meu coorientador Prof. Evaldo da USP por ter confiado em mim para analisar as amostras do projeto temático e sua equipe pela execução dos experimentos, em especial a Laís Lopes, Isabelle Freitas e o Allan Ogura, pessoas as quais tiver maior contato durante a realização desta tese.

À Susan Casement pela revisão do inglês dos manuscritos.

A todos os meus alunos das disciplinas de Limnologia, Ecologia de Zooplâncton e Ecologia Geral que ministrei como professor. Vocês foram essenciais para a minha formação como professor.

À minha psicóloga, que me acompanha desde o início do mestrado e me fez enxergar os meus objetivos de vida e por ter me ajudado a curar e ressignificar diversos momentos da minha vida.

Ao Dy, que me fez ter momentos de paz e parceria ao final desta tese.



As minhas amigas, Barbara, Akemi e Monique, pelas amizades de anos e que posso contar para a vida toda.

As meninas do handebol, Lalá, There, Leda, Camila, Ana, Dani e as agregadas, por todos os momentos de descontração.

A todos os meus amigos do handebol, em especial ao Prego, Paulo, Elton, Matheus, Sassá, Marreta, Kexu, Belini, Yagor, pelos momentos de descontraídos e os vividos em InterUnesp.

A todos os atletas do handebol da UNESP, FAMERP e FACERES, por todos os momentos vividos no handebol.

Ao quinteto fantástico, amigas da graduação que mantenho até hoje, em especial a Jacque.

As minhas queridas amigas do cursinho pela amizade de anos, em especial a companheira de vida acadêmica Dana.

As minhas amigas Aninha e Yasmim.

A todos que não mencionei (por ter esquecido) e que fizeram meu caminho mais tranquilo e leve ao longo da vida.

Ao Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) pela bolsa de doutorado concedida (nº 141102/2020-9).

À Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) pelo suporte financeiro ao projeto temático do meu coorientador Prof. Evaldo (2015/18790-3).

Ao Programa de PPG Biodiversidade e a Capes.

## RESUMO

DOS SANTOS, N.G. **Suscetibilidade do zooplâncton ao uso do solo, às aplicações de agrotóxicos e de vinhaça: análise da diversidade funcional e taxonômica.** 2024. Tese de Doutorado, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Biodiversidade, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas, São José do Rio Preto, São Paulo, Brasil.

O uso e manejo do solo são um dos principais impactos às comunidades aquáticas e terrestres na atualidade. Dentre os diferentes usos do solo, os usos para plantações e pastagens são um dos mais impactantes, uma vez que utilizam agroquímicos, como inseticidas, herbicidas e fertilizantes, além da vinhaça, empregada como fertilizante natural nos cultivos de cana de açúcar no Brasil. Esses pesticidas e vinhaça podem ser carregados aos corpos aquáticos e impactar as comunidades aquáticas e os parâmetros da água. Diante disso, o objetivo principal dessa tese de doutorado foi avaliar a suscetibilidade do zooplâncton ao uso do solo, às aplicações de agrotóxicos e à vinhaça utilizando análises da diversidade funcional e taxonômica. Para atingir esse objetivo foram realizados estudos que resultaram na elaboração de 4 artigos com 3 abordagens, sendo elas: uma revisão de ciênciometria, análise de dados coletados em campo e dois experimentos de mesocosmos. O primeiro artigo teve como objetivo apresentar um panorama global dos estudos sobre os efeitos do uso da terra sobre as comunidades zooplânctônicas de água doce, por meio da ciênciometria e de uma síntese dos principais conhecimentos produzidos em artigos publicados sobre o tema. Após a seleção, chegamos a um total de 80 artigos, revelando que este número tem aumentado ao longo do tempo, especialmente nos EUA, Polónia, Canadá, China, Argentina e Brasil. O uso da terra para plantações, pastagem e urbanização tem demonstrado ter um impacto negativo nas comunidades de zooplâncton. A presença de vegetação natural circundante em ambientes aquáticos tem demonstrado contribuir para uma maior diversidade taxonômica e funcional do zooplâncton. O segundo artigo teve como objetivo avaliar o efeito dos parâmetros da água de oito reservatórios inseridos em uma paisagem agropastoril sobre a estrutura funcional do zooplâncton. Os modelos mistos aditivos generalizados revelaram que o pH e o nitrogênio total são variáveis chave para a estruturação funcional do zooplâncton. No terceiro artigo foi realizado um experimento com simulações realísticas de uso e manejo do solo com a construção de mesocosmos. Este estudo teve como objetivo verificar os efeitos do uso e manejo do solo em pastagem extensiva, pastagem intensiva e cana-de-açúcar sobre a estrutura taxonômica e funcional do zooplâncton e analisar quais parâmetros da água estruturam o zooplâncton sob a influência de cada tipo de uso do solo. Nos usos do solo para pastagem intensiva e cana de açúcar houve uma redução da diversidade de Shannon e da riqueza funcional entre o início e o final do experimento. O pH foi o parâmetro mais importante na estruturação das comunidades zooplânctônicas, sendo a única variável estruturante presente em todos os tratamentos. O quarto artigo teve como objetivo avaliar os efeitos do fipronil, do 2,4-D e da vinhaça, isoladamente ou em misturas, sobre a diversidade do zooplâncton e identificar os parâmetros da água que estruturam a comunidade. Foi realizado um experimento em mesocosmos com seis tratamentos e três réplicas: controle (C), 2,4-D (D), fipronil (F), fipronil e 2,4-D (M), vinhaça (V) e todos os compostos (MV). Após a aplicação dos compostos, a riqueza de espécies, a diversidade de Shannon-Wiener, a riqueza e a dispersão funcional foram significativamente mais baixas nos tratamentos F, M, MV e V do que nos tratamentos C e D durante o experimento. Os parâmetros estruturais da água foram diferentes para cada tratamento. No tratamento C, a temperatura e a clorofila foram as variáveis estruturantes. No tratamento D, a turbidez e o pH foram as principais variáveis. A clorofila a foi a principal variável estruturante no tratamento F, enquanto o pH e a condutividade elétrica foram as variáveis estruturantes nos tratamentos MV e V,

respectivamente. Os resultados desta tese destacam os impactos deletérios do uso e manejo do solo para pastagens e cana de açúcar e da aplicação de inseticida e vinhaça. Além disso, dependendo do tipo de uso do solo ou da aplicação de pesticida e de vinhaça os parâmetros da água que estruturam o zooplâncton serão diferentes, destacando o pH e a condutividade elétrica como os mais frequentes. As práticas agrícolas, uso e manejo do solo e aplicações de pesticidas ou vinhaça, reduzem a diversidade taxonômica e funcional do zooplâncton contribuindo para a perda de funções ecossistêmicas. Portanto, novas práticas sustentáveis de manejo e uso do solo precisam ser adotadas para diminuir os efeitos negativos sobre as comunidades aquáticas e, consequentemente, contribuir para a manutenção e conservação da biodiversidade aquática e das funções ecossistêmicas.

**Palavras-chave:** Impactos Ambientais. Paisagem. Inseticida. Herbicida. Cladocera. Copepoda. Rotifera.

## ABSTRACT

DOS SANTOS, N.G. **Susceptibility of zooplankton to land use, pesticide and vinasse applications: analysis of functional and taxonomic diversity**. 2024. Doctoral thesis, Postgraduate Program in Biodiversity, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas, São José do Rio Preto, São Paulo, Brazil.

Land use and management is one of the most important impacts on aquatic and terrestrial communities today. Among the different land uses, sugarcane crops and pastures are one of the most impactful because they use agrochemicals such as insecticides, herbicides and fertilizers, as well as vinasse, which is used as a natural fertilizer in sugarcane crops in Brazil. These pesticides and vinasse can be carried into water bodies and affect aquatic communities and water parameters. Against this background, the main objective of this thesis was to assess the sensitivity of zooplankton to land use, pesticide applications and vinasse using functional and taxonomic diversity analyses. To achieve this objective, studies were carried out that resulted in the preparation of 4 articles with 3 approaches: a review of scientometrics, analysis of data collected in the field and two mesocosm experiments. The aim of the first article was to provide a global overview of studies on the effects of land use on freshwater zooplankton communities, using scientometrics and a synthesis of the main findings in articles published on the subject. After selection, we arrived at a total of 80 articles, showing that this number has increased over time, especially in the USA, Poland, Canada, China, Argentina and Brazil. Land use for cropland, pasture and urbanization have been shown to have a negative impact on zooplankton communities. The presence of surrounding natural vegetation in aquatic environments has been shown to contribute to greater taxonomic and functional diversity of zooplankton. The second article aimed to evaluate the effect of water parameters of eight reservoirs inserted in an agropastoral landscape on the functional structure of zooplankton. The generalized additive mixed models revealed that pH and total nitrogen are key variables for the functional structuring of zooplankton. In the third article, an experiment with realistic simulations of land use and management was carried out using mesocosms. The aim of this study was to verify the effects of land use and management in extensive pasture, intensive pasture and sugarcane on the taxonomic and functional structure of zooplankton and to analyze which water parameters structure zooplankton under the influence of each type of land use. Intensive pasture and sugarcane land use showed a reduction in Shannon's diversity and functional richness between the beginning and the end of the experiment. pH was the most important parameter in structuring zooplankton communities, being the only structuring variable present in all treatments. The fourth article aimed to evaluate the effects of fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse, alone or in mixtures, on zooplankton diversity and to identify the water parameters that structure the community. A mesocosm experiment was conducted with six treatments and three replicates: control (C), 2,4-D (D), fipronil (F), fipronil and 2,4-D (M), vinasse (V) and all compounds (MV). After application of the compounds, species richness, Shannon-Wiener diversity, richness and functional dispersion were significantly lower in the F, M, MV and V treatments than in the C and D treatments during the experiment. The structural parameters of the water were different for each treatment. In treatment C, temperature and chlorophyll were the structuring variables. In treatment D, turbidity and pH were the main structuring variables. Chlorophyll a was the main structuring variable in treatment F, while pH and electrical conductivity were the structuring variables in treatments MV and V, respectively. The results of this work highlight the detrimental effects of land use and management for pasture and sugarcane, as well as the application of insecticides and vinasse. In addition, depending on the type of land use or application of pesticides and vinasse, the water parameters

that structure the zooplankton will be different, with pH and electrical conductivity being the most common. Agricultural practices, land use and management, and pesticide or vinasse applications reduce the taxonomic and functional diversity of zooplankton, contributing to the loss of ecosystem functions. Therefore, new sustainable land use and management practices need to be adopted to reduce the negative impacts on aquatic communities and thus contribute to the maintenance and conservation of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystem functions.

