



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Comparative agroenvironmental risks of pesticides in different cropping systems: application of the I-Phy indicator

This is the submitted version (pre peer-review, preprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Comparative agroenvironmental risks of pesticides in different cropping systems: application of the I-Phy indicator / Beber C.L.; da Rosa Couto R.; Lovato P.E.; Guillemain J.-P.; Nicolardot B.; Schenato R.B.; Comin J.J.. - In: ENVIRONMENTAL EARTH SCIENCES. - ISSN 1866-6280. - ELETTRONICO. - 77:14(2018), pp. 532.1-532.10. [10.1007/s12665-018-7698-6]

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/773981> since: 2020-10-09

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-018-7698-6>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is a pre-print of an article published in Environmental Earth Sciences

The final authenticated version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-018-7698-6>

Caetano Luiz BEBER^a, Rafael da Rosa COUTO^a, Paulo Emílio LOVATO^a, Jean-Philippe GUILLEMIN^b, Bernard NICOLARDOT^b, Jucinei José COMIN^a, Ricardo Bergamo SCHENATO^c

COMPARATIVE AGROENVIRONMENTAL RISKS OF PESTICIDES IN DIFFERENT CROPPING SYSTEMS: APPLICATION OF THE I-PHY INDICATOR

^a Departamento de Engenharia Rural - Centro de Ciências Agrárias da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Rod. Admar Gonzaga, 1346 - Itacorubi, Florianópolis - SC, 88034-000, Brasil

^b Département Agronomie, Agroéquipements, Élevage et Environnement - AgroSup Dijon - Institut National Supérieur des Sciences Agronomiques, de l'Alimentation et de l'Environnement. 26 Boulevard Dr Petitjean, 21000 Dijon, França

^c Departamento de Ciência do Solo - Centro de Ciências Rurais da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria. Av. Roraima, 1000 – Camobi, Santa Maria - RS, 97105-900, Brasil

Corresponding Author: Caetano Luiz BEBER¹ - cbeber@gwdg.de

Telephone: +49 551 39-4869

Rafael da Rosa COUTO² - rrccouto@hotmail.com

Paulo Emílio LOVATO - paulo.lovato@ufsc.br

Jean-Philippe GUILLEMIN - jp.guillemine@agrosupdijon.fr

Bernard NICOLARDOT - b.nicolardot@agrosupdijon.fr

Jucinei José COMIN - j.comin@ufsc.br

Ricardo Bergamo SCHENATO – ribschenato@gmail.com

Abstract:

Agricultural activities are responsible for causing impacts to the environment depending on the practices adopted during the production process. In order to assess the risks of those practices, measurement tools are necessary. This paper concerns the empirical application of the environment assessment indicator I-Phy, an indicator measuring the risks of pesticide usage in agriculture. Five crops in two different climate regions were assessed, a tropical and a temperate, and three different cropping systems: no-tillage, minimal tillage and conventional tillage. No-tillage generally presented risks of environmental pollution slightly lower in both regions. High environmental vulnerability of the fields and the numerous applications of active substances with high risks exhibit high risks of general contamination. The I-Phy indicator can be useful as a support tool to farmers and research and extension institutions pursuing management practices with lower impact on the environment.

Key Words: pesticide indicator, environmental assessment, no tillage, I-Phy

¹ Present address: Georg-August-Universität Göttingen - Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development (DARE) - Platz der Göttinger Sieben 5, 37073 - Göttingen

² Present address: Programa de Pós-graduação em Ciência do Solo – Universidade Federal de Santa Maria. Av. Roraima nº 1000, cidade universitária, Santa Maria, RS, 97105-900, Brasil.

1. INTRODUCTION

Environmental assessment methods are needed to reconcile high performance of cropping systems with the demand for more sustainable farming practices (Thiollet-Scholtus and Bockstaller 2015). Impacts from agricultural activities are usually associated with pesticide use, both in tropical and temperate regions.

Pesticide use in a cropping system may result in surface- and groundwater contamination, air pollution, and accumulation in soils. Cropping system, soil type, relief, rainfall, and slope shape and length, all may affect prediction of transported particle size distribution (Flanagan and Nearing 2000). Tillage and other agricultural practices can determine runoff volume and subsurface drainage (Boyd et al. 2003); (Xie, Chen, and Shen 2015), and consequently affect the amount of nutrients and pesticides leached from agricultural fields, thus affecting their environmental risks and impacts.

Brazil has become the largest consumer of pesticides worldwide, with a great spectrum of active ingredients and chemical groups, gaps on the legislation regulating pesticide, lack of training and pressure of industry in many ways (Pedlowski et al., 2012). The impact of pesticides are well documented in Brazil, including cases of suicide (Krawczyk et al., 2014), changes in immune and endocrine markers (Raphael et al., 2011), fetal exposure in utero (Ferreira et al., 2013) and cutaneous melanoma (Segatto et al., 2015).

The large impact of pesticide use on agriculture has led to different studies using a range of phytosanitary indicators (Bockstaller et al. 2009). Phytosanitary treatments were compared in many different environmental situations and crop-specific conditions (Roussel, Cavelier, and van der Werf 2000), (Tixier et al. 2007), (Combret et al. 2007), (Hernández-Hernández et al. 2007), (Thiollet-Scholtus and Bockstaller 2015). In such studies, indicators consider differently the environment characteristics, and assign more or less importance to each of them in the impact evaluation.

