Lethal effects of Cr(III) alone and in combination with propiconazole and clothianidin in honey bees

(Article begins on next page)

25 April 2024

1 **Lethal effects of Cr(III) alone and in combination with propiconazole and**

2 **clothianidin in honey bees**

3 Fabio Sgolastra[1*], Sonia Blasioli[1*], Teresa Renzi[1], Simone Tosi[1,2], Piotr Medrzycki[3], Roberto

4 Molowny-Horas[4], Claudio Porrini[1], Ilaria Braschi[1]

5 [1]Dipartimento di Scienze Agrarie, *Alma Mater Studiorum*, Università di Bologna, Italy;

6 [2]University of California, San Diego, Division of Biological Sciences, Section of Ecology,

7 Behavior and Evolution, USA;

8 [3]CREA-AA, Consiglio per la Ricerca in Agricoltura e l'Analisi dell'Economia Agraria - Centro di

9 Ricerca Agricoltura ed Ambiente, Italy;

10 [4]CREAF, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, Spain

11

12 *These authors share first authorship

13

14 Corresponding author: F. Sgolastra (fabio.sgolastra2@unibo.it)

15

Abstract

17 Several anthropogenic contaminants, including pesticides and heavy metals, can affect honey bee

18 health. The effects of mixtures of heavy metals and pesticides are rarely studied in bees, even

19 though bees are likely to be exposed to these contaminants in both agricultural and urban

20 environments. In this study, the lethal toxicity of Cr alone and in combination with the

21 neonicotinoid insecticide clothianidin and the ergosterol-biosynthesis-inhibiting fungicide

22 propiconazole was assessed in *Apis mellifera* adults. The LD_{50} and lowest benchmark dose of Cr as

23 $Cr(NO_3)_3$, revealed a low acute oral toxicity on honey bee foragers (2049 and 379 mg L^{-1},

24 respectively) and the Cr retention (i.e. bee ability to retain the heavy metal in the body) was

generally low compared to other metals. A modified method based on the binomial proportion test was developed to analyze synergistic and antagonistic interactions between the three tested contaminants. The combination of an ecologically-relevant field concentration of chromium with clothianidin and propiconazole did not increase bee mortality. On the contrary, the presence of Cr in mixture with propiconazole elicited a slight antagonistic effect.

Highlights

- Low acute oral toxicity of chromium on adults of honey bee foragers
- Chromium retention in bee body was 20-30% of the quantity ingested
- No synergistic effect between chromium and propiconazole or clothianidin
- Slight antagonism between chromium and propiconazole

1. Introduction

Bees are extremely important as crop pollinators and to maintain plant biodiversity (Klein et al., 2007; Ollerton et al., 2011). In the last decades, wild and managed bees have been declining worldwide thus posing a potential risk to food production and human health (Lautenbach et al., 2012; Chaplin-Kramer et al., 2014). Abnormal honey bee mortality rates have been observed in US and in European Countries, with percentages of overwintering colony losses much higher than 10% rate that is usually considered an acceptable loss threshold value by beekeepers (Lee et al., 2015; Chauzat et al., 2016). Many factors have been taken into account to explain this phenomenon (Biesmeijer et al., 2006; Potts et al., 2010; Abbo et al., 2017; Fauser-Misslin et al., 2014; Dance et al., 2017). Pesticides, malnutrition, pathogens (including *Varroa* mite infestation), climate change, habitat fragmentation and some beekeeping management practices (e.g. migration activities for almond pollination in US) are the main factors that affect honey bee survival (Goulson et al., 2015). However, up to now, these stressors have often been studied individually and the potential synergic effects of other anthropogenic activities, like heavy metal pollution, have rarely been considered.

In fact, although the use of honey bees as environmental bioindicator of heavy metals have been studying since 1935 (Svoboda, 1961), the effects of these pollutants on bee health have often been overlooked and only recently they are considered in the framework of bee decline (Moroń et al., 2012; Exley et al., 2015).

In the present study, we addressed the lethal effects of chromium as Cr(III), alone and in combination with the neonicotinoid clothianidin and the ergosterol-biosynthesis-inhibitor (EBI) fungicide propiconazole on honey bees (*Apis mellifera ligustica* L.) following acute oral exposure under laboratory conditions. Chromium is a heavy metal ubiquitous in the environment often found as Cr (III) or (VI). The environmental diffusion of Cr has been increasing in the last years due to mining and industrial activities (Zayed and Terry, 2003). Although Cr(III) is commonly present in

animals, it becomes toxic at high concentrations (Di Bona et al., 2011). Since this metal may be accumulated in plant tissues (Oliveira, 2012), honey bees can be exposed to this contaminant by contact and ingestion. As a consequence, chromium can be found in honey (Conti and Botrè, 2001; Porrini et al., 2002; Satta et al., 2012). Honey bees are considered bioindicator of environmental Cr pollution since environmental levels detected in honey bee matrices (i.e. honey, bee body, beeswax) range from 0.005 to 46.52 mg kg^{-1} depending on the matrix considered or on environmental colony location (i.e. rural, urban or industrial area) (Porrini et al., 2002; Satta et al., 2012).

LD_{50} of heavy metals are rarely assessed in bee ecotoxicology (Hladun et al., 2013; Di et al. 2016; Heard et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2017) and no value is available in literature for Cr as well as its benchmark dose (BMD) (*i.e.* the estimated lowest dose that produces an adverse response compared to the negative control).

Clothianidin and propiconazole pesticides are commonly applied to various crops such as oilseed rape, sunflower, fruit trees, maize and cereals (EFSA, 2013a; 2013b; Simon-Delso et al., 2015) and their residues are often found in honey bee matrices (Lambert et al., 2013; Mullin et al., 2010; Pistorius et al., 2015; Porrini et al., 2016). Therefore, the co-exposure of bees to these compounds under field conditions should be investigated.

Previous studies have already reported that clothianidin and propiconazole may interact in a synergistic way in honey bees following acute oral or contact exposure (Biddinger et al., 2013; Thompson et al., 2014; Sgolastra et al., 2017). However, no information on possible interactions among Cr and these two pesticides is available.