Keywords: Environmental Impact. Landscape. Insecticide. Herbicide. Cladocera. Copepoda. Rotifera.

## List of Figures

### Chapter 1 – How land use affects freshwater zooplankton communities: A global overview

Figure 1. Studies on the impact of land use on the zooplankton community. A. Number of papers over time. B. Percentage contribution of continents to land-use studies over time. C. Percentage of land-use types studied over time.

Figure 2. Number of studies carried out in countries that have evaluated the effects of land use on zooplankton. Darker colors indicate higher numbers of studies.

Figure S1. - Contribution of publications on the effect of land use on zooplankton by continent.

Figure S2. - Number of articles published evaluating the effect of land use on zooplankton by country.

Figure S3. - Types of land use and contribution by continent.

Figure S4. - Types of environments. A) Most frequently studied. B) Contribution of each type of land use by environment.

### Chapter 2 – Total nitrogen and pH are key variables for functional structure of zooplanktonic communities in an agropastoral landscape

Figure 1. Maps showing the study area of eight reservoirs within an agropastoral landscape and located in the northwest of the state of São Paulo, Brazil.

Figure 2. The best fitted models for indices functional diversity. A. Relationship between FRic and total nitrogen and pH. B. Relationship between FEve and total phosphorus and pH. C. Relationship between FDiv and total nitrogen, pH and dissolved oxygen.

Figure 3. Redundancy analysis (RDA) of the density of the functional traits constrained by environmental factors; A relationships between the trait body size and environmental vectors; B relationships between the trait feeding type and environmental vectors. Full name of sampling sites can be found in Table 1. Abbreviation defined as follows: TN, total nitrogen; lim, limnetic; lit, littoral; filt.rot, filtration rotifer; rap.rot, raptorial rotifer; rap.cop, raptorial copepod; filt.cop, filtration copepod; filt.clad, filtration cladoceran; scraper.clad, scraper cladoceran.

Appendix C: Figure 1. Density of the zooplankton community according to different size categories (big, medium and small) observed in different types of land uses (citrus, pasture and sugarcane). No difference was observed between the different types of land uses ( $F = 2.50$  ;  $P = 0.068$ ).

Appendix C: Figure 2. Density of the zooplankton community according to feeding type categories (filtration-clad, filtration-cop, filtration-r, raptorial-cop, raptorial-r and scraper-clad) observed in different types of land uses (citrus, pasture and sugarcane). The density of the

feeding type trait was different between land uses ( $F = 3.62$  ;  $P = 0.01$ ). Abbreviation defined as follows: clad, cladoceran; cop, copepod; rot, rotifer.

Appendix C: Figure 3. Density of the zooplankton community according to the trophic group (carnivore, herbivore and omnivore) observed in different types of land uses (citrus, pasture and sugarcane). No difference was observed between the different types of land uses ( $F = 3.08$  ;  $P = 0.078$ ).

Appendix C: Figure 4. Density of the zooplankton community according to habitat occupied in an environmental aquatic (limnetic, littoral and littoral-limnetic) observed in different types of land uses (citrus, pasture and sugarcane). No difference was observed between the different types of land uses ( $F = 0.92$  ;  $P = 0.50$ ).

### **Chapter 3 – How does soil management for pasture and sugarcane affect zooplankton and its relationship with water structuring parameters?**

Figure 1. A) View of the area where the experiment was conducted. Each plot represents a sampling unit with a mesocosm in the center. EP = Extensive Pasture; IP = Intensive Pasture and SC = Sugarcane Crop. The black lines indicate the separation of each treatment. B) View of the area of each mesocosm placed in the center of each sampling unit.

Figure 2. Water parameters responsible for structuring taxonomic diversity in each treatment. A) Structuring variables in the EP treatment. B) Structuring variables in the IP treatment. C) Structuring variables in the SC treatment.

Figure 3. Water parameters responsible for structuring functional diversity in each treatment. A) Structuring variables in the EP treatment. B) Structuring variables in the IP treatment. C) Structuring variables in the SC treatment.

### **Chapter 4 – Using a mesocosm approach to evaluate the effects on the zooplankton community of applying fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse and to assess the relationship between application and water parameters.**

Figure 1. Effects of treatments on diversity indices over time. A) Effect on species richness B) Effect on Shannon-Wiener diversity C) Effect on functional richness D) Effect on functional dispersion. The points represent the mean, and the vertical lines of the points represent the standard deviation.

Figure 2. Structuring water parameters of taxonomic and functional diversity indices for each treatment. A) Structuring water parameters for treatment C. B) Structuring water parameters for treatment D. C) Structuring water parameters for treatment F.

Figure 3. Structuring water parameters of taxonomic and functional diversity indices for each treatment. A) Structuring water parameters for treatment M. B) Structuring water parameters for treatment MV. C) Structuring water parameters for treatment V.

## List of Tables

### **Chapter 1 – How land use affects freshwater zooplankton communities: A global overview**

Table 1. Main results of papers evaluating land-use effects on zooplankton communities over time

Table S1 – Type and size (meters) of buffers used in different types of environments in studies assessing the effect of land use on zooplankton. () = number of times the size was used.

Table S2 - Incidence of the indices used to estimate the effect of land use on the zooplankton community.

### **Chapter 2 – Total nitrogen and pH are key variables for functional structure of zooplanktonic communities in an agropastoral landscape**

Table 1- Code, city, land use and physical and chemical parameters of the water of each reservoir located at an agropastoral landscape in the countryside of the southeastern Brazil.

Table 2 - Parameters of the best fitted models that explain the effect of environmental variables from agropastoral landscapes on the functional diversity of zooplankton. FRic: Richness Functional; FEve: Functional Evenness and FDiv: Functional Divergence. \* Significance level for  $P < 0.05$ .

Appendix A: Table 1- Species list and functional traits of the zooplankton community collected in eight reservoirs inserted in agropastoral landscapes.

Appendix A: Table 2: Parameters used to select the best fitted Generalized Additive Mixed Model (GAMM) for Functional Richness (FRic). Functional Evenness (FEve). Functional Divergence (FDiv); DV = dependent variable; IV = independent variable; SCS = spatial autocorrelation structure;  $s$  = smooth term for GAMM;  $te$  = smoothing full tensor for GAMM; FC = false convergence; NC = no convergence; SC = singular convergence.

Appendix B: Table 1 - Parameters used to select the best fitted Generalized Additive Mixed Model (GAMM) for functional diversity.

### **Chapter 3 – How does soil management for pasture and sugarcane affect zooplankton and its relationship with water structuring parameters?**

Table 1 - Mean, standard deviation (sd), minimum (min) and maximum (max) values of water parameters in each treatment. EP = Extensive Pasture; IP = Intensive Pasture and SC = Sugarcane Crop.

Table 2 - Means and standard deviations of taxonomic and functional diversity indexes at the beginning and end of the experiment. P values in bold indicate significant differences in the



index between treatments at the beginning and end of the experiment. EP = Extensive Pasture; IP = Intensive Pasture and SC = Sugarcane Crop.

Table 3 - Comparison of the average index values between the beginning and the end of the experiment. - = indicates a decrease and + an increase. Bold P values indicate significant differences.

Table S1 - List of the species and the functional traits of the zooplankton community that were found in the experiment.

Table S2 - Parameters used to select the best linear mixed models (GLMM) for taxonomic and functional diversity indices. Model combinations were based on the analysis of the full model (including all water variables). Collinearity between water variables was checked. The water variables that were collinear were removed from the full model. Subsequently, the variables that showed an influence (P value) on the indices were combined with each other. Then, each variable was analyzed individually. To select the best models, only homoscedastic and linear models (Dharma function), models with significant variables and the lowest AICC value were considered. temp = temperature; do = dissolved oxygen; turbidity; ec = electrical conductivity; cla = chlorophyll a; tn = total nitrogen and tp = total phosphorus.

#### **Chapter 4 – Using a mesocosm approach to evaluate the effects of application of fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse on the zooplankton community and its relationship with water parameters.**

Table 1 - Mean and standard deviation ( $\pm$ ) of the environmental variables per treatment at the beginning (day 0), in the middle (day 14) and at the end (day 74) of the experiment. C = control treatment with no pesticide or vinasse application; F = fipronil insecticide application; D = 2,4-D herbicide application; M = combined insecticide and herbicide application; V = vinasse application; and MV = combined insecticide, herbicide and vinasse application.

Table S1 - List of the species and the functional traits of the zooplankton community that were found in the experiment.

Table S2 - Parameters used to select the best linear mixed models (GLMM) for taxonomic and functional diversity indices. Model combinations were based on the analysis of the full model (including all water variables). Collinearity between water variables was checked. The water variables that were collinear were removed from the full model. Subsequently, the variables that showed an influence (P value) on the indices were combined with each other. Then, each variable was analyzed individually. To select the best models, only homoscedastic and linear models (Dharma function), models with significant variables and the lowest AICC value were considered. temp = temperature; do = dissolved oxygen; turbidity; cond = electrical conductivity; cla = chlorophyll a; tn = total nitrogen and tp = total phosphorus.