The impact of an increasing number of pesticides is not simple to access and to express in a comprehensive base. The I-Phy index consider the active ingredient, the characteristics of the plot and the application to identify which practices are generating

31 the main environmental risks of phytosanitary treatments in different scenarios of crop
32 production.

33 The I-Phy index has been used in different soil conditions, climates, crops, system
34 arrangements and scales, moreover, the constant improvements is an determining factor
35 to the robustness and applicability of models and indexes. Lindahl and Bockstaller
36 (2012), as example, incorporating a mechanistic approach, that allows to consider
37 preferential flow and calculate the risk to groundwater.

38 To address those issues, we assessed the environmental impacts of pesticide use in
39 systems with soils managed in conventional system (CS), minimum tillage (MT) and no
40 tillage (NT) in two different regions. The regions assessed were Is-sur-Tille in France,
41 and Ituporanga in Brazil. Those are two important agricultural regions in their
42 respective countries, and they have a long history of pesticide use in different crop
43 systems and the associated environmental impacts. We adopt here the indicator I-Phy
44 (van der Werf and Zimmer 1998) which has been designed for arable crops in France.
45 Adaptations were made to use it in Ituporanga/SC. I-Phy is an indicator belonging to the
46 environmental assessment method INDIGO® (aka IPest).

47 Our first objective is to apply the indicator I-Phy with modifications in a
48 subtropical environment. Secondly we wish to compare three soil management systems,
49 both having a long history of pesticide use, in two distinct regions.

50 In the first part of this paper, we give an overview on both regions and their
51 environmental characteristics, and in the second part the methods are presented with a
52 description of the I-Phy indicator. In sequence we present the Results and Discussion of
53 our analysis followed by the conclusions.

54 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

55 **3.1 I-Phy**

56 The I-Phy Indicator is based on *fuzzy* logic, which deals with variables that can
57 have heterogeneous nature and limited accuracy associated in a rule-based decision
58 system. This system can be summarized by a decision tree, in which the choice of a
59 variable implies the choice of the next variable, until the last step leads to the final
60 indicator (Bockstaller and Girardin 2008), as shown in Figure 1. This approach allows
61 aggregation of quantitative and qualitative variables, such as characteristics of the active

62 substance, the environment and application conditions. It also considers qualitative loss
 63 mechanisms crossed with toxicity. In the construction of the indicator I-Phy (van der
 64 Werf and Zimmer 1998), four types of risks are considered: (I) the risk of leaching
 65 toward groundwater (RESO), (II) the risk of surface water contamination (RESU), (III)
 66 the airborne contamination risk (RAIR) and (IV) the risk of environmental presence
 67 (DOSE). The risks are constructed with variables for which a favorable class (low risk)
 68 and an unfavorable class (high risk) are defined.

69 3.2 Variables used

70 Each of these four types of risk is expressed on a scale from 0 (highest risk) and
 71 10 (minimum risk). To calculate those risks the indicator uses physico-chemical
 72 characteristics and toxicity of the molecule, environmental information (slope, soil
 73 organic matter, distance from surface water bodies, crop species, etc.), and application
 74 mode (date, dose, soil-incorporated or surface application, application on the entire field
 75 or on bands, etc.) as summarized in table 2.

76 Table 1: Variables considered in risk calculation for each module of the I-Phy
 77 indicator.

Variables	Units or modalities	Dose	Groundwater	Surface water	Air
Variables linked to the active substance					
Half-Life (HL 50) GUS ⁽¹⁾	days			x	x
Henry Constant K _H ⁽²⁾	-		x		
ADI ⁽³⁾	mg.kg ⁻¹		x	x	x
Aquatox ⁽⁴⁾	mg.l ⁻¹			x	
Variables linked to the environment (plot)					
Leaching potential	between 0 et 1		x		
Drift percentage ⁽⁵⁾	%			x	
Runoff potential	between 0 et 1			x	
Variables linked to application conditions					
Application Dose	g ha ⁻¹	x			
Application Position	Into or over the soil or over the soil cover (% soil cover)		x	x	x


78 * Adapted from (Werf & Zimmer, 1998). (1) Ground Water Ubiquity Score: index expressing the leaching potential
 79 of the active substance. GUS = log 10 (TD50) * (4-log10) (Koc), where Koc is the coefficient of the division organic
 80 carbon-water from the molecule. (2) Dimensionless variable determining the risk of volatilization the active
 81 substance. (3) Acceptable Daily Intake (human toxicity). (4) Toxicity to wildlife (fish, etc.) and aquatic flora (algae).
 82 It uses the highest toxicity for the three groups of aquatic organisms. (5) Expressed in % of active substance spread
 83 depending on the distance of the river. It was considered that a risk of drift > 1% is totally acceptable.
 84

85 Environment-related risks are measured by estimations related to risk potential of
 86 some factors, e.g., soil organic matter content was used to estimate leaching potential.
 87 Drift relates to the amount of product that can be found directly in a watercourse (ditch,
 88 water well or other water source). Potential for surface runoff is based on slope

89 inclination, since a moderate slope may allow flow, unlike erosion itself, strongly linked
90 to steeper slopes. Soil cover is based on early crop establishment and treatment dates.