In this study, the LD_{50} of Cr (expressed both in mg L^{-1} sugar syrup and in μg bee^{-1}) and its BMD (expressed in mg L^{-1}) at 48 hours after ingestion were determined for the first time. In addition, possible lethal effects of environmental Cr concentrations in combinations with clothianidin and propiconazole (i.e., binary or ternary mixtures) were investigated and a new statistical method to

4

88 define synergistic/antagonistic interaction among them was developed *ad hoc*. Finally, Cr

89 bioconcentration ratio in the bee body (i.e., bee Cr concentration/feeding solution Cr concentration),

90 as a measure of honey bee capacity to retain the heavy metal, was estimated.

91

2. Materials and methods

93 *2.1 Bees and test conditions*

94 Forager honey bees (*Apis mellifera ligustica*) were obtained from three healthy colonies placed in

95 an experimental apiary of CREA-AA (Bologna, Italy). During summer 2015, forager bees were

96 collected using the "Funnel trap" (Medrzycki, 2013). The trap placed at the entrance of the hive

97 allows collecting only forager bees, thus reducing the variability among bee categories (i.e., guard

98 and other in-hive bees). After 30 min of anesthetization with 60% CO_2 in synthetic air, bees were

99 placed in cardboard cages (9.5 cm x 6.5 cm x 5 cm) in groups of 10 (LD_{50} and BMD estimations) or

100 20 individuals (single pollutants, binary/ternary mixtures exposure experiment) per cage. Three

101 cages per treatment were used. Bees from each colony were randomly distributed in group of 10 (or

102 20) among treatments to account for genetic diversity (i.e. different colony origin). In addition, to

103 exclude any potential colony effect, a rank-transformed repeated-measures ANOVA analyses

104 (Zimmerman and Zumbo, 1993) was performed for each treatment, with colony as the between-

105 subjects factor and time (4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 h) as the within-subjects factor. In all treatments, no

106 differences among colonies were found (Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplementary Information).

107 During the experiment, the cages were maintained at 25±2 °C and 50-70% of relative humidity in

108 an incubator under complete darkness. The cages were daily rotated to reduce potential differences

109 in the incubator microclimate.

110 All treatments were performed on bees after 1 h starvation period. Test solutions (*vide infra*) were

111 provided using a bulk feeder. For each treatment, the volume provided per cage was defined

according to the assumption that, through trophallaxis, all individuals would ingest similar doses of 10 μL (OECD, 1998; Medrzycki et al., 2013). At the end of the exposure phase (maximum 2 h), the complete consumption of the solution was verified by visual inspection of the feeder. After that, bees were fed *ad libitum* with a sugarbeet (Eridania Italia SpA, Italy) syrup solution (sugarbeet:distilled water = 50:50 w/v) until the end of the experiment (96 h). Dead bees were preserved at -20 °C until elemental analysis.

2.2 Chemicals

$Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$ (MW 400.15 g mol^{-1}) and $Cr_2(SO_4)_3$ (MW 392.18 g mol^{-1}) were purchased from Carlo Erba (Italy).

Propiconazole with 98.4% purity and clothianidin with 99% purity were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (USA) and from Dr Ehrenstorfer Gmbh (Germany), respectively. The main chemical characteristics of the two pesticides are reported in Table 1.

2.3 Estimation of Cr(III) LD$_{50}$ and BMD

Bees were exposed to different doses of $Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$ in a geometric series in order to calculate the dose-response curve and estimate the LD$_{50}$ and BMD of Cr. As defined by a range-finding test, the following Cr concentrations in the sugar syrup solution (50% w/v) were chosen: 514, 1632, 2167, 2667 and 4605 mg Cr L^{-1}. Among treatments, the highest concentration (4605 mg Cr L^{-1}) was excluded in the calculation of the dose-response curve because the solution was not completely consumed by bees at the end of the exposure phase, likely due to its repellent effect. The toxicity of Cr as $Cr_2(SO_4)_3$ was also tested at the Cr concentrations of 302, 932, 1336, 1865, and 2685 mg L^{-1} to evaluate possible effect of the Cr counterion.

The Cr concentrations in the test solutions were determined by elemental analysis with an inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometer (*vide infra*).

137   Control cages were supplied with sugar syrup solution.

138

139   *2.4 Bee treatments with single component solutions, binary and ternary mixtures*

140   A propiconazole solution at the concentration of 700 mg L^{-1} was prepared by dissolving 700 mg of

141   the fungicide in 15 mL of acetone (purity >99.0%, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) and then adding sugar

142   syrup solution (50:50 w/v) up to 1 L of final volume. Aliquots of 10 µL of the solution containing 7

143   µg of propiconazole were provided per-capita to the bees: the dose was chosen as a non-lethal dose

144   as previously defined (Sgolastra et al., 2017). This dose corresponds at ~1/9 the oral LD$_{50}$ at 24 h

145   for *Apis mellifera* (Ladurner et al., 2005).

146   A clothianidin solution at the concentration of 0.074 mg L^{-1} was prepared by dissolving 0.074 mg

147   of the insecticide in 15 mL of acetone and then adding the sugar syrup solution up to 1 L of final

148   volume. Solution aliquots of 10 µL containing 0.74 ng of clothianidin were provided per-capita to

149   the bees: the dose falls within the range of the LD$_{10}$±95% confidence limit (CL) for clothianidin in

150   *A. mellifera* as previously estimated (Sgolastra et al., 2017). This dose can be also considered

151   ecologically relevant since it is within the range of the estimated amount of clothianidin ingested by

152   a honey bee during a foraging bout (0.11-1.36 ng) (Sgolastra et al., 2017).

153   A sugar syrup solution (sugar:distilled water = 50:50 w/v), containing 1.5% of acetone and 3.9 mg

154   Cr L^{-1} as $Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$, was prepared for the evaluation of the effect of the environmental Cr

155   concentration on bees. Solution aliquots of 10 µL containing 0.039 µg of Cr were provided per-

156   capita to the bees. This concentration was chosen because it falls within the Cr concentrations found

157   in honey bee matrices (Porrini et al., 2002; Satta et al., 2012) and thus it can be considered

158   ecologically relevant.