## SUMMARY

|                                                                                                                                         |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>1 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS</b> .....                                                                                                  | 18  |
| <b>2 GENERAL INTRODUCTION</b> .....                                                                                                     | 19  |
| 2.1 Impact of land use on communities .....                                                                                             | 19  |
| 2.2 Impact of pesticides and vinasse on communities .....                                                                               | 24  |
| <b>3 HYPOTHESIS</b> .....                                                                                                               | 28  |
| <b>4 GENERAL OBJECTIVE</b> .....                                                                                                        | 29  |
| 4.1 Specific objectives .....                                                                                                           | 29  |
| <b>5 References</b> .....                                                                                                               | 30  |
| <b>6 CHAPTER 1</b> .....                                                                                                                | 44  |
| <b>How land use affects freshwater zooplankton communities: A global overview</b> .....                                                 | 44  |
| 6.1 Introduction.....                                                                                                                   | 46  |
| 6.2 Materials and methods .....                                                                                                         | 49  |
| 6.2.1 Search process .....                                                                                                              | 49  |
| 6.2.2 Eligibility, filtering and data extraction .....                                                                                  | 49  |
| 6.3 Results.....                                                                                                                        | 50  |
| 6.4 Discussion .....                                                                                                                    | 62  |
| 6.5 Conclusions.....                                                                                                                    | 69  |
| 6.6 References.....                                                                                                                     | 71  |
| 6.7 Supplementary Material.....                                                                                                         | 99  |
| <b>7 CHAPTER 2</b> .....                                                                                                                | 103 |
| <b>Total nitrogen and pH are key variables for functional structure of zooplanktonic communities in an agropastoral landscape</b> ..... | 103 |
| 7.1 Introduction.....                                                                                                                   | 106 |
| 7.2 Material and Methods .....                                                                                                          | 108 |
| 7.2.1 Study area.....                                                                                                                   | 108 |
| 7.2.2 Sampling design .....                                                                                                             | 109 |
| 7.2.3 Functional traits.....                                                                                                            | 110 |
| 7.2.4 Statistical analyses.....                                                                                                         | 111 |
| 7.3 Results.....                                                                                                                        | 112 |
| 7.4 Discussion .....                                                                                                                    | 111 |
| 7.5 Conclusions.....                                                                                                                    | 114 |
| 7.6 References.....                                                                                                                     | 115 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 7.7 Appendix A.....                                                                                                                                                                 | 128        |
| 7.8 Appendix B - .....                                                                                                                                                              | 137        |
| 7.9 Appendix C - .....                                                                                                                                                              | 156        |
| <b>8 CHAPTER 3.....</b>                                                                                                                                                             | <b>159</b> |
| <b>How does soil management for pasture and sugarcane affect zooplankton and its relationship with water structuring parameters?.....</b>                                           | <b>159</b> |
| 8.1 Introduction.....                                                                                                                                                               | 162        |
| 8.2 Material and Methods .....                                                                                                                                                      | 164        |
| 8.2.1 Study area and experimental design.....                                                                                                                                       | 164        |
| 8.2.2 Sampling of water parameters and zooplankton .....                                                                                                                            | 167        |
| 8.2.3 Taxonomic and functional structure of zooplankton.....                                                                                                                        | 168        |
| 8.2.4 Statistical analysis .....                                                                                                                                                    | 169        |
| 8.3 Results.....                                                                                                                                                                    | 170        |
| 8.4 Discussion .....                                                                                                                                                                | 181        |
| 8.5 Conclusion .....                                                                                                                                                                | 184        |
| 8.6 References.....                                                                                                                                                                 | 185        |
| 9 Supplementary Material.....                                                                                                                                                       | 202        |
| <b>9 CHAPTER 4.....</b>                                                                                                                                                             | <b>226</b> |
| <b>Using a mesocosm approach to evaluate the effects of application of fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse on the zooplankton community and its relationship with water parameters ....</b> | <b>226</b> |
| 9.1 Introduction.....                                                                                                                                                               | 229        |
| 9.2 Material and Methods .....                                                                                                                                                      | 231        |
| 9.2.1 Experimental design.....                                                                                                                                                      | 231        |
| 9.2.2 Sampling and analysis of the zooplankton community and water parameters .....                                                                                                 | 232        |
| 9.2.3 Statistical analysis .....                                                                                                                                                    | 233        |
| 9.3 Results.....                                                                                                                                                                    | 234        |
| 9.4 Discussion .....                                                                                                                                                                | 244        |
| 9.5 Conclusion .....                                                                                                                                                                | 247        |
| 9.6 References.....                                                                                                                                                                 | 249        |
| 9.7 Supplementary Material.....                                                                                                                                                     | 262        |
| <b>10 CHAPTER 5.....</b>                                                                                                                                                            | <b>301</b> |
| <b>Additional contributions to the professional academic.....</b>                                                                                                                   | <b>301</b> |
| <b>11 GENERAL CONCLUSION AND THE NEXT STEPS.....</b>                                                                                                                                | <b>307</b> |

## 1 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

This thesis is organized into a general introduction, which contains the main information about the studies of land use, pesticides and vinasse on ecological communities in Brazil. That led to the thesis development, followed by 5 chapters, a general conclusion and the next steps. The first 4 chapters are divided into 1 published article (chapter 2) and 3 manuscripts (chapters 1, 3 and 4). The first one has already been submitted. Chapters 3 and 4 are manuscripts written in a scientific journal format that are intended to be published. The fifth chapter describes the main scientific activities carried out during the PhD formation. The last section is a general conclusion of the thesis and the next step for the future.

The first chapter is a scientometric review that aims to provide an overview of studies on the effects of land use on the freshwater zooplankton community, considering geographical, temporal and ecological aspects.

The second chapter is a published article (Dos Santos et al., 2023). This paper evaluated what were the main water parameters in the structure of the diversity and functional composition of zooplankton. This study was carried out in 8 reservoirs inserted in agropastoral landscape in Brazil. The pH and total nitrogen were the structuring variables in these environments.

The third chapter shows the implementation of an experiment that represents, under realistic conditions, the main land uses in Brazil: extensive pasture, intensive pasture and sugarcane crops. These land uses are one of the main economic activities in Brazil and have caused serious damage to Brazilian biodiversity. The effects of these land uses on the diversity and composition of zooplankton, both functionally and taxonomically, were analyzed. Also, the main water variables that structure the zooplankton in these land use types were identified.

The fourth chapter describes the isolated and mixed effects of insecticide, herbicide and vinasse on the functional and taxonomic diversity of zooplankton using a mesocosm experiment. The insecticide and vinasse isolated and mixed treatments caused a reduction in functional and taxonomic richness, Shannon diversity and functional dispersion. We also identified the main structuring water variables for each type of pesticide and vinasse.

The fifth chapter describes the main academic activities carried out during the doctorate, including scientific dissemination and teaching, co-supervision, participation in and organization of scientific events, publications and awards.

Finally, in the general conclusion and next steps, the conclusion of the doctoral thesis and new studies that should be carried out are presented.

## **2 GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 Impact of land use on communities**

Throughout human history, anthropogenic actions have caused several changes to native biomes, one of the most important being the reduction and/or fragmentation of natural landscapes, which has resulted in the loss of biodiversity worldwide (NEWBOLD et al., 2015, 2016A; MORRISON; BROSI; DIRZO; 2020). These changes are driven by high population growth, which has led to increased demand for food and housing (ROSA, 2020; WILLIAMS; BATES; NEWBOLD, 2020; SCHNEIDER; ZABEL; MAUSER, 2022). The impacts of the Anthropocene have resulted in the conversion of natural landscapes to agricultural and urbanized landscapes (TILMAN et al., 2011; TSCHARNTKE et al., 2012; LIU et al., 2022; SCHNEIDER; ZABEL; MAUSER, 2022). These changes are altering the abiotic and biotic characteristics of all ecosystems around the world, resulting in the loss of taxonomic and functional diversity of diverse biological communities (LIU et al, 2022, PAQUETTE et al., 2022). Currently, the expansion of land use and management for agricultural activities and urbanization over natural areas is increasing every year, especially in Brazil (OGURA et al., 2022a; LUCAS; CALDARELLI; VENTURA, 2023), which as a developing country is experiencing economic growth and has agribusiness as one of its main economic activities.

There are myriad abiotic changes and impacts resulting from land use change and management. The increase in deforestation associated with land use change has led to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, which has contributed to increased global warming (ROLANDO et al., 2017; EL-MAGD et al., 2024). In addition, changes in land use have increased the amount of organic matter and sediment in lakes and streams over the years, resulting in the siltation of these environments (WILD; GÜCKER; BRAUNS, 2019; CHEN et al., 2023; WU et al., 2023; BIBENTYO et al., 2024). Furthermore, loss of riparian vegetation increases nutrient inputs and temperature of aquatic environments, leading to altered trophic interactions of aquatic communities (MOLINA-NAVARRO et al., 2018; REIS; BUNN; ALBRECHT; 2022). On the other hand, increases in nutrients and dissolved organic matter may benefit some species of phytoplankton and macrophytes, whose abundance increases as they assimilate the nutrients introduced into the aquatic environment (ZHANG et al., 2022a).

Understanding the effects of abiotic changes caused by land use is essential for the conservation of biodiversity. By identifying the conditions under which abiotic variables lead to greater biodiversity in terms of species taxonomy and function, it is possible to design environmental conservation laws and projects.

Several studies have assessed the impacts of land use on terrestrial communities, such as the impacts on terrestrial vertebrate diversity, which contributes to the loss of ~15% of terrestrial vertebrate species and ~14% of their native habitat, potentially resulting in the global extinction of 556 to 818 vertebrate species (CHAUDHARY; MOOERS, 2018, SEMENCHUK et al., 2022). With increased habitat loss due to changes in land use, it is estimated that approximately 1,700 species of birds, amphibians and mammals will be extinct by 2070 (POWERS, JETZ, 2019). In addition, the conversion of land from natural vegetation to agricultural and/or urban areas promotes the migration of vertebrate species to new habitats, leading to an intensification of competitive interactions with endemic species (BAJARU et al., 2020; MAYANI-PARÁS et al., 2021; POLAINA et al., 2021; STRONA; BRADSHAW, 2022). Another factor that impacts terrestrial communities is the intensification of land use, which influences the fluctuation of terrestrial animal populations, with deforestation being one of the main factors responsible for reducing bat population stability and pastureland for bird population (BLÜTHGEN et al., 2016). Moreover, herbivory rates of terrestrial invertebrates decrease with increasing intensity of land use near forest areas and in pasture areas (NEFF et al., 2023). Changes in land use, such as the conversion of areas from pasture to croplands, have been associated with changes in the composition and structure of small mammal communities (TORRE et al., 2015; GRAHAM et al., 2019). Thus, changes in land use, whether through conversion of land, intensification of use, or loss of habitat, have resulted in the loss of terrestrial biodiversity worldwide (NEWBOLD et al., 2015, 2016B; OUTHWAITE; MCCANN; NEWBOLD, 2022).

