





Impact of Hydrogen Peroxide and Copper Sulfate on the Delayed Release of Microcystin

Arash Zamyadi ^{1,2,*}, Katherine E. Greenstein ³, Caitlin M. Glover ⁴, Craig Adams ⁵, Erik Rosenfeldt ⁶ and Eric C. Wert ³

- ¹ Water Research Australia (WaterRA), Adelaide/Melbourne, South Australia/Victoria, 5001, Australia
- ² BGA Innovation Hub and Water Research Centre, School of Civil and Environment Engineering, University of New South Wales (UNSW), Sydney, New South Wales 2052, Australia
- ³ Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA), Las Vegas, NV 89193-9954, United States; katie.greenstein@gmail.com (K.E.G.); eric.wert@lvvwd.com (E.C.W.)
- ⁴ Department of Civil Engineering, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, H3A 0G4, Canada; caitlinmeara@gmail.com
- ⁵ Department of Civil Engineering, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO 63103, United States; craig.adams@slu.edu
- ⁶ Hazen and Sawyer, Raleigh, NC 27607, United States; erosenfeldt@hazenandsawyer.com
- * Correspondence: a.zamyadi@unsw.edu.au; arash.zamyadi@waterra.com.au

Table S1. Dosing and residuals for hydrogen peroxide in the lab-cultured *Microcystis aeruginosa* (MA) in Colorado River water (CRW) and the USA bloom.

	Lab-Cultured MA		USA Bloom		CA Bloom	
H ₂ O ₂ :D OC	Initial dose (mg/L)	24-hour residual (mg/L)	Initial dose (mg/L)	24-hour residual (mg/L)	Initial dose (mg/L)	24-hour residual (mg/L)
0.1	0.25	<d.l.< td=""><td>0.94</td><td><d.l.< td=""><td>0.6</td><td>ND</td></d.l.<></td></d.l.<>	0.94	<d.l.< td=""><td>0.6</td><td>ND</td></d.l.<>	0.6	ND
0.25	0.71	<d.l.< td=""><td>2.36</td><td><d.l.< td=""><td>1.55</td><td>ND</td></d.l.<></td></d.l.<>	2.36	<d.l.< td=""><td>1.55</td><td>ND</td></d.l.<>	1.55	ND
0.4	1	0.01	3.77	<d.l.< td=""><td>2.5</td><td>ND</td></d.l.<>	2.5	ND
1.6	3.84	2.66	15.09	7.4	10.7	ND
4	9.71	8.63	37.73	22.9	26.4	ND

ND = not determined.

Table S2. Control experiments collected for the lab-cultured MA and USA bloom in the presence of only sodium thiosulfate or without any addition.

	Lab-Cultured MA with Sodium Thiosulfate		Lab-Cultured MA with No Addition	
Parameter	Pre-stagnation	Post-stagnation	Pre-stagnation	Post-stagnation
DOC (mg/L)	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.5
Chl-a (μ g/L)	85.8	54.7	88.6	35.6
Extracellular MC (µg/L)	2.7	2.9	2	3
	USA Bloom with Sodium Thiosulfate		USA Bloom with No Addition	
Parameter	Pre-stagnation	Post-stagnation	Pre-stagnation	Post-stagnation
DOC (mg/L)	10.2	9.88	10.1	9
Chl- a (µg/L)	86.2	110	141	150
Extracellular MC (µg/L)	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5

Note: Lab-cultured MA control samples were collected during a separate set of experiments and therefore values are different than those discussed in the main text.



Figure S1. Impact of hydrogen peroxide on (**a**) the concentration of extracted chl-*a* (left axis) in the USA bloom and the lab-cultured MA in CRW and the PC fluorescence (right axis) in the CA bloom and (**b**) the level DOC in all three suspensions.



Figure S2. Impact of copper sulfate on (**a**) the concentration of extracted chl-*a* (left axis) in the USA bloom and the lab-cultured MA in CRW and the PC fluorescence (right axis) in the CA bloom and (**b**) the level DOC in all three suspensions.



Figure S3. The impact of stagnation time after exposure to 0.4 H₂O₂:DOC on (**a**) the extracted chl-*a* (left axis) in the USA bloom and the lab-cultured MA and the PC fluorescence (right axis) in the CA bloom, and (**b**) the DOC.



Figure S4. The impact of extended exposure to copper sulfate on (**a**) the concentration of extracted chl-*a* (left axis) in the USA bloom and the lab cultured MA and the PC fluorescence (right axis) in the CA bloom, and (**b**) the DOC.