159   Binary solutions were prepared by dissolving into 15 ml of acetone: i) 700 mg of propicnazole and

160   0.074 mg of clothianidin; ii) 700 mg of propiconazole and 3.9 mg of Cr as $Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$; iii)

161   0.074 mg of clothianidin and 3.9 mg of Cr as $Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$. All the organic solutions were then

7

162 diluted with sugar syrup solution up to 1 L of final volume. Aliquots of 10 µL of each binary

163 solution were provided per-capita to the bees.

164 A ternary solution was prepared by adding to 1 L of the binary solution of propiconazole and

165 clothianidin, 3.9 mg of Cr(III) as $Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$. Even in this case, aliquots of 10 µL of the ternary

166 solution were provided per-capita to the bees.

167 Acetone (15 mL) was diluted to 1 L with the sugar syrup solution as a control (solvent control). In

168 addition, the syrup solution was also tested on bees as a negative control.

169

170 *2.5 Metal content analysis*

171 Metal concentrations in contaminated syrup solution and in honey bee body were measured after 48

172 h from exposure phase by using an inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometer (ICP-

173 OES) furnished by SPECTRO Analytical Instruments GmbH & Co. (Kleve, Germany) equipped

174 with a plasma source and an optical detector with a charge-coupled device (CCD) able to quantify

175 emission wavelengths of elements ranging between 125 and 780 nm. Test solutions were analyzed

176 for Cr after addition of HNO_3 ($\geq$ 69% v/v, for trace analysis, Sigma-Aldrich, USA).

177 Single honey bees (mean±SE dry weight: 22.75±0.47 mg each) were analyzed for Cr content after

178 dissolution in a mixture of HNO_3 ($\geq$ 69% v/v, for trace analysis, Fluka, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) and

179 H_2O_2 (30% v/v, for trace analysis, VWR Prolabo Chemicals, USA) in the ratio of 4:1 (v:v) by

180 microwave-assisted digestion (*Start D*, Microwave Digestion System, Milestone, USA) before

181 elemental analysis. The limit of detection (LOD) for Cr was 0.38 µg kg^{-1} bee. For the statistical

182 analysis, zero value was assigned to concentrations below the limit of detection (*vide infra*).

183 The Cr recovery from bee matrix exposed to digestion and then analysed by ICP-OES was

184 determined as follows. After drying at 100°C for 24 h, five bees were singly spiked with 10 µL of a

185 Cr standard solution (1000 mg Cr L^{-1}) for ICP-OES calibration and additional five control bees

186 were added with the same volume of distilled water. Once the added solutions were reduced by

187 evaporation (within ca. 2 h), bees were singly mineralized and processed for Cr determination as

188   already described. Cr recovery on spiked bees resulted 102±1.6% and Cr content of control bees

189   was always below the LOD.

190

191   *2.6 Statistical analysis*

192   The number of dead bees was measured 4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 h after exposure to pollutants (see

193   Figures S1 and S2 of Supplementary Information for mortality data *vs* time, corrected with Abbott's

194   formula for Cr as $Cr(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$ or $Cr_2(SO_4)_3$). Both the BMD intervals (BMDL-BMDU) and

195   LD_{50} values of Cr were estimated at 48 h after exposure phase.

196   The LD_{50}s were estimated with a Probit analysis (Finney, 1952) at 95% CL. The values expressed

197   in mg Cr L^{-1} in the sugar syrup were then transformed in µg bee^{-1} assuming that each bee ingested

198   10 µL of test solution.

199   The Cr BMD intervals were estimated using PROAST version 62.5 (http://www.proast.nl). The

200   BMD approach is considered as an alternative of the no-observed-adverse-effect level (NOAEL)

201   approach, since it makes a more extended use of available dose–response data and provides a

202   quantification of their uncertainties (EFSA, 2009). The approach considers the dose-response

203   information by fitting several mathematical models to the data. Our dose-response data were

204   analysed according to EFSA (EFSA, 2009, 2017). Briefly, the Bench Mark Response (BMR), also

205   known as Critical Effect Size, was set at 10% as recommended for quantal data analysis. The BMD

206   is the dose, derived from the estimated dose-response curve, associated with the BMR. The lower

207   and upper bounds of the BMD, denoted BMDL and BMDU, correspond to the projection of the

208   lower and upper 95% one sided confidence bound of BMR, respectively, to the dose axis. The

209   BMD intervals for each fitted model were reported following the EFSA recommendations (EFSA,

210   2017) so that the lowest BMDL and highest BMDU from these selected models were then used to

211   define the final BMD confidence interval.

212 The quantity of Cr retained by single bees (expressed in µg mg^{-1} of dry body weight) and the metal

213 bioconcentration ratio (MBR), i.e. the ratio between Cr ingested and Cr found in bee body, were

214 evaluated with a regression analysis (see Section S3 and Figures S3 and S4 in Supplementary

215 Information).

216 In the experiment where bees were exposed to pollutants as single compound or binary/ternary

217 mixtures, Log-rank Kaplan-Meier (K-M) survival analyses with pairwise multi comparison

218 procedures (Hom-Sidak method) were carried out to compare survival among treatments. Survival

219 analyses were conducted with SigmaPlot 12.3.

220 For each assessment time (i.e. 4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 h after exposure to pollutants), the binomial

221 proportion test described in Sgolastra et al. (2017) was used to estimate potential synergism on bee

222 mortality between the different combinations of chromium and the two pesticides. In addition, the

223 test was modified in order to assess antagonistic interactions. Since antagonism and synergism were

224 tested on the same dataset and at five different times, we used a multiple comparison correction

225 (Holm, 1979) to estimate significance levels for 10 p-values jointly. The null hypotheses that we

226 were trying to test were:

$$H_0 \equiv p_{AB}^{obs} - p_{AB}^{exp} = p_{AB}^{obs} - \left(p_A + p_B - p_A \cdot p_B\right) > 0$$

227 when synergy was expected, and:

$$H_0 \equiv p_{AB}^{obs} - p_{AB}^{exp} = p_{AB}^{obs} - \left(p_A + p_B - p_A \cdot p_B\right) < 0$$

228 when antagonism was expected. According to Bliss independence criterion, the expected combined

229 effect of two substances in an organism is expressed as follows:

$$p_{AB}^{exp} = p_A + p_B - p_A \cdot p_B$$

where p_A and p_B represent the mortality probability associated with the use of substances A and B, respectively, and p_{AB}^{exp} is the expected mortality of their combined effect (see the R script at section S4 in Supplementary Information).