In addition to impacts on terrestrial communities, some studies have shown the effects of land use on aquatic communities, particularly fish and macroinvertebrate communities (ITO et al., 2020; CABRERA et al., 2023). Land use intensification affects trophic interactions and the functioning of aquatic ecosystems, reducing the number of interactions between species but increasing the efficiency of energy transfer (COLLYER et al., 2023). In addition, deforestation causes limnological changes, such as increases in temperature and nutrients, and consequently alters trophic interactions between species and within fish guilds (REIS; BUNN; ALBRECHT,

2022). Other studies have shown that land use conversion from pasture to sugarcane has caused a decrease in the functional diversity of fish and macroinvertebrates (ZENI; HOEINGHAUS; CASATTI, 2017; LIU et al., 2022). Thus, land use has led to a loss of aquatic biodiversity and a homogenization of aquatic ecosystems, especially on fish and macroinvertebrate communities. Studies on the effects of land use on zooplankton are still scarce (BALSEIRO et al., 2023; CASTILHO-NOLL et al., 2023) and it is necessary to find a global overview to identify the state of the art of these studies. It is expected that the majority of these studies will be conducted in developed countries with high publication rates and that promote environmental stewardship. Therefore, the study of the effects of land use on other aquatic communities is essential to understand these effects on the different biological communities that exist and, consequently, to propose public policies to mitigate these effects.

Historically, there has been an increase in land use for agricultural areas to grow different crops such as soy, rice, oranges, and sugarcane, which are essential raw materials for different products used for human food. In addition, the use of pastureland is one of the most important forms of land use worldwide, as raising livestock provides meat for the population (WRIGHT et al., 2015, LAL et al. 2021). The use of land for planting and pasture alters the characteristics of the soil and the communities associated with it (DAMIAN et al., 2021; 2023), as well as affecting nearby water bodies, since crops use different chemicals to maximize production, which are transported to aquatic environments (FREITAS et al., 2023; CORAPI et al., 2023; CABRERA et al., 2023). Thus, cropland and pasture are among the main forms of land use that cause various impacts on terrestrial and aquatic communities, leading to changes in species composition and extinction and loss of biodiversity (PEARSON et al., 2018; BRAUER; BEHEREGARAY, 2020).

Brazil suffers from intense deforestation and uncontrolled land use, with intensive agricultural practices being one of the main activities that directly and indirectly affect the biodiversity of aquatic and terrestrial environments (TILMAN, 1999; NORTON; REID; YOUNG, 2013; DUDLEY; ALEXANDER, 2017; TURCOTTE, et al., 2017). In Brazil, soybeans, corn and sugarcane predominate, the latter being one of the most important crops in the country for ethanol production (MARTINELLI et al., 2010). The increased stimulus for the production of this fuel has led to a demand for the use of arable land, as well as the conversion of pastureland into sugarcane crops (BORDONAL et al., 2018). According to recent studies, this measure prevents the deforestation of native areas of the Brazilian biome and,

consequently, allows the maximization of the ecosystem services provided by these areas (ALKIMIM; SPAROVEK; CLARKE, 2015; OLIVEIRA et al., 2019). However, the effects of pasture conversion to sugarcane on aquatic communities are still unknown. It is known that sugarcane crops intensively use fertilizers, vinasse, and pesticides such as insecticides and herbicides, which contaminate aquatic environments (KHATRI; TYAGI, 2015; SCHIESARI, L.; CORRÊA, 2016) and directly affect aquatic communities. In addition, extensive pastures have been converted to intensive pastures to maximize livestock production and avoid deforestation of native areas (MACDONALD et al., 2017; OLIVEIRA et al., 2019). This has involved the application of fertilizers to the soil and/or the use of highly productive grasses as a food source for animals (DE OLIVEIRA SILVA et al., 2017; MACDONALD et al., 2017). The runoff of fertilizers and vinasse to aquatic environments in intensive pasture and sugarcane, increases the concentration of nutrients and consequently the phytoplankton community can have a greater abundance (ZHANG et al., 2024; DORY et al., 2024). On the other hand, the intensification of the pasture areas will not be sufficient to avoid the pressure on the natural areas (KREIDENWEIS et al., 2018). However, the effects of these different types of pastures on communities, especially aquatic communities, are still unknown. It is expected that in pasture and sugarcane environments, total nitrogen and total phosphorus (nutrients) will be the structuring variables because of fertilizer and vinasse application.

One of the most important existing aquatic communities that has been little studied is the zooplankton. Zooplankton organisms have a short life cycle and therefore respond rapidly to various environmental changes (MIN et al., 2021; MUÑOZ-COLMENARES; SORIA; VICENTE, 2021; RAJEWICZ et al., 2023). The zooplankton community plays a fundamental role in the functioning of the aquatic system, since it is responsible for the transfer of energy between the producing organisms and the other consuming trophic levels, acting as an essential link in trophic interactions (WETZEL, 2001). In addition, these organisms are highly sensitive to environmental changes, such as climate and landscape changes (DAS CANDEIAS et al., 2022; BOMFIM et al., 2023). Their importance can also be seen in the role of some species in controlling the phytoplankton community through herbivory, mediating the possible risks of eutrophication (AMORIM et al., 2019; BUTTS; MOODY; WILKINSON, 2022; TERESHINA et al., 2023), as well as in the consumption of organic matter through nutrient cycling in aquatic ecosystems (HE; WANG, 2020; JOHNSTON et al., 2022). However, most studies on zooplankton relate to the effects of predators and macrophytes, and how communities are affected by environmental changes caused by eutrophication and salinization (DOS SANTOS



et al., 2020; IGLESIAS, 2020; CASTILHO-NOLL et al., 2023). Thus, the effects of land use on the zooplankton community are still poorly understood (BALSEIRO et al., 2023; CASTILHO-NOLL et al., 2023).

Studies on the effects of land use on zooplankton have yielded inconsistent results. Some have reported that the zooplankton community is not affected by changes in land use, but by water parameters such as pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature and nutrients (ALLEN et al., 1999; MSITELI-SHUMBA; KATIVU; HULOT, 2017; LOEWEN et al., 2019). Some studies have shown that in preserved environments, temperature and chlorophyll are structuring variables of the zooplankton community (LI et al., 2019; GOMES et al., 2020). In addition, other studies have shown that the presence of predators and macrophytes are factors that structure the zooplankton community more than land use (GELINAS; PINEL-ALLOUL, 2008; BATTES et al., 2019). On the other hand, other studies have shown that community structure is explained by the land use in which the aquatic environments are inserted (HOFFMANN; DODSON, 2005; DODSON et al., 2007; DRINAN et al., 2013; BEAVER et al., 2014). However, these studies do not specify the different land uses and how each type affects the community. Few studies differentiate between different types of land use, such as types of pastures, cropland, and urbanization, and compare the impact of different types of land use on zooplankton communities (RUMES; EGGERMONT; VERSCHUREN, 2011; GILBERT et al., 2017; Li; Li, 2023; FLORES-MENDEZ et al., 2024). The zooplankton community in aquatic environments where the environment is managed has lower taxonomic and functional diversity than communities in environments where the environment is preserved (PAQUETTE et al., 2022; WANG et al., 2023). On the other hand, the zooplankton community in lakes with an agricultural environment has a higher biomass and density than communities with a preserved environment (ZHANG et al., 2022b). Few studies have identified which water parameters structure the zooplankton community under the influence of different land uses. It is expected that chlorophyll a will be a structuring variable of the zooplankton community in preserved environments or without the application of pesticides, since chlorophyll a is a parameter to infer the quantity of phytoplankton, which is the food resource of zooplankton. Therefore, studying the effects of land use and management and identifying the structuring variables is essential to improve the understanding of these effects and, consequently, to develop more sustainable policies and actions to maintain and conserve the limnological features that provide better water quality and greater aquatic biodiversity.

Among the ecological metrics for community structure studies, the concept and classical measure of taxonomic diversity, represented by the number of species and their relative contributions, have proven ineffective in representing the structure and functioning of communities (CIANCIARUSO; SILVA; BATALHA, 2009). Recently, the functional diversity approach has been considered as a new ecological metric for these studies, but it is still little explored for the zooplankton community (BARNETT; FINALY; BEISNER, 2007; VOGT; PERES-NETO; BEISNER, 2013; BOMFIM et al., 2023). This ecological approach is more efficient in detecting community responses to environmental changes than classical diversity measures, as it results from the study of specific functional traits of each species, reflecting the functioning of the ecosystem as a whole (TILMAN et al., 1997, MOUILLOT et al., 2013). Thus, combining both metrics is a way to understand how communities respond to changes in ecosystems and to identify which metrics are most effective in predicting specific environmental impacts.

Understanding the effects of land use and management practices, such as sugarcane cropland and pastures, on aquatic communities is essential to identify their impacts and, consequently, to provide food for thought in developing more sustainable and productive forms of land use and management. More sustainable and productive agricultural practices reduce impacts on terrestrial and aquatic communities and consequently contribute to increased food security. Thus, this work contributes directly and indirectly to Goals 2 (hunger and sustainable agriculture) and 13 (action on global climate change) of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations (UN), as set out in the UN Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development (ONU, 2015). In addition, Goals 14 (Life Below Water) and 15 (Life on Land) are also covered (ONU, 2015), as this dissertation examines the main impacts of land use on aquatic communities and how water characteristics can influence these communities. Fresh water is an essential source of life for terrestrial organisms, and its use is becoming increasingly inaccessible and expensive under deteriorating conditions.

## 2.2 Impact of pesticides and vinasse on communities

In order to prevent pests and correct soil characteristics, and thus maximize agricultural yields, various types of agricultural inputs such as insecticides, herbicides and fertilizers are used on croplands (PELINSON et al. 2023, SCHULZ et al. 2024). Especially in Brazil, vinasse,

a liquid residue from ethanol production, is also used as a natural fertilizer (CHRISTOFOLETTI et al. 2013, DA SILVA et al., 2013). There are numerous brands and active ingredients of agricultural inputs that have different physical and chemical properties, and therefore different levels of toxicity and impact (DA SILVA PINTO et al., 2021a; COTTA et al., 2023). In addition to impacting terrestrial communities, these compounds can be transported to aquatic environments and cause various effects on aquatic communities, such as behavioral and physiological changes at the population level or a reduction in diversity and richness at the community level (DA SILVA PINTO et al., 2021b, SILVA et al., 2021). Understanding the effects caused by these agricultural inputs is essential for the conservation of aquatic biodiversity and the promotion of new bio-organic products for use in soil management and use.