91 3.3 Method of calculation I-Phy (adapted from van der Werf and Zimmer
92 (1998) and Bockstaller and Girardin (2008)).

93 The calculation can be performed at different levels depending on the type of
94 information aimed, and done in the following order:



95

96 Figure 1: Steps of I-Phy indicator determination (adapted from van der Werf and
97 Zimmer, 1998).

98 Step 1: Calculation of a risk per module for each application of a given active
99 substance. It is based on four modules: the environmental compartments of
100 groundwater, surface water, air, and dose-associated risk.

101 Step 2: Calculation of an indicator (Iphysa) for each application of an active
102 substance.

103 The four risks are combined with the same method using *fuzzy* logic (it is neither
104 an addition nor a calculation of the mean) for a global risk rated from 0 (highest risk) to
105 10 (zero risk), depending on the active substance dose.

106 Step 3: Calculation of a global indicator on a program of treatments applied over a
107 crop.

108 The risk linked to a treatment program is due to either a treatment with high risk
109 (estimated by the minimum values of the indicators for each treatment (I_{physa}), or to a
110 program including a large number of low-risk treatments, according to equation 1.

111 Equation 1:

$$I - Phy = \min(I_{physa_i}) \times \sum K_i \times (10 - I_{physa_i}) \div 10 + k_i \times (10 - \min(I_{physa_i}) \div 10)$$

112 Where:

113 I_{physa_i} : indicator for the application of active substance i ;

114 k_i weighting coefficient empirically obtained by regression ($k = 0,1$ to $I_{physa} = 10$, $k = 0,2$ to $I_{physa} = 7$ and $k = 1$ to $I_{physa} = 2$). It is obtained from equations 2 and 3.

116 Equation 2:


$$117 \quad k = 1,7175 \times e^{(-0,2913 \times I_{physa})}$$

118 Equation 3:

119 $\sum k_i \times (10 - \min I_{physa_i}) \div 10$, that represents the sum of the weighted risks
120 less the minimum value I_{physa} .

121 Figure 2 shows the decision rules for calculation of overall risk.

122 For each figure, the white boxes represent the cases in which the variable is
123 favorable and dark boxes represent cases in which the variable is unfavorable.



(*) - One of the three modules Reso, Resu, Rair takes an unfavorable value (= 0)

(**) - Two of the three modules Reso Resu, Rair takes an unfavorable value (= 0)

124
 125 Figure 2: Rules of decision tree for the calculation of the overall risk per active
 126 substance of the I-Phy (adapted from Bockstaller et al. 2008).

127 A decision tree is constructed with the following hypotheses:

- 128 a) No weighing is made among the modules of risk to groundwater, surface
 129 water, and air.
 130 b) A low dose significantly minimizes risk. If, in the case of a totally
 131 unfavorable value in one of the compartments, dose is very low and
 132 favorable, the indicator score is set at the limit of 7, expressing the
 133 minimum acceptable in INDIGO® method.

134 The general structure of the I-Phy highlights the architecture of interactions
 135 between input data, which describe farming practices, climate, field characteristics and
 136 the active substance used, as well as the calculation processes and the ultimate indicator.

137 3.4 Field characteristics and Data collection

138 The data was collected in 26 farms from the two regions totaling 43 fields, 12 in
 139 No Tillage, 17 in Minimal Tillage and 14 in Conventional. The description and the
 140 insertion in the local context are as follows.

141 The main crops in the Is-sur-Tille (Burgundy/France) region are wheat, barley and
 142 rapeseed, with cropping systems heavily dependent on agrochemicals. The area is
 143 crossed by the Ignon River, which at certain times of the year has contamination

144 problems, caused mainly by nitrates, phosphates, herbicides, and others chemical. This
 145 has affected aquatic communities and curtailed water consumption (Poquet M. E. 2007).
 146 Rainfall is around 744 mm/year, and the region is composed by two natural zones: in
 147 the western part there is a heavily forested limestone plateau with shallow soils having
 148 high infiltration potential, and in the eastern part there is a more humid clayey plain,
 149 with deeper soils on a slight slope. In the entire region, tillage is limited by shallow
 150 soils, with depth rarely exceeding 30 cm. Those farmers who remain tilling their soils
 151 have fields on medium-depth to deep soils, located mainly on the clay plain.

152 In the Ituporanga (SC / Brazil) region, tillage practices are marked by intense
 153 plowing and disk harrowing, especially in areas grown with onions, the region's main
 154 crop. The intense plowing leads to soil compaction, and intense rainfalls in some
 155 periods of the year cause important erosion events. The Itajaí-Açu River crosses the
 156 municipality, and the annual average rainfall is around 1400mm. Soils in that region are
 157 predominantly Cambisol and Gleysol (WRB/FAO 2014), distributed in various types of
 158 relief, most of them subject to high runoff potential. Table 1 summarizes the most
 159 common practices in the three different cropping systems found in both regions.