3. Results and discussion

Although the co-exposure to heavy metals and pesticides can likely occur in agricultural and urban environment, their effects in combination have been rarely evaluated in bees (Jumarie et al., 2017). This study was aimed at assessing the lethal toxicity of Cr alone and in combination with two common pesticides: the neonicotinoid insecticide clothianidin and the EBI fungicide propiconazole under laboratory conditions. In general, results from laboratory studies are usually considered conservative in risk assessment (worst case scenario) since chemicals are better protected by environmental degradation (Cluzeau, 2002). In addition, data obtained in laboratory conditions are more reliable and comparable because of the adopted standard methods. However, several ecologically important effects (i.e. sublethal effects that can affect the whole colony) are difficult to detect under the same conditions.

3.1 Chromium LD$_{50}$ and BMD

The Cr LD$_{50}$ and BMD intervals (BMDL and BMDU) estimated at 48 hours in the acute oral toxicity tests are reported in Table 2.

The values of LD$_{50}$ are expressed both as mg Cr L^{-1} sugar syrup and µg Cr bee^{-1}. For the LD$_{50}$, the CL ranges obtained for Cr as Cr(NO$_3$)$_3$ is well overlapped with the range values obtained for Cr as Cr(SO$_4$)$_3$, thus excluding possible lethal effects of Cr counterion. The calculated Cr LD$_{50}$ in *A. mellifera* adults equals to 2049 mg L^{-1} (or 20.5 µg bee^{-1}) which indicates slight toxicity based on the WSDA pesticide's classification (WSDA, 2010), especially when compared to other pollutants

254 (e.g.: Se LD_{50}: 60 mg L^{-1} (Hladun et al., 2013); Cu LD_{50}: 72 mg L^{-1} and Pb LD_{50}: 345 mg L^{-1} (Di et

255 al., 2016); Cd LD_{50}: 18.36 mg L^{-1} and As LD_{50}: 25.68 mg L^{-1} (Heard et al., 2017)).

256 As far as the BMD is concerned, a detailed description of the BMD analysis according EFSA

257 guideline (EFSA 2009; 2011) is reported in section S4 of Supplementary Information (Tables S6

258 and S7). According to this analysis, the lowest BMD limit determined for Cr as $Cr(NO_3)_3$ (BMDL:

259 379 mg Cr L^{-1}, Table 2) is one order of magnitude higher than the highest environmental

260 concentrations found in honey bee matrices (46.52 mg Cr kg^{-1}, Satta et al., 2012). According to our

261 data, Cr at environmental concentrations poses a relatively low risk to honey bee adults by acute

262 oral exposure.

263 The effects of Cr have also been addressed in other insect species however it is very difficult to

264 compare their results to our findings due to the relevant differences in the methodologies adopted.

265 For example, several studies focused on Cr exposure during larval stage (*Drosophila melanogaster*:

266 Hepburn et al., 2003; *Bombyx mori*: Tucker et al. 2003; *Galleria mellonella*: Wu and Yi, 2015;

267 *Hermetia illucens*: Gao et al. 2017), others tested Cr(VI) (*Culex quinquefasciatus*: Sorensen et al.

268 2006; *Oxya chinensis*: Li et al. 2005) or assessed different endpoints (e.g. genotoxicity and

269 reproduction in *D. melanogaster*: Hepburn et al., 2003). Finally, other studies dealt with aquatic

270 insects with exposure via water environment (Warnik and Bell 1969; Rehwoldt et al. 1973).

271

272 *3.2. Bioaccumulation of chromium in bee body*

273 Figure 1 shows the Cr retained in bee body (a) and the MBR (b) as a function of Cr dissolved in the

274 syrup ingested by the bees. No Cr residues were detected in control bees. Observational data in

275 Figure 1a,b were fitted with statistical models (see section S3 in Supplementary Information) in

276 order to model the dependence of Cr retained and MBR datasets on Cr dissolved in syrup.

277 The Cr-retained dataset showed a positive and very significant linear relationship with Cr in the

278 feeding solution (p<0.001 for α_{A1} coefficient and p=0.0880 for β_{A1}: Table S3 in Supplementary

279 Information).

280 On the other hand, the MBR data showed a weak increasing trend with Cr in syrup. A non-linear

281 curve constrained to pass through the origin of coordinates (see section S3.2 in Supplementary

282 Information) showed a good agreement with the observed MBR points, although its coefficients

283 were not statistically significant. Similar nonlinear MBR trends with the metal concentrations in the

284 syrup have been reported for Al, Pb and Cd in honey bee body following chronic exposure

285 (Gauthier et al., 2016). Remarkably, our data show that Cr accumulated in the bee body was 20-

286 30% of Cr ingested (0.2–0.3 MBR values) within the tested concentration range (514-2667 mg Cr

287 L^{-1}).

288 In our study, the Cr retention in bee body after acute exposure was generally lower than the values

289 observed after Al, Pb, Cd and Fe chronic exposure, thus suggesting bee higher ability to eliminate

290 Cr compared to other heavy metals (Gauthier et al., 2016; Jumarie et al., 2017). Seemingly, the low

291 toxicity of Cr in bee compared to other heavy metals (Hladun et al., 2013; Di et al., 2016; Heard et

292 al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2017) might be related to bee ability to eliminate the heavy metal from

293 the body.