Brazil is one of the main countries in the world in terms of pesticide consumption, as its economy is based on agricultural activities. In addition, in recent years, especially in the period 2016 to 2022, Brazil had a government with anti-environmental policies that allowed the regulation of more than 400 agrochemicals, some of which are banned in several European countries (ABESSA; FAMÁ; BURUAEM, 2019, CARNEIRO, 2022). During this period, the indiscriminate use and consumption of agrochemicals may have increased, as well as the rate of deforestation.

Among the many types of pesticides regulated in Brazil, the insecticide fipronil and the herbicide 2,4-D are among the most widely used in sugarcane crops (ALBUQUERQUE et al., 2016). Fipronil is an insecticide that acts as a neurotoxin, inhibiting gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) ionotropic receptors in the central nervous system, and is classified as highly toxic in Brazil (CETESB, 2018; MAPA, 2020). Some studies have shown various effects on terrestrial and aquatic non-target species. For example, a decrease in the bee population was observed in areas where fipronil was applied compared to areas where this insecticide was not applied (FARDER-GOMES et al., 2021). Behavioral and physiological changes have also been observed in insects, such as habitat exploration behavior and neuromuscular changes (ROSA et al., 2023). Various effects of this insecticide have been reported in several laboratory studies with different aquatic organisms. For example, fipronil causes changes in respiration rate and oxidative stress in amphibians, leading to high mortality (GRIPP et al., 2017; FREITAS et al., 2022). In addition, the acute and sublethal effects of fipronil have resulted in physiological and histopathological changes in freshwater mussels (ARSLAN; GÜNAL, 2023). These effects

have been reported in various aquatic populations, but the effects of this insecticide on the taxonomic and functional diversity of the zooplankton community are not yet known.

2,4-D is a herbicide whose active ingredient is 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid. In high concentrations, 2,4-D acts by altering the growth and cell division of weeds, causing plant death (OGURA et al. 2022b). This herbicide is classified as extremely toxic by the National Health Surveillance Agency (MAPA, 2020). When applied to the soil, 2,4-D can alter the microbial community, increasing the diversity of rhizospheric fungi in the soil (AGUIAR et al., 2020). On the other hand, laboratory studies have shown that 2,4-D causes changes in mitochondrial function, oxidative status, and fish behavior (THIEL et al., 2020; VIANA et al., 2022). In addition, some studies have shown that this herbicide can alter the predator avoidance behavior of zooplankton and also reduce the growth rates of some cladoceran species (ANDRADE et al., 2018). However, the effects on different community metrics, such as taxonomic and functional diversity index and species richness, are still scarce.

The insecticide fipronil and the herbicide 2,4-D can be applied sequentially to sugarcane plantations. In this way, the two compounds can be carried into the aquatic environment, resulting in a more harmful synergistic effect on aquatic communities (COTTA et al., 2023; GALLO et al. 2023; GOULART et al. 2024). An experimental study has shown that when these two pesticides are applied together, they are detected by the fish species *Danio rerio*, which avoids contaminated areas in search of areas free of pesticides (MOREIRA et al., 2022). The same fish shows changes in its homeostasis when these two pesticides are applied at concentrations recommended for sugarcane crops (VIANA et al., 2022). On the other hand, the isolated effects of fipronil and 2,4-D on the biomass of the tropical amphipod *Hyalella meinerti* are more pronounced than when they are mixed (DA SILVA PINTO et al., 2021a). In addition, the vast majority of studies evaluating the effects of pesticides on zooplankton analyze the effects at the population level, examining only a few zooplankton species, mainly cladocerans (SILVA et al., 2021; GALLO et al., 2023). These studies attempt to determine the effects of the use of insecticides and herbicides that are transported to aquatic environments associated with agricultural areas (HANAIZATO, 1991; RELYEA, 2005, 2009; HAYASAKA et al., 2012; GERG et al., 2013, MOREIRA et al., 2017). There are few studies evaluating the effects of pesticides on the zooplankton community as a whole and their impact on aquatic ecosystems. It is therefore important to study the effects of these compounds in isolation and in mixtures to identify potential synergies on community metrics such as diversity indices.

In addition to the effects of pesticides, there are the effects of fertilizers, which are used to enrich soils with nutrients and improve crop production (CHRISTOFOLETTI et al., 2013). However, the irrational and inappropriate use of fertilizers contributes to the increase of the primary community in aquatic environments near crops. This leads to excessive growth of algae and aquatic macrophytes (WAISER; ROBARTS, 1997; GRACE et al., 2019), which affects the limnological parameters and trophic interactions of these environments (VILLAMAGNA; MURPHY, 2010). In addition to the application of fertilizers, the use of vinasse as a natural fertilizer has recently increased in Brazil (CHRISTOFOLETTI et al., 2013, MORAES et al. 2014). Vinasse is a liquid residue from ethanol production that has chemical properties such as high concentrations of nutrients, which helps in the growth and increase of sugarcane production (CHRISTOFOLETTI ET AL., 2013; DA SILVA et al., 2013). In addition, the physiological and chemical characteristics of vinasse include high electrical conductivity and the amount of organic matter, as well as various metals (DA SILVA PINTO et al., 2021; COTTA et al., 2023; FREITAS et al. 2023). The high concentrations of nutrients can flow into aquatic ecosystems and increase their primary productivity, causing eutrophication (MARTINELLI; FILOSO, 2008). Moreover, when vinasse is discharged into aquatic environments, the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the aquatic environment can decrease significantly due to the high concentration of organic matter (CHRISTOFOLETTI et al., 2013, FREITAS et al., 2023). In this way, several negative effects can occur on aquatic communities, especially on the zooplankton community. However, the effects of vinasse on the zooplankton community are still unknown.

Fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse are widely used in sugarcane crops in Brazil, which is the main type of land use and management for agricultural activities in the country. As such, these compounds can be found together in Brazilian water bodies and cause numerous adverse effects (COTTA et al., 2023; GIROTTO et al., 2023). Some studies have demonstrated the effects on aquatic communities, especially on macroinvertebrate communities and on populations of tadpoles and aquatic invertebrates such as *Hyaella* and *Ceriodaphnia* (DA SILVA PINTO et al., 2021a; SILVA et al. 2021; GIROTTO et al., 2023). In general, these studies have shown that fipronil and vinasse, alone or in mixtures, are more harmful than 2,4-D, causing rapid mortality and consequently reducing species diversity and abundance (MOREIRA et al. 2020, COTTA et al. 2023). However, the effects of these compounds, alone or in mixtures, on the zooplankton community, especially on taxonomic and functional diversity indices, are still unknown.

Therefore, the analysis of the effects of land use and the application of insecticides, herbicides and vinasse, alone or in mixtures, on the zooplankton community, using taxonomic and functional diversity metrics, is essential for progress in the assessment of the ecological risk generated by these effects on the functioning of ecosystems. This thesis has made it possible to advance studies on the functional and taxonomic diversity of zooplankton associated with the effects of changes in the agro-ecosystem, such as land use with different intensities of pasture and sugarcane and the use of pesticides and vinasse. The results of this thesis will provide a more detailed understanding of the effects of these practices on aquatic ecosystems, which will contribute to the development of new sustainable practices and environmental protection laws.

## 5 References

ABESSA, D.; FAMÁ, A.; BURUAEM, L. The systematic dismantling of Brazilian environmental laws risks losses on all fronts. **Nature ecology & evolution**, v. 3, n. 4, p. 510-511, 2019.

AGUIAR, L. M. et al. Influence of 2,4-D residues on the soil microbial community and growth of tree species. **International Journal of Phytoremediation**, v. 22, n. 1, p. 69-77, 2020.

ALBUQUERQUE, A. F. et al. Pesticides in Brazilian freshwaters: a critical review. **Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts**, v. 18, n. 7, p. 779-787, 2016

ALLEN, A. P. et al. Concordance of taxonomic composition patterns across multiple lake assemblages: effects of scale, body size, and land use. **Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences**, v. 56, n. 11, p. 2029-2040, 1999.

ALKIMIM, A.; SPAROVEK, G.; CLARKE, K. C. Converting Brazil's pastures to cropland: An alternative way to meet sugarcane demand and to spare forestlands. **Applied Geography**, v. 62, p. 75-84, 2015.

AMORIM, C. A. et al. Seasonal variations of morpho-functional phytoplankton groups influence the top-down control of a cladoceran in a tropical hypereutrophic lake. **Aquatic Ecology**, v. 53, n. 3, p. 453-464, 2019.

ANDRADE, V. S. et al. Shifts in zooplankton behavior caused by a mixture of pesticides. **Water, Air, & Soil Pollution**, v. 229, p. 1-7, 2018.

ARSLAN, P.; GÜNAL, A. C. Does Fipronil Affect on Aquatic Organisms? Physiological, Biochemical, and Histopathological Alterations of Non-Target Freshwater Mussel Species. *Water*, v. 15, n. 2, p. 334, 2023.

BAJARU, S. et al. A multi-species occupancy modeling approach to access the impacts of land use and land cover on terrestrial vertebrates in the Mumbai Metropolitan Region (MMR), Western Ghats, India. **Plos one**, v. 15, n. 10, p. e0240989, 2020.

BALSEIRO, E. et al. Status of the zooplankton ecology in freshwater ecosystems from Argentina. **Limnologica**, v. 100, p. 126011, 2023.

BARNETT, A. J.; FINLAY, K.; BEISNER, B. E. Functional diversity of crustacean zooplankton communities: towards a trait-based classification. **Freshwater Biology**, v. 52, n. 5, p. 796-813, 2007.

BATTES, K. P. et al. Species-area relationships for aquatic biota in several shallow lakes from the Fizeş Valley (Transylvania, Romania). **North-Western Journal of Zoology**, v. 15, n. 2, 2019.

BEAVER, J. R. et al. The late summer crustacean zooplankton in western USA reservoirs reflects ecoregion, temperature and latitude. **Freshwater Biology**, v. 59, n. 6, p. 1173-1186, 2014.

BIBENTYO, T. M. et al. Landslides, bedrock incision and human-induced environmental changes in an extremely rapidly formed tropical river gorge. **Geomorphology**, v. 449, p. 109046, 2024.