160 Table 2: Characteristics of the conventional soil tillage, minimal tillage and no-
 161 tillage systems.

Characteristics of crops	Farming/cropping System		
	Conventional	Minimal tillage	No-tillage
Tillage	Deep	Reduced	Only in the crop row, 2 to 10 cm depth
Plowing	Twice a year, 10 to 20 cm depth	Absent	Absent
Harrowing	Twice a year, 5 to 10 cm depth	Once or twice a year, 5 to 10 cm depth	Absent
Subsoiler	Absent	Once or twice a year, 8 to 15 cm depth	Absent
Crop residues	Incorporated into the soil	Incorporated into the soil	Over the soil

162
 163 The study was carried out from April to July 2009 in the French region, and from
 164 August to December 2010 in the Brazilian region. Indicator calculations were then
 165 performed for each field and each farm.

166 Indicator analyses were performed individually for each region. The results were
 167 linked to the farming systems, in order to better understand the differences between
 168 practices, and their effects on treatments and on the environment.

169 In Is-sur-Tille (N47°31'00" E05°06'00") the study was carried out with ten
170 farmers belonging to the Group of Studies and Agricultural Development (GSAD),
171 which comprises 35 farmers totaling 7.000 ha, of which 2.000 ha are under no tillage
172 (NT) since 2009. Three of the ten participants used conventional tillage with plowing,
173 four adopted minimum tillage (MT), two used no tillage (NT) system, and one used MT
174 and NT. The fields studied, ranging from 4,3 to 52,0 hectares, were located on smooth
175 slopes (3 to 20 %), generally near watercourses. The crops present in this region were
176 winter wheat, winter barley and rapeseed.

177 In Ituporanga (S27°24'52" W49°36'9"), 13 farmers participated in the study; five
178 of them used conventional tillage with plowing, four used MT, three used NT, and one
179 used MT and NT. The fields, ranging from 2 to 12 ha, in general 1.0 km far from
180 watercourses, had slopes with medium to high inclination (20 to 45 %). The crops
181 present in this region were tobacco, onion and corn.

182 To obtain the data, we studied a field of each crop from the crop-succession
183 adopted in each farm. Each farmer defined the field with the largest representativeness
184 of the respective crop.

185 3.5 Active Substances

186 The impact of each active substance was evaluated to determine their
187 environmental risk, according to some characteristics of the compound, as example, the
188 risk in assessing the aquatic environment, the leaching potential, the volatilization
189 potential and the persistence.

190 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

191 I-phyma values were variable in three farming systems (Table 4). Index variability
192 were strongly linked to three factors that affects I-phyma, environment characteristics,
193 as fields near rivers and soil type, active substances (AS) used and their doses, and
194 agricultures techniques used by farmers.

195 Soils are a key component that rule many processes on Earth and soil texture is an
196 important characteristic to water fluxes. The region of Is-sur-Tille has high pesticide
197 leaching potential, due to clayey texture, low content of organic matter and shallow
198 soils, environment-linked characteristics that reduce RESO indexes. The texture has a
199 dominant effect for water infiltration capacity, and the increment of organic matter

200 generally increases water holding capacity and conductivity (Saxton and Rawls, 2006).
201 Moreover, shallow soils are strongly influenced by bedrocks and present high spatial
202 variability of hydraulic conductivity and water infiltration (Pedron et al., 2011). The
203 water flow in these soils is complex and the groundwater module of I-Phy relies on
204 GUS-index, neglecting preferential flow and, consequently, can underestimate pesticide
205 leaching (Lindhal et al., 2012).

206 The results also varied significantly due to phytosanitary control techniques, as
207 shown by Combret et al. (2007), who observed that sprays carried by airplanes and
208 tractor led to differences in 4.0 points in their final I-Phy index, due to the impact on
209 AS's drift by technique employed.

210 Active substances also had an important role in environmental impact, as is the
211 case of *isoproturon*, *2,4-D - MCPA*, *trifluralin*, *metazachlor*, *quinmerac*, *chlormequat*
212 *and alphas-methrin* (Table 3), even then presents distinct aspects regarding environmental
213 patterns and human health impacts. Isoproturon, as example, shows a dose-dependent
214 increase in its persistence and low affinity for soil adsorption (Papadopoulou et al.,
215 2016) leading to high leaching potential. Whilst, the exposure to *2,4-D - MCPA* are
216 linked to some cancers and other diseases (Mills, et al., 2005; Hartge et al., 2005),
217 although the studies are not conclusive in some aspects like the effects of association of
218 *2,4-D* and *MCPA* (Stackelberg, 2013).

219 Farmers applied high doses of these substances, which have toxicity to humans
220 and the environment, besides a high risk of volatilization, leaching, and persistence in
221 environment.

222 Those factors reduce scores when they are present in phytosanitary treatments.
223 Tixier et al. (2007) found significant differences in environmental contamination
224 indicators due to the characteristics of specific AS. However, glyphosate® was applied
225 at high doses in all NT fields. Environmental contamination risks of this molecule are
226 considered low in I-Phy environmental modules (Table 3).


227 Therefore, it is not possible to infer, per the I-Phy indicator, that high doses of
228 glyphosate® in NT induce strong impacts on the environment. Despite the indicator is
229 sensitive to high doses, glyphosate presents low environmental toxicity because its
230 values of some parameters, e.g., GUS, half-life, aquatox.