294

295 *3.3. Experiment with the mixtures of chromium, clothianidin and propiconazole*

296 Cumulative proportion of surviving bees to Cr, propiconazole and clothianidin as single compounds

297 and as binary and ternary mixtures are presented in Figure 2. Significant differences among

298 cumulative survival curves of honey bees exposed to different treatments were found (Log-rank

299 analysis χ^2=87.6, df=8, p<0.001). In order to better highlight differences among treatment effects on

bee mortality, pairwise analysis was performed on survival curves of Figure 2 and the p values are reported in Table 3.

In details, the clothianidin and propiconazole combination in the absence (CLO+PRO) or in the presence of Cr (CLO+PRO+Cr), as well as clothianidin and chromium mixture (CLO+Cr), gave the lowest bee survival after 96 hours from ingestion (Figure 2). As far as the bee survival within 4 days observation is concerned, no significant differences were observed among the combined treatments (i.e., CLO+PRO, CLO+PRO+Cr, CLO+Cr); however, the survival rates were significantly lower than controls (Table 3). On the contrary, after 96 hours from ingestion, bee exposure to single pollutants (i.e., PRO, CLO and Cr) or to propiconazole and Cr combination (PRO+Cr) resulted in a more limited mortality if compared to the other treatments (Figure 2). As reported in Table 3, no significant differences ($p>0.05$) were observed among survival curves of these treatments and the two controls (negative and solvent controls), thus confirming that our test doses were sublethal when administered alone.

In this study, the binomial proportion test developed for synergism (Sgolastra et al., 2017) was implemented to evaluate the antagonistic effect of the three pollutants in binary or ternary mixtures on bee mortality (Table 4). The script of this new procedure is provided as a Supporting data. Briefly, the implemented test is able to highlighten both the synergistic or antagonistic effect size expressed as a positive or negative difference, respectively, between the observed and expected mortality probabilities for each pollutants combination at each assessment time. In Table 4, A or B terms refer to the effect size of single pollutants in binary or in ternary mixture. The lethal effect on bees of clothanidin and propiconazole combination (A and B terms, respectively, Table 4) was synergistic for the first 48 hours after ingestion as shown by the significantly ($p<0.05$) positive values of effect size, in full agreement with previous results (Sgolastra et., 2017). The mechanism responsible for the synergism between the two pesticides is well known and it is related to the ability of propiconazole to inhibit the metabolization of clothianidin by cytochrome P450

14

monooxygenases (Berenbaum and Johnson, 2015). According to our data, a similar significant sinergistic effect was also observed in the ternary mixture by considering PRO+Cr (A term) and CLO (B term) as well as CLO+Cr (A term) and PRO (B term), although within a shorter time period (4-24 h). Cr contribution to the synergistic effect observed in the ternary mixture with clothianidin and propiconazole was ruled out by considering the effect size of CLO+PRO (A term) and Cr (B term).

A significant (p<0.05) antagonistic effect in the chromium and propiconazole mixture was revealed at 72 and 96 hours after ingestion, according to the negative effect size values observed. In the literature, no information to explain the observed antagonistic effect is available.

To exclude any possible complexation of propiconazole by Cr(III) able to decrease the lethal effect of these stressors in honey bees, a UV study on syrup solution containing propiconazole and Cr as single compounds and their combination were performed both at the concentration adopted in the mixture as well as at one order of magnitude higher. The UV spectra (data not shown) did not reveal visible absorption differences, thus excluding any propiconazole-Cr complex formation. Likely, the antagonism between propiconazole and Cr may affect their main physiological detoxification processes in honey bees as bioavailability, uptake, internal transportation, metabolization, binding at the target site and excretion.

5. Conclusions

The calculated LD_{50} of chromium as $Cr(NO_3)_3$ in *A. mellifera* adults (2049 mg L^{-1} syrup solution or 20.5 μg bee^{-1}) indicates low toxicity. Acute exposure to Cr at concentration higher than 379 mg L^{-1} (BMDL) may cause lethal effects to honey bee forgers. However, these concentrations are 10-100 times higher than the level usually found in honey bee matrices, thus confirming moderate Cr risks for honey bee foragers. In addition, honey bees showed higher ability to eliminate Cr (low Cr MBR)

349 compared to other heavy metals (Al, Pb, Cd and Fe). However, Cr effect on mortality of bee larvae

350 or behavioural perturbation that might chronically affect colony could not be ruled out.

351 Chromium at environmental concentration (3.9 mg L^{-1}) ingested alone or in combination with

352 sublethal doses of clothianidin and propiconazole did not significantly decrease the survival rate in

353 bees. A modified binomial proportion test-based method was developed to analyse pairwise

354 synergistic and antagonistic interactions between the three stressors for each assessment time.

355 Significant synergistic effects were observed in bees in the first 48 hours after ingestion in the

356 mixture clothianidin and propiconazole either in the presence or in the absence of chromium,

357 whereas antagonistic effects were observed in the binary mixture of propiconazole and Cr at 72 and

358 96 hours after ingestion.

359

360 Competing interests

361 We have no competing interests.

362

363 Acknowledgements

368

369 Reference

370   Abbo, P.M., Kawasaki, J.K., Hamilton, M., Cook, S.C., DeGrandi-Hoffman, G., Li W.F., Liu, J.,

371   Chen Y.P., 2017. Effects of Imidacloprid and *Varroa destructor* on survival and health of

372   European honey bees, *Apis mellifera*. Insect. Sci. 24 (3), 467-477. doi: 10.1111/1744-

373   7917.12335.

374   Berenbaum, M.R., Johnson R.M., 2015. Xenobiotic detoxification pathways in honey bees. Curr.

375   Opin. Insect. Sci. 10, 51–58.

376   Biddinger, D.J., Robertson, J.L., Mullin, C., Frazier, J., Ashcraft, S., Rajotte, E.G., et al., 2013.

377   Comparative toxicities and synergism of apple orchard pesticides to *Apis mellifera* (L.) and

378   *Osmia cornifrons* (Radoszkowski). PloS One 8(9), e72587.

379   http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0072587.