BLÜTHGEN, N. et al. Land use imperils plant and animal community stability through changes in asynchrony rather than diversity. **Nature Communications**, v. 7, n. 1, p. 10697, 2016.

BOMFIM, F. F. et al. How are zooplankton's functional guilds influenced by land use in Amazon streams?. **Plos one**, v. 18, n. 8, p. e0288385, 2023.

BORDONAL, R. O. et al. Sustainability of sugarcane production in Brazil. A review. **Agronomy for Sustainable Development**, v. 38, p. 1-23, 2018.



BUTTS, T. J.; MOODY, E. K.; WILKINSON, G. M. Contribution of zooplankton nutrient recycling and effects on phytoplankton size structure in a hypereutrophic reservoir. **Journal of Plankton Research**, v. 44, n. 6, p. 839-853, 2022.

BRAUER, C. J.; BEHEREGARAY, L.B. Recent and rapid anthropogenic habitat fragmentation increases extinction risk for freshwater biodiversity. **Evolutionary applications**, v. 13, n. 10, p. 2857-2869, 2020.

CABRERA, M. et al. Effects of intensive agriculture and urbanization on water quality and pesticide risks in freshwater ecosystems of the Ecuadorian Amazon. **Chemosphere**, p. 139286, 2023.

CARNEIRO, L. et al. Brazilian pesticides law could poison the world. **Science**, v. 376, n. 6591, p. 362-362, 2022.

CASTILHO-NOLL, M. S. M. et al. A review of 121 years of studies on the freshwater zooplankton of Brazil. **Limnologia**, v. 100, p. 126057, 2023.,

CETESB, 2018. Companhia Ambiental do Estado de São Paulo. Qualidade das águas interiores no estado de São Paulo 2017, Relatórios. Série Relatórios/CETESB, São Paulo.

CHAUDHARY, A.; MOOERS, A. O. Terrestrial vertebrate biodiversity loss under future global land use change scenarios. **Sustainability**, v. 10, n. 8, p. 2764, 2018.

CHEN, Yu-Ting et al. Nutrient variability and sediment contribution along a mixed land-use within Sturgeon Creek-Lake Erie watershed. **Journal of Environmental Management**, v. 347, p. 119139, 2023.

CIANCIARUSO, M. V.; SILVA, I. A.; BATALHA, M. A.. Diversidades filogenética e funcional: novas abordagens para a Ecologia de comunidades. **Biota Neotropica**, v. 9, p. 93-103, 2009.

COLLYER, G. et al. Land-use intensification systematically alters the size structure of aquatic communities in the Neotropics. **Global Change Biology**, v. 29, n. 14, p. 4094-4106, 2023.

CORAPI, A. et al. Agricultural drift depositional simulation of a copper-based fungicide and its effects on non-target terrestrial and freshwater compartments. **Ecotoxicology**, v. 32, n. 3, p. 370-382, 2023.

COTTA, C. P. et al. Exposure to fipronil, 2, 4-D and vinasse influences macroinvertebrate assemblage structure: An experimental mesocosm approach. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 888, p. 164259, 2023.

CHRISTOFOLETTI, C. A. et al. Sugarcane vinasse: environmental implications of its use. **Waste management**, v. 33, n. 12, p. 2752-2761, 2013.

DA SILVA, A. et al. Net and potential nitrogen mineralization in soil with sugarcane vinasse. **Sugar tech**, v. 15, p. 159-164, 2013.

DA SILVA PINTO, T. J. et al. Toxicity of fipronil and 2, 4-D formulations (alone and in a mixture) to the tropical amphipod *Hyalella meinerti*. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, v. 28, p. 38308-38321, 2021a.

DA SILVA PINTO, T. J. et al. Functional responses of *Hyalella meinerti* after exposure to environmentally realistic concentrations of 2, 4-D, fipronil, and vinasse (individually and in mixture). **Aquatic Toxicology**, v. 231, p. 105712, 2021b.

DAS CANDEIAS, D. A. et al. High temperature, predation, nutrient, and food quality drive dominance of small-sized zooplankton in Neotropical lakes. **Aquatic Sciences**, v. 84, n. 4, p. 49, 2022.

DE OLIVEIRA SILVA, R. et al. Sustainable intensification of Brazilian livestock production through optimized pasture restoration. **Agricultural systems**, v. 153, p. 201-211, 2017.

DAMIAN, J. M. et al. Pastureland intensification and diversification in Brazil mediate soil bacterial community structure changes and soil C accumulation. **Applied Soil Ecology**, v. 160, p. 103858, 2021.

DAMIAN, J. M. et al. Intensification and diversification of pasturelands in Brazil: Patterns and driving factors in the soil carbon stocks. **Catena**, v. 220, p. 106750, 2023.

DODSON, S. I. et al. Effect of watershed land use and lake age on zooplankton species richness. **Hydrobiologia**, v. 579, p. 393-399, 2007.

DOS SANTOS, N. G. et al. How free-floating macrophytes influence interactions between planktivorous fish and zooplankton in tropical environments? An in-lake mesocosm approach. **Hydrobiologia**, v. 847, p. 1357-1370, 2020.

DOS SANTOS, N. G. et al. Total nitrogen and pH are key variables for functional structure of zooplanktonic communities in an agropastoral landscape. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 891, p. 164031, 2023.

DORY, F. et al. Interaction between temperature and nutrients: How does the phytoplankton community cope with climate change?. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 906, p. 167566, 2024.

DRINAN, T. J. et al. The impact of conifer plantation forestry on the Chydoridae (Cladocera) communities of peatland lakes. **Hydrobiologia**, v. 700, p. 203-219, 2013.

DUDLEY, N.; ALEXANDER, S. Agriculture and biodiversity: a review. **Biodiversity**, v. 18, n. 2-3, p. 45-49, 2017.

EL-MAGD, S. A. A. et al. Towards understanding climate change: Impact of land use indices and drainage on land surface temperature for valley drainage and non-drainage areas. **Journal of Environmental Management**, v. 350, p. 119636, 2024.

FARDER-GOMES, C. F. et al. Harmful effects of fipronil exposure on the behavior and brain of the stingless bee *Partamona helleri* Friese (Hymenoptera: Meliponini). **Science of the Total Environment**, v. 794, p. 148678, 2021.

FLORES-MENDEZ, D. N. et al. Influence of Cattle Activity in Floodplains on the Zooplankton Community During a Period of Water Retraction. **Wetlands**, v. 44, n. 1, p. 4, 2024.

FREITAS, J. S. et al. Realistic exposure to fipronil, 2, 4-D, vinasse and their mixtures impair larval amphibian physiology. **Environmental Pollution**, v. 299, p. 118894, 2022.

FREITAS, I. B. F. et al. Soil management effects of extensive pastures, intensive pastures and sugarcane crops on the availability of metals and nutrients in freshwater: A realistic mesocosm approach. **Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment**, v. 350, p. 108473, 2023.

GALLO, N. C. et al. Toxicity of fipronil and 2, 4-D pesticides in *Daphnia similis*: a multiple endpoint approach. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, p. 1-12, 2023.

GELINAS, M.; PINEL-ALLOUL, B. Relating crustacean zooplankton community structure to residential development and land-cover disturbance near Canadian Shield lakes. **Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences**, v. 65, n. 12, p. 2689-2702, 2008.

GERGS, A. et al. Chemical and natural stressors combined: from cryptic effects to population extinction. **Scientific Reports**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 2036, 2013.

GILBERT, J. D. et al. Linking watershed land uses and crustacean assemblages in Mediterranean wetlands. **Hydrobiologia**, v. 799, p. 181-191, 2017.

GIROTTI, L. et al. Using mesocosms to evaluate the impacts of pasture intensification and pasture-sugarcane conversion on tadpoles in Brazil. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, v. 30, n. 8, p. 21010-21024, 2023.

GOULART, B. V. et al. Fate and toxicity of 2, 4-D and fipronil in mesocosm systems. **Chemosphere**, v. 346, p. 140569, 2024.

GRACE, K. A. et al. Substrate manipulation near the outflow of a constructed wetland reduced internal phosphorus loading from sediments and macrophytes. **Ecological Engineering**, v. 129, p. 71-81, 2019.

GRAHAM, S. I. et al. Effects of land-use change on community diversity and composition are highly variable among functional groups. **Ecological Applications**, v. 29, n. 7, p. e01973, 2019.

GRIPP, H. S. et al. Biochemical effects of fipronil and its metabolites on lipid peroxidation and enzymatic antioxidant defense in tadpoles (*Eupemphix nattereri*: Leiuperidae). **Ecotoxicology and environmental safety**, v. 136, p. 173-179, 2017.

HANAZATO, T. Effects of repeated application of carbaryl on zooplankton communities in experimental ponds with or without the predator Chaoborus. **Environmental Pollution**, v. 74, n. 4, p. 309-324, 1991.

HAYASAKA, D. et al. Differences in susceptibility of five cladoceran species to two systemic insecticides, imidacloprid and fipronil. **Ecotoxicology**, v. 21, p. 421-427, 2012.

HE, X; WANG, W. X. Allocation and stoichiometric regulation of phosphorus in a freshwater zooplankton under limited conditions: Implication for nutrient cycling. **Science of the Total Environment**, v. 728, p. 138795, 2020.

HOFFMANN, M. D.; DODSON, S. I. Land use, primary productivity, and lake area as descriptors of zooplankton diversity. **Ecology**, v. 86, n. 1, p. 255-261, 2005.

IGLESIAS, M. C. A. A review of recent advances and future challenges in freshwater salinization. **Limnetica**, v. 39, n. 1, p. 185-211, 2020.

ITO, H. C. et al. Combined impact of pesticides and other environmental stressors on animal diversity in irrigation ponds. **PLoS One**, v. 15, n. 7, p. e0229052, 2020.

JOHNSTON, S. E. et al. Zooplankton release complex dissolved organic matter to aquatic environments. **Biogeochemistry**, p. 1-13, 2021.

KHATRI; TYAGI. Influences of natural and anthropogenic factors on surface and groundwater quality in rural and urban areas. **Frontiers in life science**, v. 8, n. 1, p. 23-39, 2015.

KREIDENWEIS, U. et al. Pasture intensification is insufficient to relieve pressure on conservation priority areas in open agricultural markets. **Global change biology**, v. 24, n. 7, p. 3199-3213, 2018.