231 Table 4: The descriptive Statistics of I-phyma results for crops in the three
 232 different systems

System	Crop	Mean of fields	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	System Mean	System Std.Dev.
No Tillage	Tobacco	7,40	2,26	5,8	9	7,5	1,49
	Onion	9,05	0,21	8,9	9,2		
	Rapeseed	8,10	1,13	7,3	8,9		
	Winter wheat	7,33	0,67	6,6	7,9		
	Winter barley	6,30	1,91	5,2	8,5		
Minimal Tillage	Tobacco	8,20	0,85	7,6	8,8	6,37	1,88
	Onion	8,00	0,71	7,5	8,5		
	Rapeseed	6,30	2,01	2,8	7,9		
	Winter wheat	6,35	1,29	5	8,1		
	Winter barley	4,75	1,97	2,1	6,8		
Conventional	Tobacco	8,20	0,14	8,1	8,3	6,69	1,87
	Onion	6,60	2,13	4,3	8,5		
	Rapeseed	6,60	0,79	5,7	7,2		
	Winter wheat	6,47	2,10	4,4	8,6		
	Winter barley	6,07	3,20	2,4	8,3		

233

234 Excessive doses, lack of care in applications, number of applications above the
 235 necessary or done in inappropriate periods, all contribute to high environment
 236 contamination risk in those systems and conditions. Among the most common farming




237 systems in Is-sur-Tille, difficulties in phytosanitary control during cultivation of winter
 238 barley stands out in all cropping system. Figures 3, 4 and 5 present the I-phyma results
 239 of all fields accessed in No Tillage, Minimal Tillage and Conventional system
 240 respectively. Winter Wheat and Rapeseed also had problems in the MT system (figure
 241 4), and in CS, only tobacco had good scores (above 7) (Figure 5).

242

243 Figure 3: I-phyma results for the different fields in No Tillage system

244

245



252

253

254

255

Figure 4: I-phyma results for the different fields in Minimal Tillage system

256

257

258


259

260

261

262

263



264

265

266

Figure 5: I-phyma results for the different fields in Conventional system

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

The small differences between different systems (1,13 points) do not suffice to state that plowing induces reduction of certain risks associated with pesticide use. The NT system also showed greater uniformity in results, indicating a standardization of phytosanitary controls and the possibility pesticides uses without an adequate technical support. The perception of farmers the richest and most diverse weed community in NT system could be a factor to increase the use of pesticides, even the tillage system had no effect for cereal production (Mas et al., 2003). In that system, no plot showed extremely high contamination risks (Figure 3), i.e., I-phyma scores under 5.0 points, which indicate high contamination, a condition in which the phytosanitary control program must be reformulated, to reduce contamination levels.

277

278

279

280

281

Rapeseed in NT was less pollutant (Figure 3) than in other systems, since it does not receive high pesticide doses, except for glyphosate®. In this case, there may be an interaction between crop and cropping system. That is not the case for winter barley in CS, in which scores have high variance (Table 4). This high variance in winter barley is due to treatment management practices, since plot characteristics are similar and did

282 influence I-phyma variance. High doses and high toxicity risks of substances such as
283 *trifluralin, metazachlor, alphamethrin and quinmerac*, were responsible for indicator
284 decrease in rapeseed grown in MT and CS systems.

285 Environmental characteristics may either enhance or reduce contamination
286 chances, as observed in the work by Combret et al. (2007), in which environmental
287 factors changed results in up to 2,4 I-phyma points. The interaction of soil
288 characteristics and the landscape are important to determine the behavior of pesticides
289 on the environment, e.g., the transference of chemicals from soil to water is fewer from
290 a deep and clayey profile on a flat relief, under a system which maintain plants on the
291 surface than a sandy soil or even a clayey one located in a steeper region. Rossa et al.
292 (2017), shows that river contamination increases when it drains areas with contaminated
293 plots, highlighting the importance of consider the watershed scale to a more integrative
294 approach management.

295 Winter wheat received high doses of pollutant AS (*2,4- MCPA, mécoprop-P,*
296 *chlortoluron*) in CS. However, it showed no noticeable global changes, having a
297 reasonable control in most fields and, at the same time, more uniform environmental
298 impact. This crop demonstrates to perform better in NT where RESO and RESU scores
299 remains at higher levels due to soil cover. Correia et al. (2007) compared atrazine
300 contamination potential in soil under different cropping systems, and found that NT had
301 a greater potential to reduce leaching and groundwater contamination. The role of
302 enhancing the storage of organic matter, especially at the surface layers of long-term
303 areas under NT system must be considered as a factor to improve the biological
304 properties and control the processes of degradation and transference of molecules to the
305 watercourses (Melero et al., 2009).

306 Spatial isolation (distance from water sources, hedges) of winter wheat fields in
307 CS reduced environmental impact risk. At the same time, there are situations in which
308 environment was unfavorable to the indicators, such as the second plot of winter wheat
309 in MT, which exhibited low I-phyma (Figure 4). In this plot the treatments are
310 considered acceptable, but the plot is vulnerable to environmental contamination,
311 particularly RESO risks. This result corroborates those obtained by Roussel, Cavelier,
312 and van der Werf (2000) in winter wheat fields, where the high risks of runoff and
313 "drift" percentage led to lower scores, indicating higher risk of environmental
314 contamination.