380   Biesmeijer, J.C., Roberts, S.P.M., Reemer, M., Ohlemüller, R., Edwards, M., Peeters, T., et al.,

381   2006. Parallel Declines in Pollinators and Insect-Pollinated Plants in Britain and the

382   Netherlands. Science, 313 (5785), 351–354. http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1127863.

383   Chaplin-Kramer, R., Dombeck, E., Gerber, J., Knuth, K.A., Mueller, N.D., Mueller, M., et al.,

384   2014. Global malnutrition overlaps with pollinator-dependent micronutrient production. Proc.

385   R. Soc. B 281: 20141799. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1799.

386   Chauzat, M.-P., Jacques, A., Laurent, M., Bougeard, S., Hendrikx, P., & Ribière-Chabert, M., 2016.

387   Risk indicators affecting honeybee colony survival in Europe: one year of surveillance.

388   Apidologie 47, 348-378. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-016-0440-z.

389   Cluzeau, S., 2002. Risk assessment of plant protection products on honey bees. In: Honey Bees:

390   Estimating the Environmental Impact of Chemicals. Edited by James Devillers and Minh-Hà

391   Pham-Delègue. London and New York. Taylor and Francis.

392   Conti, M.E., Botrè, F., 2001. Honeybees and their products as potential bioindicators of heavy

393   metals contamination. Environ. Monit. Assess. 69(3), 267–82.

394 Dance, C., Botías, C., Goulson, D., 2017. The combined effects of a monotonous diet and exposure

395   to thiamethoxam on the performance of bumblebee micro-colonies. Ecotoxicol. Environ.

396   Safety 139, 194-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2017.01.041.

397 Di, N., Hladun, K.R., Zhang, K., Liu, T.X., Trumble, J.T., 2016. Laboratory bioassays on the

398   impact of cadmium, copper and lead on the development and survival of honeybee (*Apis*

399   *mellifera* L.) larvae and foragers. Chemosphere 152, 530-538.

400 Di Bona, K.R., Love, S., Rhodes, N.R., McAdory, D., Sinha, S.H., Kern, N., et al., 2011.

401   Chromium is not an essential trace element for mammals: effects of a "low-chromium" diet. J

402   Biol. Inorg. Chem. 16, 381–390. http://doi.org/10.1007/s00775-010-0734-y.

403 EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2009. Guidance of the Scientific Committee on a request

404   from EFSA on the use of the benchmark dose approach in risk assessment. EFSA J. 7(6),

405   1150. http://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2009.1150.

406 EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2013a. Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide

407   risk assessment for bees for Clothianidin. EFSA J. 11(1), 3066.

408   http://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3066.

409 EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2013b. Reasoned opinion on the review of the existing

410   maximum residue levels (MRLs) for ethoxyquin according to Article 12 of Regulation (EC).

411   EFSA J. 11(396), 3231. http://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3231.

412 EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2017. Update: Guidance on the use of the benchmark

413   dose approach in risk assessment. EFSA J. 15(1), 4658. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4658.

414 Exley, C., Rotheray, E., Goulson, D., 2015. Bumblebee pupae contain high levels of aluminium.

415   PloS One 10(6), e0127665. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127665.

416 Fauser-Misslin, A., Sadd, B. M., Neumann, P., Sandrock, C., 2014. Influence of combined pesticide

417   and parasite exposure on bumble bee colony traits in the laboratory. J. Appl. Ecol. 51, 450–

418   459. http://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12188.

419   Finney, D.J., 1952. Probit Analysis. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press. 318 pp.

420   Gao, Q., Wang, X.Y., Wang, W.Q., Lei, C.L., Zhu, F., 2017. Influences of chromium and cadmium

421   on the development of black soldier fly larvae. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 24, 8637-8644.

422   Gauthier, M., Aras, P., Jumarie, C., Boily, M., 2016. Low dietary levels of Al, Pb and Cd may

423   affect the non-enzymatic antioxidant capacity in caged honey bees (*Apis mellifera*).

424   Chemosphere 144, 848–854. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.09.057.

425   Goulson, D., Nicholls, E., Botías, C., Rotheray, E.L., 2015. Bee declines driven by combined stress

426   from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. Science 347, 1255957-1-1255957-9.

427   http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1255957.

428   Heard, M. S., Baas, J., Dorne, J.-Lou, Lahive, E., Robinson, A.G., Rortais, A., et al., 2017.

429   Comparative toxicity of pesticides and environmental contaminants in bees: Are honey bees a

430   useful proxy for wild bee species ? Sci. Total. Environ. 578, 357–365.

431   http://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.180.

432   Hepburn, D.D.D, Xiao, J., Bindom, S., Vincent, J.B., O'Donnell, J., 2003. Nutritional supplement

433   chromium picolinate causes sterility and lethal mutations in *Drosophila melanogaster*. PNAS

434   100, 3766–3771.

435   Hladun, K.R., Kaftanoglu, O., Parker, D.R., Tran, K.D., Trumble, J.T., 2013. Effects of selenium on

436   development, survival, and accumulation in the honeybee (*Apis mellifera* L.). Environ.

437   Toxicol. Chem. 32, 2584–2592. http://doi.org/10.1002/etc.2357.

438   Holm, S., 1979. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. Scand. J. Stat. 6, 65−70.

439 Jumarie, C., Aras, P., Boily, M., 2017. Chemosphere Mixtures of herbicides and metals affect the

440 redox system of honey bees. Chemosphere 168, 163–170.

441 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.10.056

442 Klein, A.-M., Vaissière, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen, C.,

443 Tscharntke, T., 2007. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. Proc.

444 R. Soc. B 274, 303-313. http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3721.

445 Ladurner, E., Bosch, J., Kemp, W.P., Maini, S., 2005. Assessing delayed and acute toxicity of five

446 formulated fungicides to *Osmia lignaria* Say and *Apis mellifera*. Apidologie 36, 449–460.

447 Lambert, O., Piroux, M., Puyo, S., Thorin, C., L'Hostis, M., Wiest, L., et al., 2013. Widespread

448 Occurrence of Chemical Residues in Beehive Matrices from Apiaries Located in Different

449 Landscapes of Western France. PLoS One 8(6), 1–12.

450 http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0067007.