LAL, R. Feeding the world and returning half of the agricultural land back to nature. **Journal of Soil and Water Conservation**, v. 76, n. 4, p. 75A-78A, 2021.

LI, Y.; LI, L. Development and validation of the planktonic index of biotic integrity (P-IBI) for Qin River, a main tributary of the Yellow River in China. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, v. 30, n. 2, p. 2622-2636, 2023.

LIU, Z. et al. Land conversion induced by urbanization leads to taxonomic and functional homogenization of a river macroinvertebrate metacommunity. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 825, p. 153940, 2022.

LOEWEN, C. J. G. et al. Macroecological drivers of zooplankton communities across the mountains of western North America. **Ecography**, v. 42, n. 4, p. 791-803, 2019.

LUCAS, K. R. G; CALDARELLI, C. E.; VENTURA, M. U. Agriculture and biodiversity damage: A prospective evaluation of the impact of Brazilian agriculture on its ecoregions through life cycle assessment methodology. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 899, p. 165762, 2023.

MACDONALD, K. A. et al. Production and economic responses to intensification of pasture-based dairy production systems. **Journal of Dairy Science**, v. 100, n. 8, p. 6602-6619, 2017.

MAPA, 2020. Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Desenvolvimento. Sistema de Agrotóxicos Fitossanitários - AGROFIT. Relatório Consolidado de Ingredientes Ativos. Disponível em. [http://agrofit.agricultura.gov.br/agrofit\\_cons/principal\\_agrofit\\_cons](http://agrofit.agricultura.gov.br/agrofit_cons/principal_agrofit_cons).

MARTINELLI, L. A.; FILOSO, S. Expansion of sugarcane ethanol production in Brazil: environmental and social challenges. **Ecological applications**, v. 18, n. 4, p. 885-898, 2008.

MARTINELLI, L. A. et al. Agriculture in Brazil: impacts, costs, and opportunities for a sustainable future. **Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability**, v. 2, n. 5-6, p. 431-438, 2010.

MAYANI-PARÁS, F. et al. Cumulative habitat loss increases conservation threats on endemic species of terrestrial vertebrates in Mexico. **Biological Conservation**, v. 253, p. 108864, 2021.

MIN, C. et al. Copepods as environmental indicator in lakes: Special focus on changes in the proportion of calanoids along nutrient and pH gradients. **Aquatic Ecology**, v. 55, p. 1241-1252, 2021.

MOLINA-NAVARRO, E. al. Quantifying the combined effects of land use and climate changes on stream flow and nutrient loads: A modelling approach in the Odense Fjord catchment (Denmark). **Science of the Total Environment**, v. 621, p. 253-264, 2018.

MORAES, B. S. et al. Anaerobic digestion of vinasse from sugarcane biorefineries in Brazil from energy, environmental, and economic perspectives: Profit or expense?. **Applied Energy**, v. 113, p. 825-835, 2014.

MOREIRA, R. A. et al. Toxicity of abamectin and difenoconazole mixtures to a Neotropical cladoceran after simulated run-off and spray drift exposure. **Aquatic Toxicology**, v. 185, p. 58-66, 2017.

MOREIRA, R. A. et al. Exposure to environmental concentrations of fipronil and 2, 4-D mixtures causes physiological, morphological and biochemical changes in *Raphidocelis subcapitata*. **Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety**, v. 206, p. 111180, 2020.

MOREIRA, R. A. et al. Avoidance responses by *Danio rerio* reveal interactive effects of warming, pesticides and their mixtures. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 847, p. 157525, 2022.

MORRISON, B. M. L.; BROSI, B. J.; DIRZO, R. et al. Agricultural intensification drives changes in hybrid network robustness by modifying network structure. *Ecology letters*, v. 23, n. 2, p. 359-369, 2020.

MSITELI-SHUMBA, S.; KATIVU, S.; HULOT, F. D. Influence of environmental variables on plankton community composition in permanent and temporal pans in and around Hwange National Park, Zimbabwe. **Transactions of the Royal Society of South Africa**, v. 72, n. 3, p. 266-279, 2017.

MUÑOZ-COLMENARES, M. E.; SORIA, J. M.; VICENTE, E. Can zooplankton species be used as indicators of trophic status and ecological potential of reservoirs?. **Aquatic Ecology**, v. 55, n. 4, p. 1143-1156, 2021.

NEFF, F. et al. Reduction of invertebrate herbivory by land use is only partly explained by changes in plant and insect characteristics. **Ecological Monographs**, v. 93, n. 2, p. e1571, 2023.

NEWBOLD, T. et al. Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. **Nature**, v. 520, n. 7545, p. 45-50, 2015.

NEWBOLD, T. et al. Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the planetary boundary? A global assessment. **Science**, v. 353, n. 6296, p. 288-291, 2016a.

NEWBOLD, T. et al. Global patterns of terrestrial assemblage turnover within and among land uses. **Ecography**, v. 39, n. 12, p. 1151-1163, 2016b.

NORTON, D. A.; REID, N.; YOUNG, L.. Ultimate drivers of native biodiversity change in agricultural systems. **F1000Research**, v. 2, 2013.

OGURA, A. P. et al. An overview of the sugarcane expansion in the state of São Paulo (Brazil) over the last two decades and its environmental impacts. **Sustainable Production and Consumption**, v. 32, p. 66-75, 2022a.

OGURA, A. P. et al. Irrigation with water contaminated by sugarcane pesticides and vinasse can inhibit seed germination and crops initial growth. **Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology**, v. 82, n. 3, p. 330-340, 2022b.

OLIVEIRA, D. M. S et al. Is the expansion of sugarcane over pasturelands a sustainable strategy for Brazil's bioenergy industry?. **Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews**, v. 102, p. 346-355, 2019.

ONU. Organização das Nações Unidas. Os objetivos do desenvolvimento sustentável no Brasil. 2015. Disponível em: <<https://brasil.un.org/pt-br>> Acesso em 14.fev.2024.

OUTHWAITE, C. L.; MCCANN, P.; NEWBOLD, T. Agriculture and climate change are reshaping insect biodiversity worldwide. **Nature**, v. 605, n. 7908, p. 97-102, 2022.

PAQUETTE, C. et al. Zooplankton assemblage structure and diversity since pre-industrial times in relation to land use. **Global Ecology and Biogeography**, v. 31, n. 11, p. 2337-2352, 2022.

PEARSON, C. E. et al. The effects of pastoral intensification on the feeding interactions of generalist predators in streams. **Molecular Ecology**, v. 27, n. 2, p. 590-602, 2018.

PELINSON, R. M. et al. Impacts of agrochemical intensification and spatial isolation on the assembly and reassembly of temporary pond metacommunities. **Journal of Applied Ecology**, v. 60, n. 10, p. 2235-2250, 2023.

POLAINA, E. et al. The future of invasive terrestrial vertebrates in Europe under climate and land-use change. **Environmental Research Letters**, v. 16, n. 4, p. 044004, 2021.



POWERS, R P.; JETZ, W. Global habitat loss and extinction risk of terrestrial vertebrates under future land-use-change scenarios. **Nature Climate Change**, v. 9, n. 4, p. 323-329, 2019.

RAJEWICZ, W. et al. Daphnia's phototaxis as an indicator in ecotoxicological studies: A review. **Aquatic Toxicology**, p. 106762, 2023.

REIS, A. S.; BUNN, S. E.; ALBRECHT, M. P. Effects of land use change on inter-species and intra-guild trophic interactions of fish communities in tropical headwater streams. **Freshwater Biology**, v. 67, n. 12, p. 2050-2063, 2022.

RELYEA, R. A. The impact of insecticides and herbicides on the biodiversity and productivity of aquatic communities. **Ecological applications**, v. 15, n. 2, p. 618-627, 2005.

RELYEA, R. A. A cocktail of contaminants: how mixtures of pesticides at low concentrations affect aquatic communities. **Oecologia**, v. 159, n. 2, p. 363-376, 2009.

ROCHA, G. S.; DE PALMA LOPES, L. F.; ESPÍNDOLA, E. L. G. Copper and cadmium, isolated and in the mixture, impact the Neotropical freshwater Calanoida copepod *Notodiaptomus iheringi*: A short-term approach with environmental concentrations. **Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology**, v. 105, p. 104326, 2024.

ROLANDO, J. L. et al. Key ecosystem services and ecological intensification of agriculture in the tropical high-Andean Puna as affected by land-use and climate changes. **Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment**, v. 236, p. 221-233, 2017.

ROSA, I. M. D. Monitoring and projecting land use and land cover change at multiple spatial scales. **Environ. Assess**, p. 68-79, 2020.

ROSA, M. E. et al. Fipronil affects cockroach behavior and olfactory memory. **Journal of Experimental Biology**, v. 226, n. 8, p. jeb245239, 2023.

RUMES, B.; EGGERMONT, H.; VERSCHUREN, D. Distribution and faunal richness of Cladocera in western Uganda crater lakes. **Hydrobiologia**, v. 676, p. 39-56, 2011.

SCHNEIDER, J. M.; ZABEL, F.; MAUSER, W. Global inventory of suitable, cultivable and available cropland under different scenarios and policies. **Scientific Data**, v. 9, n. 1, p. 527, 2022.

SCHIESARI, L.; CORRÊA, D. T. Consequences of agroindustrial sugarcane production to freshwater biodiversity. **GCB Bioenergy**, v. 8, n. 3, p. 644-657, 2016.

SCHULZ, R. et al. A synthesis of anthropogenic stress effects on emergence-mediated aquatic-terrestrial linkages and riparian food webs. **Science of The Total Environment**, v. 908, p. 168186, 2024.

SEMENCHUK, P. et al. Relative effects of land conversion and land-use intensity on terrestrial vertebrate diversity. **Nature communications**, v. 13, n. 1, p. 615, 2022.

SILVA, L. C. M. et al. Lethal and sublethal toxicity of pesticides and vinasse used in sugarcane cultivation to *Ceriodaphnia silvestrii* (Crustacea: Cladocera). **Aquatic Toxicology**, v. 241, p. 106017, 2021.

STRONA, G.; BRADSHAW, C. J. A. Coextinctions dominate future vertebrate losses from climate and land use change. **Science Advances**, v. 8, n. 50, p. eabn4345, 2022.