315 In the Ituporanga region, indicators of environmental contamination show no
316 strong overall risk. The context must be concerned to this case because in the time data
317 collection took place, corn crop was predominantly from genetically modified (GM)
318 seeds, and, according to the farmers, pesticides were not used due to the absence or low
319 incidence of pests. Therefore, there are no I-Phy indicators of environmental pollution,
320 and it appears that environmental pollution by pesticides in GM corn is void, since
321 farmers grow it in CS, and therefore do not apply any glyphosate® nor any other
322 herbicide. However, according to the farmers, there are already records of progressive
323 incidence of some pests in the crop to which GM corn is supposedly resistant, and
324 pesticides are being reintroduced just can be observed on the fields.

325 Regarding both places, there were few differences between farming systems, and
326 the results were, in general, satisfactory (Figures 3, 4 and 5), with only a few fields
327 indicating high risks. There are fields in NT system with high performance, and, as
328 noted by Combret et al. (2007), that happens because I-Phy analyses consider soil cover
329 percentage at the time of pesticide application. Due to better soil cover in NT, the direct
330 impact of pesticides on soil are reduced, with higher adsorption rates to crop residues
331 and/or cover crop dry mass, consequently, erosion and runoff will be reduced.

332 Fields in NT (15 years under NT) have higher contents of organic matter (OM), as
333 compared to systems without crop residues on the soil. RESO risks of NT are also
334 reduced, since I-Phy considers that OM lowers leaching potential. Lower weed
335 incidence, due to the presence of cover crops, also reduces the need for numerous
336 applications of herbicides.

337 Onion crop yield was generally similar in all three farming systems (25 to 35 t ha⁻¹)
338 ¹). There was a reduction in pesticide applications in onion under NT because planting
339 is carried out with seedlings, 70 days after sowing. At that time, seedlings show
340 pseudostem diameter of 0.5 cm and 15-30 cm high, unlike other systems, in which
341 sowing is done directly in the field. In some cases, this planting practice (with 70 days)
342 does not require initial pesticide treatments in fields under NT. The plot 1 of onion in
343 CS showed low I-phyma (Figure 5), due to application of *pendiméthaline*, a very
344 volatile AS, which increases RAIR impacts at high doses.

345 In CS, the high doses of *ioxynil*, and *mancozeb* also contribute to increased risks
346 on onion crop. *Ioxynil* has a high risk of human toxicity measured through the ADI,

347 therefore impacting all three modules RESO, RESU, and AIR (table 2). *Mancozeb* has a
348 high risk of toxicity for aquatic life, leading to a strong impact on RESU.

349 MT system did not have any plot with less than 7,0 points I-phyma, and it also
350 showed the lowest variance (table 4). It was the system with greater standardization of
351 controls in both tobacco and onion crops.

352 In the NT system, only tobacco showed scores under 7,0 on plot 2, due to use of
353 high doses of substances such as *chlorpyrifos-ethyl*, *mancozeb*, *acephate*, *iprodione* and
354 *bifenthrin*, which may cause greater contamination. Therefore, more effective
355 management of applications, anticipation of treatments, appropriate choice of species
356 for soil cover, and decrease in number of treatments, could reduce contamination risk.
357 Comparing three maize fields under similar environmental conditions and even
358 cropping system, Roussel et al. Roussel, Cavelier, and van der Werf (2000) found
359 different results, which highlights the importance of pest control practice. Farmers can
360 choose doses, number of applications and the AS (more or less toxic), and those choices
361 are determinant of differences in environmental impacts.

362

363 *REGIONAL DIFFERENCES & PRACTICAL USE OF THE I-Phy INDICATOR*

364 The I-Phy was developed and calibrated under temperate climates and soils,
365 nevertheless was possible to apply the indicator under subtropical conditions
366 satisfactorily, showing robustness and adaptability. Once the climatic, farm and
367 production characteristics influence on-farm pesticide use (Andert et al., 2015), the
368 demonstration of sensitivity to Brazilian soil and climate open a wide field of
369 possibilities to application to another areas, crops and management conditions.

370 In Ituporanga, there was not high risk associated with the vulnerability of fields
371 (proximity to rivers or watercourses, shallow soils, surface sealing, etc). For that reason,
372 RESU and RESO scores did not have major reductions, even when doses were high.
373 This fact kept the I-phyma of fields in environmental contamination levels considered
374 tolerable in all systems, with few variations between fields from the same system.
375 However, the indicator does not consider the specific conditions of subtropical climate,
376 where rainfall is higher, with average annual precipitation around 1,400 mm. Therefore,
377 rates of leaching, runoff, and drift are different from those normally included in I-Phy.

378 On the other hand, in the French region of Is-sur-Tille, the fields are extremely
379 vulnerable to environmental contamination, since pesticides quickly reach waterways
380 and/or groundwater, which are close to the surface and have little protection to prevent
381 rapid contact with pesticides from fields.

382 The I-Phy indicator can be useful as a support tool to farmers and research and
383 extension institutions pursuing management practices with lower impact on the
384 environment. However, I-Phy has some limitations that should be reviewed in order to
385 increase the reliability and accuracy of its results. Some proposals are: to include the
386 risks to the operator and to soil macro and microfauna; to have an online platform with
387 constant updating of the database; to include a tropical agriculture platform which
388 considers half-lives of active substances in tropical weather conditions.

389 **4. CONCLUSIONS**

390 The I-Phy indicator was able to access the characteristics of systems tested,
391 including under a subtropical condition.