451 Lautenbach, S., Seppelt, R., Liebscher, J., Dormann, C.F., 2012. Spatial and temporal trends of

452 global pollination benefit. PloS One, 7(4), e35954.

453 http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035954.

454 Lee, K.V., Steinhauer, N., Rennich, K., Wilson, M.E., Tarpy, D.R., Caron, D.M., et al., 2015. A

455 national survey of managed honey bee 2013–2014 annual colony losses in the USA.

456 Apidologie 46, 292–305. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-015-0356-z.

457 Li, L.J., Zhang, F., Liu, X.M., Guo, Y.P., Ma, E.B., 2005. Oxidative stress related enzymes in

458 response to chromium(VI) toxicity in *Oxya chinensis* (Orthoptera: Acridoidae). J. Environ. Sci.

459 17, 823-826.

460 Medrzycki, P., 2013. Funnel trap – a tool for selective collection of exiting forager bees for tests. J.

461 Apic. Res. 52, 122–123. http://doi.org/10.3896/IBRA.1.52.3.02.

462   Medrzycki, P., Giffard, H., Aupinel, P., Belzunces, L.P., Chauzat, M.-P., Claßen, C., et al., 2013.

463   Standard methods for toxicology research in *Apis mellifera*. J. Apic. Res. 52, 1–60.

464   http://doi.org/10.3896/IBRA.1.52.4.14.

465   Moroń, D., Grześ, I.M., Skórka, P., Szentgyörgyi, H., Laskowski, R., Potts, S.G., Woyciechowski,

466   M., 2012. Abundance and diversity of wild bees along gradients of heavy metal pollution. J.

467   Appl. Ecol. 49(1), 118–125. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02079.x.

468   Mullin, C.A, Frazier, M., Frazier, J.L., Ashcraft, S., Simonds, R., Vanengelsdorp, D., Pettis, J.S.,

469   2010. High levels of miticides and agrochemicals in North American apiaries: implications for

470   honey bee health. PloS One 5(3), e9754. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0009754.

471   OECD, 1998. Guideline for testing of chemicals. Test No. 213: Honey bees, acute oral toxicity test.

472   OECD, Paris, France (1998).

473   Oliveira, H., 2012. Chromium as an environmental pollutant: Insights on induced plant toxicity.

474   Journal of Botany, Article ID 375843, 1-8. http://doi.org/10.1155/2012/375843.

475   Ollerton, J., Winfree, R., Tarrant, S., 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals?

476   Oikos 120(3), 321–326. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18644.x.

477   Pistorius J., Wehner A., Kriszan M., Bargen H., Knäbe S., Klein O., Frommberger M., Stähler M.,

478   Heimbach U., 2015. Application of predefined doses of neonicotinoid containing dusts in field

479   trials and acute effects on honey bees. B Insectology 68, 161-172.

480   Porrini, C., Ghini, S., Girotti, S., Sabatini, A.G., Gattavecchia, E., Celli, G., 2002. Use of honey

481   bees as bioindicators of environmental pollution in Italy. In: Honey Bees: Estimating the

482   Environmental Impact of Chemicals. Edited by James Devillers and Minh-Hà Pham-Delègue.

483   London and New York. Taylor and Francis.

484   Porrini, C., Mutinelli, F., Bortolotti, L., Granato, A., Laurenson, L. et al., 2016. The Status of

485   Honey Bee Health in Italy: Results from the Nationwide Bee Monitoring Network. PloS One,

486   11(5): e0155411. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155411.

487   Potts, S., Roberts, S., Dean, R., Marris, G., Brown, M., Jones, R., et al., 2010. Declines of managed

488   honey bees and beekeepers in Europe. J. Apic. Res. 49, 15-22. DOI: 10.3896/IBRA.1.49.1.02.

489   Rehwoldt, R., Lasko, L., Shaw, C., Wirhowski, E., 1973. The acute toxicity of some heavy metal

490   ions toward benthic organisms. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 10, 291-294.

491   Robinson, A., Hesketh, H., Lahive, E., Horton, A.A., Svendsen, C., Rortais, A., et al., 2017.

492   Comparing bee species responses to chemical mixtures: Common response patterns? PLoS

493   One 12(6): e0176289. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176289.

494   Satta, A., Verdinelli, M., Ruiu, L., Buffa, F., Salis, S., Sassu, A., Floris, I., 2012. Combination of

495   beehive matrices analysis and ant biodiversity to study heavy metal pollution impact in a post-

496   mining   area   (Sardinia,   Italy).   Environ.   Sci.   Pollut.   Res.   19(9),   3977–3988.

497   http://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-012-0921-1

498   Sgolastra, F., Medrzycki, P., Bortolotti, L., Renzi, T., Tosi, S., Bogo, G., et al. 2017. Synergistic

499   mortality   between   a   neonicotinoid   insecticide   and   an   ergosterol-biosynthesis-inhibiting

500   fungicide   in   three   bee   species.   Pest.   Manag.   Sci.   73,   1236–1243.

501   http://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4449

502   Simon-Delso, N., Amaral-Rogers, V., Belzunces, L.P., Bonmatin, J.M., Chagnon, M., Downs, C.,

503   Wiemers, M., 2015. Systemic insecticides (neonicotinoids and fipronil): trends, uses, mode of

504   action and metabolites. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 22, 5–34. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-

505   014-3470-y.

506   Sorensen, M.A., Jensen, P.D., Walton, W.E., Trumble, J.T., 2006. Acute and chronic activity of

507   perchlorate and hexavalent chromium contamination on the survival and development of *Culex*

508   *quinquefasciatus* Say (Diptera: Culicidae). Environ. Pollut. 144, 759-764.

509   Svoboda, J., 1961. Prumyslové otravy vcel arsenem (Industrial poisoning of bees by arsenic). Ved.

510   Pr. Vyzk. Ustavu Vcelarskeho CSAZV 2, 55–60.

511   Thompson, H.M., Fryday, S.L., Harkin, S., Milner, S., 2014. Potential impacts of synergism in

512   honeybees (*Apis mellifera*) of exposure to neonicotinoids and sprayed fungicides in crops.

