

Table S1. Direct evaluation of the soil biodegradation process after 40 days of direct contact with soil.

Materials	Mass per unit area (g/cm ²)	Weight loss (%)	Visually/SEM index
	initial	after 40 days biodegradation	
Cotton - soil #1	1.835±0.03	-	+++
Cotton - soil #2		-	+++
Linen - soil #1	2.118±0.02	43.127	++++
Linen - soil #2		36.019	+++
Wool- soil #1	1.959±0.10	-	+++
Wool - soil #2		-	++
Leather - soil #1	2.561±0.04	8.984	+
Leather - soil #2		6.093	+
Sanitary pad brand A - soil #1	0.028±0.015	-	-
Sanitary pad brand A-soil #2		-	-
Sanitary pad brand B - soil #1	0.026±0.007	-	-
Sanitary pad brand B-soil #2		-	+
Cosmetic disk brand A-soil #1	0.020±0.04	23.883	++
Cosmetic disk brand A-soil #2		27.537	++
Cosmetic disk brand C- soil #1	0.019±0.02	22.069	++
Cosmetic disk brand C-soil #2		26.410	++
Antibacterial wet wipe - soil #1 (dry)	0.0045±0.01	24.332	-
Antibacterial wet wipe - soil #2 (dry)		19.881	-
Sanitary wet wipe - soil #1 (dry)	0.0042±0.01	23.077	-
Sanitary wet wipe - soil #2 (dry)		13.461	-

Legend: level of biodegradation ++++ very high, +++ high, ++ medium + low - no biodegradation.

Table S2. Indirect evaluation of the soil biodegradation process after 40 days of direct contact with soil.

Materials	NTG (CFU/g soil)	Cellulolytic activity increased (%)	# of fungal strain isolated
Soil #1	5.5×10^7	100	
Soil # 2	1.2×10^7	100	
Linen- soil #1	2.5×10^9	588	1
Sanitary pad brand A - soil #1	3.2×10^8	101	2
Sanitary pad brand A-soil #2	2.6×10^8	94.5	
Sanitary pad brand B - soil #1	3.5×10^8	98.5	
Sanitary pad brand B-soil #2	1.4×10^8	93.8	
Cosmetic disk brand A-soil #1	5.6×10^8	207	3,4
Cosmetic disk brand A-soil #2	8.9×10^8	343.5	
Cosmetic disk brand C- soil #1	5.1×10^8	213.4	
Cosmetic disk brand C-soil #2	7.3×10^8	309.8	5,6
Antibacterial wet wipe - soil #1	4.3×10^4	133	
Antibacterial wet wipe - soil #2	3.9×10^4	126	7
Sanitary wet wipe - soil #1	5.7×10^4	116.7	8
Sanitary wet wipe - soil #2	4.1×10^4	127.8	