392 The assessment of environmental impact of pesticide use in conventional tillage
393 system, minimal tillage and no-tillage showed that no-tillage generally presented risks
394 of environmental pollution slightly lower in both regions.

395 The phytosanitary controls in the region Is-sur-Tille exhibit higher risk of
396 contamination due to high environmental vulnerability of the fields and the numerous
397 applications of active substances with high risks.

398 The phytosanitary controls in the region Ituporanga exhibit low overall risk of
399 environmental contamination, mainly due to low vulnerability of fields and some good
400 management practices.

401 **5. REFERENCES**

402

- 403 Andert, S., Bürger, J., Gerowitt, B. On-farm pesticide use in four Northern German
404 regions as influenced by farm and production conditions. *Crop Protection*. 75: 1-
405 10. 2015. doi :10.1016/j.cropro.2015.05.002
406 Bockstaller, C., and Ph Girardin. 2008. "Mode de Calcul Des Indicateurs Agri-
407 Environnementaux de La Méthode INDIGO." *Rapprt Technique, INRA*.
408 <http://wiki.inra.fr/wiki/deximasc/download/package+MASC/WebHome/Manuel>
409 [CalculIndicateurINDIGO.pdf](#).

- 410 Bockstaller, Christian, Laurence Guichard, Olivier Keichinger, Philippe Girardin,
411 Marie-Béatrice Galan, and Gérard Gaillard. 2009. "Comparison of Methods to
412 Assess the Sustainability of Agricultural Systems. A Review." *Agronomy for*
413 *Sustainable Development* 29 (1): 223–35. doi:10.1051/agro:2008058.
- 414 Bockstaller, Christian, Julie Wohlfahrt, A. Huber, Pierre Hennebert, Frédéric Zahm,
415 Françoise Vernier, O. Keichinger, and P. Girardin. 2008. "Les Indicateurs de
416 Risque de Transfert de Produits Phytosanitaires et Leur Validation: Exemple de
417 L'indicateur I-PHY." *Ingénieries Eau Agriculture Territoires*, 103–15.
- 418 Boyd, Paul M., James L. Baker, Steven K. Mickelson, and Syed I. Ahmed. 2003.
419 "Pesticide Transport with Surface Runoff and Subsurface Drainage through a
420 Vegetative Filter Strip." *Transactions of the ASAE* 46 (3): 675–84.
- 421 Combret, Lucie Polge de, Eliana Freire Gaspar de Carvalho, Pierre Silvie, Eric Scopel,
422 Jean-Louis Bélot, and Alicio Alves Pinto. 2007. "Utilização Do Indicador Agro-
423 Ecológico I-PHY Para Avaliação Do Potencial de Impacto Ambiental Da
424 Proteção Fitossanitária Do Algodão No Mato Grosso, Brasil." In . Vol. 6.
425 Uberlândia.
- 426 Correia, Fábio Veríssimo, Fábio Martins Mercante, Amoacy Carvalho Fabrício, Tacio
427 Mauro Pereira de Campos, Eurípedes Vargas Jr, and Tomaz Langenbach. 2007.
428 "Adsorção de Atrazina Em Solo Tropical Sob Plantio Direto E Convencional."
429 *Pesticidas: Revista de Ecotoxicologia E Meio Ambiente* 17.
430 <http://ojs.c3sl.ufpr.br/ojs/index.php/pesticidas/article/viewArticle/10663>.
- 431 Ferreira, D.J., Couto, A.C., Oliveira, M.S., Koifman, S. 2013. "In Utero Pesticide
432 Exposure and Leukemia in Brazilian Children < 2 Years of Age". *Environmental*
433 *Health Perspectives*. 121(2):269-276. doi: 10.1289/ehp.1103942.
- 434 Flanagan, D. C., and M. A. Nearing. 2000. "SEDIMENT PARTICLE SORTING ON
435 HILLSLOPE PROFILES IN THE WEPP MODEL." *Transactions of the ASAE*
436 43 (3): 573–83. doi:10.13031/2013.2737.
- 437 Guimarães, R., Asmus, C., Braga, I., Vianna, A. 2011. "Changes in Immune and
438 Endocrine Effect Markers in Adolescents Exposed to Residues of
439 Organochlorine Pesticides in Brazil". *Epidemiology*. 22: S245-S245. doi:
440 0.1097/01.ede.0000392442.80245.d5.
- 441 Hartge, P., Colt, J. S., Severson, R. K. "Residential herbicide use and risk of non-
442 Hodgkin lymphoma," *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention*, vol.
443 14, no. 4, pp. 934–937, 2005.
- 444 Hernández-Hernández, Carlos N.A., Javier Valle-Mora, Antonio Santiesteban-
445 Hernández, and Ricardo Bello-Mendoza. 2007. "Comparative Ecological Risks
446 of Pesticides Used in Plantation Production of Papaya: Application of the
447 SYNOPS Indicator." *Science of The Total Environment* 381 (1-3): 112–25.
448 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.03.014.
- 449 Krawczyk, N., Meyer, A., Abreu-Villaca, Y., Filgueiras, C., Fonseca C., Lima, J. 2014.
450 "Suicide mortality among agricultural workers in a region with intensive
451 tobacco farming and use of pesticides in Brazil". *Toxicology Letters*. 229:S107.
452 doi: 10.1016/j.toxlet.2014.06.390.
- 453 Lindhal, A. M. L., and Bockstaller, C. 2012. "An indicator of pesticide leaching risk to
454 groundwater". *Ecological Indicators* 23: 95-108.
455 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.03.014
- 456 Mas, M. T., Verdú, A. M. C. 2003. "Tillage system effects on weed communities in a 4-
457 year crop rotation under Mediterranean dryland conditions." *Soil and Tillage*
458 *Research* 74 (1): 15-24. doi :10.1016/S0167-1987(03)00079-5