513   Apidologie 45, 545–553. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-014-0273-6.

514   Tomlin, C.D.S., 2003. ed. The e-Pesticide Manual: a World Compendium. 13th ed. Surrey, UK:

515   British Crop Protection Council. Version 3.0.

516   Tucker, F.B., Wang, K., Lu, S., Xu, L., 2003. The influence of form and quantiity of chromium on

517   the development and survival of two silkworm (*Bombyx mori* L.) races. J. Environ. Sci. 15,

518   744-748.

519   Warnick S.L., Bell H.L., 1969. The Acute Toxicity of Some Heavy Metals to Different Species of

520   Aquatic Insects. J. Water Pollut. Control. Fed. 41, 280-284.

521   WSDA (Washington State Department of Agriculture), 2010. Pollinator protection requirements for

522   Section 18 Emergency Exemptions and Section 24(c) special local need registration in

523   Washington State. (AGR PUB 631–225.) 9 pp. Olympia, WA: Registration Services Program,

524   Pesticide Management Division, Washington State Department of Agriculture.

525   Wu, G., Yi, Y., 2015. Effects of dietary heavy metals on the immune and antioxidant systems of

526   *Galleria mellonella* larvae. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. C Toxicol. Pharmacol. 167, 131-139.

527   Zayed, A.M., Terry, N., 2003. Chromium in the environment: Factors affecting biological

528   remediation. Plant and Soil 249, 139–156. http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022504826342.

529   Zimmerman, D.W., Zumbo, B.D., 1993. Relative power of the Wilcoxon test, the Friedman test,

530   and repeated measures ANOVA on ranks. J. Exp. Educ. 62, 75-86.

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549   **Table 1.** Main chemical characteristics of agrochemicals under investigation.

Chemical structure	Abbreviation	Molecular weight (g mol^{-1})	pKa
	PRO	342.22	1.09*
	CLO	249.67	11

550   * pKa of the conjugate acid (Tomlin, 2003)

551

552 **Table 2.** Lowest and highest benchmark doses* (BMDL and BMDU, respectively) and lethal

553 dose** (LD_{50}) of Cr following acute oral exposure to $Cr(NO_3)_3$ or $Cr_2(SO_4)_3$ in *Apis mellifera* at 48

554 h after ingestion. In brackets, the 95% CLs for LD_{50} values.

Compound	BMDL-BMDU mg Cr L^{-1}	χ^2	p	LD$_{50}$ ($\pm$95% CLs) mg Cr L^{-1}	μg Cr bee^{-1}
Cr(NO$_3$)$_3$·9H$_2$O	379-1670	0.341	>0.05	2049 (1674-2508)	20.5 (16.7-25.1)
Cr$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$	43-1250	0.270	>0.05	3458 (1917-6237)	34.6 (19.2-62.4)

555 *Obtained with PROAST version 62.5; **Obtained with Probit analysis

556

557 **Table 3.** Pairwise p comparison results obtained with Holm-Sidak multicomparison test based on

558 Log-rank Kaplan-Meier survival analyses. Significantly different comparison with $p < 0.05$ (PRO:

559 propiconazole; CLO: clothianidin; Negative control: sugar syrup solution; Solvent control: sugar

560 syrup solution with 1.5% acetone).

Pairwise p comparison	Negative control	Solvent control	Cr	CLO	PRO	CLO+PRO	PRO+Cr	CLO+Cr
Solvent control	0.925	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cr	0.439	0.923	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLO	0.161	0.843	0.952	-	-	-	-	-
PRO	0.91	0.857	0.954	0.899	-	-	-	-
CLO+PRO	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.002	<0.001	-	-	-
PRO+Cr	0.927	941	0.906	0.67	0.947	<0.001	-	-
CLO+Cr	0.001	0.044	0.425	0.857	0.069	0.183	0.022	-
CLO+PRO+Cr	<0.001	0.002	0.035	0.18	0.004	0.942	0.001	0.923

561

562

Table 4. Effect size for binary (PRO+CLO; PRO+Cr, CLO+Cr) and ternary (PRO+CLO+Cr) mixtures at each assessment time (4, 24, 48, 72, and 96 h). A or B terms refer to the effect size of single pollutants in binary or in ternary mixture. A positive or negative difference indicates synergistic or antagonistic effect. Significance levels (Holm-corrected for multiple comparisons) for differences are shown within parentheses, i.e. (*): $p<0.05$; (**): $p<0.01$; (***): $p<0.001$.

| A	B	4 h	24 h	48 h	72 h	96 h
CLO	PRO	0.1900(**)	0.3650(***)	0.3181(**)	0.1322	0.0978
Cr	PRO	0.0167	0.0003	-0.1069	-0.2811(*)	-0.3244(*)
CLO	Cr	0.0342	0.0850	-0.0247	-0.1197	-0.0978
CLO+PRO	Cr	0.0973	-0.0553	-0.1467	-0.2193	-0.2307
PRO+Cr	CLO	0.2683(***)	0.3033(***)	0.2181(*)	0.0356	-0.0022
CLO+Cr	PRO	0.2500(**)	0.2200 (*)	0.1569	-0.0500	-0.1133

28

578

579

580

581   Figure 1. Results of regression analysis to the a) Cr-retained and b) MBR observations.

582   Observational data points are shown as empty dots. Figures also show a) parabola (solid line) and b)

583   nonlinear (solid line) and linear (dashed line) curves fitted to the data. Analytic expressions for each

584   curve can be found in the Supplementary data. The parabola in a) and the non-linear curve in b) are

585   forced to pass through the origin of coordinates (0, 0).

586

587

588

589   Figure 2. Cumulative proportion of surviving *Apis mellifera* foragers orally exposed to

590   propiconazole (PRO, 700 mg L^{-1}), clothianidin (CLO, 0.074 mg L^{-1}) and Cr (3.9 mg L^{-1}) as single

591   pollutants or binary and ternary mixtures. Negative control (sugar syrup solution) and solvent

592   control (sugar syrup solution with 1.5% acetone) are reported for comparison.

593