TERESHINA, M. et al. Nutrients and zooplankton as factors controlling phytoplankton growth in the Cheboksary Reservoir. **Hydrobiologia**, p. 1-18, 2023.

THIEL, N. A. et al. Exposure to the herbicide 2, 4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid impairs mitochondrial function, oxidative status, and behavior in adult zebrafish. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, v. 27, p. 45874-45882, 2020.

TILMAN, D. et al. The influence of functional diversity and composition on ecosystem processes. **Science**, v. 277, n. 5330, p. 1300-1302, 1997.

TILMAN, D. The ecological consequences of changes in biodiversity: a search for general principles. **Ecology**, v. 80, n. 5, p. 1455-1474, 1999.

TILMAN, D. et al. Global food demand and the sustainable intensification of agriculture. **Proceedings of the national academy of sciences**, v. 108, n. 50, p. 20260-20264, 2011.

TORRE, I. et al. Are recent changes in the terrestrial small mammal communities related to land use change? A test using pellet analyses. **Ecological Research**, v. 30, n. 5, p. 813-819, 2015.

TURCOTTE, M. M. et al. The eco-evolutionary impacts of domestication and agricultural practices on wild species. **Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences**, v. 372, n. 1712, p. 20160033, 2017.

TSCHARNTKE, T. et al. Global food security, biodiversity conservation and the future of agricultural intensification. **Biological conservation**, v. 151, n. 1, p. 53-59, 2012.

VIANA, N. P. et al. Bioconcentration and toxicological impacts of fipronil and 2, 4-D commercial formulations (single and in mixture) in the tropical fish, *Danio rerio*. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, p. 1-14, 2022.

VILLAMAGNA, A. M.; MURPHY, B. R. Ecological and socio-economic impacts of invasive water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*): a review. **Freshwater biology**, v. 55, n. 2, p. 282-298, 2010.

VOGT, R. J.; PERES-NETO, P. R.; BEISNER, B. E. Using functional traits to investigate the determinants of crustacean zooplankton community structure. **Oikos**, v. 122, n. 12, p. 1700-1709, 2013.

WAISER, M. J.; ROBARTS, R. D. Impacts of a herbicide and fertilizers on the microbial community of a saline prairie lake. **Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences**, v. 54, n. 2, p. 320-329, 1997.

WANG, C. et al. Long-term succession characteristics and driving factors of zooplankton communities in a typical subtropical shallow lake, central China. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, v. 30, n. 17, p. 49435-49449, 2023

WETZEL, R. G. **Limnology: lake and river ecosystems**. gulf professional publishing, 2001.

WILD, R.; GÜCKER, B.; BRAUNS, M. Agricultural land use alters temporal dynamics and the composition of organic matter in temperate headwater streams. **Freshwater Science**, v. 38, n. 3, p. 566-581, 2019.

WILLIAMS, J. J.; BATES, A. E.; NEWBOLD, T. Human-dominated land uses favour species affiliated with more extreme climates, especially in the tropics. **Ecography**, v. 43, n. 3, p. 391-405, 2020.

WRIGHT, I. A. Importance of livestock production from grasslands for national and local food and nutritional security in developing countries. 2015.

WU, R. et al. Land use regulates the spectroscopic properties and sources of dissolved organic matter in the inflowing rivers of a large plateau lake in southwestern China: implication for organic pollution control. **Environmental Science and Pollution Research**, v. 30, n. 41, p. 94623-94638, 2023.

ZENI, J. O.; HOEINGHAUS, D. J.; CASATTI, L. Effects of pasture conversion to sugarcane for biofuel production on stream fish assemblages in tropical agroecosystems. **Freshwater Biology**, v. 62, n. 12, p. 2026-2038, 2017.

ZHANG, Y. et al. Influence of land cover types and phytoplankton community on the distribution and fate of dissolved organic matter in a typical river located in the semi-arid regions of China. **Journal of Hydrology**, v. 610, p. 127818, 2022a.

ZHANG, S. et al. Spatial Differences in Zooplankton Community Structure between Two Fluvial Lakes in the Middle and Lower Reaches of the Yangtze River: Effects of Land Use Patterns and Physicochemical Factors. **Diversity**, v. 14, n. 11, p. 908, 2022b.

ZHANG, J. et al. Eutrophication and loss of riparian shading influence food quality and trophic relation in stream food webs. **Water Research**, v. 249, p. 120926, 2024.

# **11 GENERAL CONCLUSION AND THE NEXT STEPS**

## General conclusion and the next steps

In this thesis, the main information on studies on the effects of land use on the zooplankton community around the world was highlighted (article 1), as well as the main water variables that structure the zooplankton community under the influence of agropastoral landscapes, pesticides and vinasse (articles 2, 3 and 4). In addition, we found that land use and management for intensive pasture and sugarcane crops, uses of extreme importance for the Brazilian economy, affect the taxonomic and functional diversity of zooplankton (article 3). We also analyzed how the application of fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse, alone or in mixtures, affects the zooplankton community and water parameters (Article 4). This work has therefore contributed to a better understanding of the effects of land use and the application of agrochemicals and vinasse on zooplankton.

Chapter 1 provided an overview of studies on the effects of land use on freshwater zooplankton communities and a synthesis of the main results presented in articles on this topic. A total of 80 articles were identified. The number of studies has increased over time, particularly in the USA, Poland, Canada, China, Argentina and Brazil. Land use for cropland, pasture and urbanization has been shown to have a negative impact on zooplankton communities. The presence of surrounding natural vegetation in aquatic environments has been shown to contribute to greater taxonomic and functional diversity. The least studied are the effects of land use for mining and the groups of testaceous amoebae, ciliates and flagellates. Different landscape metrics have been used, which may be related to different environmental policies in different countries. We highlight the main gaps so that studies on the effects of land use can advance and contribute to environmental policies for the maintenance and conservation of aquatic biodiversity. Thus, the results of Chapter 1 confirm our hypotheses 1 and 2.

In Chapter 2, the effect of water parameters of eight reservoirs in an agropastoral landscape on the functional structure of zooplankton was analyzed. The results showed that there was a greater functional richness and diversity of traits in alkaline environments with lower nitrogen concentrations. The study indicates that pH and TN are key variables for the functional structure of zooplankton communities in an agropastoral landscape. Thus, this chapter has partially confirmed our hypothesis 3 by demonstrating that pH, in addition to total nitrogen, is a key variable in structuring the zooplankton community of reservoirs under agropastoral.

In Chapter 3, the effects of land use were studied through a realistic simulation of land use: extensive pasture, intensive pasture and sugarcane crops. In the mesocosms inserted in the intensive pasture and sugarcane landscapes, there was a change in the functional and taxonomic composition of zooplankton, resulting in more tolerant species and a significant reduction in the taxonomic and functional richness of zooplankton. In addition, temperature, pH and dissolved oxygen were the structuring variables in aquatic environments in extensive pastures, while pH and electrical conductivity were the structuring variables in intensive pastures. In aquatic environments in sugarcane crops, temperature and pH were the main water variables. pH was the most important parameter in structuring zooplankton communities, being the only structuring variable present in all treatments. Therefore, this chapter confirmed our hypothesis 4 by showing that the zooplankton of aquatic environments in intensive pastures and sugarcane fields have lower taxonomic and functional diversity than those in extensive pastures. However, this chapter did not confirm our hypothesis 5 because the structuring variables were not phosphorus and total nitrogen for the intensive pasture and sugarcane environments and chlorophyll in the extensive pasture environments.

Chapter 4 evaluated the effects of fipronil, 2,4-D and vinasse, alone or in mixtures, on zooplankton diversity and identified the water parameters that structure the community. A mesocosm experiment was conducted with six treatments: control (C), 2,4-D (D), fipronil (F), fipronil and 2,4-D (M), vinasse (V), and all compounds (MV). After application of pesticides and vinasse, species richness, Shannon-Wiener diversity, richness and functional dispersion were significantly lower in treatments F, M, MV and V than in treatments C and D throughout the experiment. In treatment C, temperature and chlorophyll were the structuring parameters, while in treatment D, turbidity and pH were the main variables. Chlorophyll a was the main structuring variable in treatment F, while pH and electrical conductivity were the structuring variables in treatments MV and V, respectively. These results showed that the application of fipronil and vinasse, alone or in a mixture, had detrimental effects on the zooplankton community. Therefore, the results of this chapter confirmed hypothesis 6. However, hypothesis 7 was partially confirmed. As each application had a set of structuring variables, as for the control treatment we had temperature and chlorophyll (according to our hypothesis), but for the 2,4-D application turbidity and pH were the structuring variables. For the fipronil and vinasse treatments, total phosphorus and nitrogen were not the key variables as hypothesized, but rather conductivity and pH.

Chapter 5 presents the entire academic career, including the publication of scientific articles and the teaching of three undergraduate courses, one of which was written by the student.

In this way, this thesis highlights the extreme need for new legislative measures to allow the use of pesticides and vinasse. Furthermore, in order to mitigate the effects of land use, it is necessary to understand the best size of riparian buffer around aquatic environments, especially lentic ones, in order to protect aquatic communities, especially zooplankton. In this way, new legislative measures can be developed to protect, conserve and maintain the functioning of aquatic environments and aquatic biodiversity in Brazil. For example, the use of land for intensive pasture and sugarcane crops, and the application of vinasse and fipronil have harmful effects on the zooplankton community, and new sustainable forms of management and use should be studied to reduce the impact on aquatic communities.

Zooplankton is a community that stands out in the interconnections of aquatic food webs. A wide variety of zooplankton species are able to exploit available resources by performing specific functions in trophic chains and in the ecosystem as a whole. These functions include their ability to filter phytoplankton and to feed on organic matter, thus performing the important function of recycling organic matter and making nutrients available to the higher links in the food chains of aquatic ecosystems.

In this sense, our studies highlight the importance of considering this microscopic community and the detrimental effects of conventional land use practices on them, as they represent a group of organisms of great importance for maintaining ecosystem functions and the overall balance of aquatic environments.

Finally, in order to publicize the results of this thesis, manuscripts will be submitted for publication. Subsequently, scientific dissemination will be necessary to make the knowledge generated by this thesis available to the general public. To this end, once the data have been published in scientific journals, we intend to create posts and videos for dissemination in social media, such as the Unesp/Ibilce PPG Biodiversity Instagram, and try to publish the main results in local newspapers.