- 459 Melero, S., López-Garrido, R., Murillo, J. M., Moreno, F. 2009. "Conservation tillage:
460 Short- and long-term effects on soil carbon fractions and enzymatic activities
461 under Mediterranean conditions." *Soil & Tillage Research* 104: 292-298.
462 doi:10.1016/j.still.2009.04.001
- 463 Mills, P. K., Yang, R. and D. Riordan, "Lymphohematopoietic cancers in the United
464 Farm Workers of America (UFW), 1988–2001," *Cancer Causes and Control*,
465 vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 823–830, 2005.
- 466 Papadopoulou, E. S., Karas, P. A., Nikolaki, S., Storck, V., Ferrari, F., Trevisan, M.,
467 Tsiamis, G., Martin-Laurent, F., Karpouzas, D.G. 2016. "Dissipation and
468 adsorption of isoproturon, tebuconazole, chlorpyrifos and their main
469 transformation products under laboratory and field conditions" *Science of the*
470 *Total Environment* 569-570: 86-96.
471 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.133>
- 472 Pedron, F. A., Fink, J. R., Rodrigues, M. F., and Azevedo, A. C. 2011. "Hydraulic
473 Conductivity and Water Retention in Leptosols-Regosols and Saprolyte Derived
474 from Sandstone, Brazil." *Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo* (35): 1253-1262.
475 doi: 10.1590/S0100-06832011000400018
- 476 Poquet M. E. 2007. "Contrats de Rivières Des Bassins Versants de La Bèze/Albane et
477 de La Tille -Côte d'Or (21)- Elaboration Des Dossiers Sommaires de
478 Candidature." Travail de Fin d'Etude pour l'obtention du diplôme d'Ingénieur
479 de l'ENGEES.
- 480 Rossa, P. D., Jannoyer, M., Mottes, C., Plet, J., Bazizi, A., Arnaud, L., Jestin, A.,
481 Woignier, T., Gaude, J. M., Cattan, F. 2017. "Linking current river pollution to
482 historical pesticide use: Insights for territorial management?" *Science of the*
483 *Total Environment*. doi :10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.065
- 484 Roussel, Olivier, Alain Cavelier, and Hayo MG van der Werf. 2000. "Adaptation and
485 Use of a Fuzzy Expert System to Assess the Environmental Effect of Pesticides
486 Applied to Field Crops." *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 80 (1): 143–
487 58.
- 488 Stackelberg, K. A. 2013. "Systematic Review of Carcinogenic Outcomes and Potential
489 Mechanisms from Exposure to 2,4-D and MCPA in the Environment." *Journal*
490 *of Toxicology* doi :10.1155/2013/371610.
- 491 Saxton, K. E., and Rawls, W. J. 2006. "Soil Water Characteristic Estimates by Texture
492 and Organic Matter for Hydrologic Solutions." *Soil Science Society of America*
493 *Journal* 70: 1569-1578. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2005.0117.
- 494 Segatto, M.M., Bonamigo, R.R., Hohmann, C.B., Muller, K.R., Bakos, L., Mastroeni,
495 S., Fortes, C. " Residential and occupational exposure to pesticides may increase
496 risk for cutaneous melanoma: a case-control study conducted in the south of
497 Brazil". 2015. *International Journal Of Dermatology*. 54(12):e527-538. doi:
498 10.1111/ijd.12826
- 499 Thiollet-Scholtus, Marie, and Christian Bockstaller. 2015. "Using Indicators to Assess
500 the Environmental Impacts of Wine Growing Activity: The INDIGO® Method."
501 *European Journal of Agronomy* 62 (January): 13–25.
502 doi:10.1016/j.eja.2014.09.001.
- 503 Tixier, P., E. Malézieux, M. Dorel, C. Bockstaller, and P. Girardin. 2007. "Rpest—An
504 Indicator Linked to a Crop Model to Assess the Dynamics of the Risk of
505 Pesticide Water Pollution." *European Journal of Agronomy* 26 (2): 71–81.
506 doi:10.1016/j.eja.2006.08.006.

- 507 Van der Werf, Hayo MG, and Christophe Zimmer. 1998. “Un Indicateur D’impact
508 Environnemental de Pesticides Basé Sur Un Système Expert À Logique Floue.”
509 *Courrier de L’environnement de l’INRA* 34: 47–66.
- 510 WRB/FAO. 2014. *World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014 International Soil*
511 *Classification System for Naming Soils and Creating Legends for Soil Maps*.
512 Rome: FAO.
- 513 Xie, Hui, Lei Chen, and Zhenyao Shen. 2015. “Assessment of Agricultural Best
514 Management Practices Using Models: Current Issues and Future Perspectives.”
515 *Water* 7 (3): 1088–1108. doi:10.3390/w7031088.
516