Abundance and types of plastic pollution in surface waters in the Eastern Arctic (Inuit Nunangat) and the case for reconciliation science

Max Liboiron[1,2]
Alex Zahara[1,2]
Kaitlyn Hawkins[1]
Christina Crespo[1,3]
Bárbara de Moura Neves[4]
Vonda Wareham-Hayes[4]
Evan Edinger[2]
Charlotte Muise[1]
Mary Jane Walzak[5]
Rebecca Sarazen[5]
Jillian Chidley[1]
Carley Mills[1]
Lauren Watwood[1]
Hridisha Arif[1]
Elise Earles[1]
Liz Pijogge[6]
Jamal Shirley[7]
Jesse Jacobs[8]
Paul McCarney[6]
Louis Charron[1]

[1] Civic Laboratory for Environmental Action Research (CLEAR), Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada
[2] Department of Geography, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada
[3] Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens, USA
[4] Department of Fisheries and Oceans, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada
[5] Surface Science Western, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada
[6] Lands and Natural Resources, Nunatsiavut Government, Nain, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada
[7] Nunavut Research Institute, Nunavut Arctic College, Iqaluit, Nunavut, Canada

[8] Nunavut Arctic College - Memorial University Partnership, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada

Abstract: Plastics are not only an environmental concern but also an issue of justice in the Arctic, particularly in Inuit Nunangat (Inuit homelands), as plastics and other contaminants that originate in the south accumulate in the north and have implications for Inuit sovereignty and wellness. This collaborative study finds an average of 0.018 plastics/m^2 in surface waters in two sites in the eastern Arctic (Tasiujarjuaq in Nunavut near Iqaluit and southwest Greenland offshore from Qaqortoq and Narsaq). A comparison with other studies shows this abundance of plastics is lesser than abundances reported further north in the Arctic, but greater than adjacent waters further south. However, within and across study areas at similar latitudes, there does not appear to be a significant difference in plastic abundance. Some characteristics of recovered plastics such as morphology and colour support local origins, while others support long range transport. Research moving forward should consider relative scales in spatial trends of plastic abundance. The discussion concludes by reflecting on the methods and findings in terms of their role in Inuit governance and research relationships, including elements of research personnel, permitting, categorization, measurement, and reporting findings. Our goal is to provide insights of where we, as scientists, may choose to intentionally move our scientific work towards reconciliation while we produce knowledge about environmental pollution in Inuit Nunangat and the Arctic broadly.

Keywords: Arctic; plastic; surface water; marine debris; colonialism; Greenland; Nunavut; Inuit Nunangat; reconciliation science

Highlights:

- Reports plastics in surface water in SW Greenland (0.026/m^2) & Tasiujarjuaq, Nunavut (0.014/m^2)
- Recovered plastics show indications of both long-range and local sources
- Surface water plastic research in Inuit Nunangat and Greenland is led by southerners and non-Inuit
- "Reconciliation science" requires changes in personnel, methods, and communicating results

1. Introduction

Plastics are not only an environmental concern, but also an issue of justice in the Arctic, particularly in Inuit Nunangat (Inuit homelands), as plastics and other contaminants that originate in the south accumulate in the north and have implications for Inuit sovereignty and wellness (Bourdages et al. 2020; Sudlovenick 2019; Watt-Cloutier 2015; Furgall et al. 2005; Van Oostam et al. 2005). Inuit Nunangat contains four regions: the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (northern Northwest Territories), Nunavut, Nunavik (northern Quebec), and Nunatsiavut (northern Labrador). It includes 53 communities and encompasses roughly 35 percent of Canada's land mass and 50 percent of its coastline, but no manufacturing infrastructure for the production of plastics (Royal Canadian Geographical Society 2018). Yet studies have shown a clear trend where plastic has been found to accumulate in Arctic waters and ecosystems compared to waters further south with higher populations and plastic manufacturing infrastructure (Obbard 2018; Cózar et al 2017). The hypothesis is that as the global Thermohaline Circulation (THC) actively moves "warm surface water from low to high latitudes across the North Atlantic Ocean to the Arctic, it could collect buoyant plastic from highly populated latitudes, leading to accumulation in the Greenland and Barents seas, where the landmasses, together with the polar ice cap, would constitute a dead end for the surface transport of floating debris" (Cózar et al 2017: 1; see also Lusher et al 2015). Southerly movement of plastics to Arctic locations also takes place through atmospheric transport of microplastics such as microfibers (Evangeliou et al 2020; Bergmann et al 2019), the release of plastics deposited by Pacific Ocean waters through melting sea ice (Peeken et al 2018; Obbard et al 2014), and the biotransport of plastics via seasonally migrating animals, such as seabirds (Bourdages et al. In press; Provencher et al 2010; Mallory et al 2006).

At the same time, the Arctic is relatively understudied from a scientific perspective (AMAP/EU-PolarNet 2020), meaning more work is needed to describe the patterns in plastic accumulation in the North. Existing scientific studies of plastic pollution in the Arctic are framed in terms of baseline figures (Lusher et al 2015; Mallory 2008) or plastics' environmental effects (Kanhai et al 2018; Provencher et al 2010). Our study continues this scientific trajectory by providing abundance measures (number of plastics/m^2) and an analysis of types of plastic pollution in surface waters near the capital city of Iqaluit in Tasiujarjuaq (Frobisher Bay), Nunavut, and offshore from Qaqortoq and Narsaq in southwest Greenland. We compare these findings to other results in the Arctic generally and Inuit Nunangat in particular.

This study is the result of a collaboration between four different groups: a scientific team based in St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, that collected all samples in Nunavut and Greenland; CLEAR, an interdisciplinary plastic pollution laboratory also based in St. John's that studies marine plastics as well as colonialism in science that conducted analysis and writing; scientists at Surface Science Western Lab at the University of Western Ontario that conducted spectrometry work; and a group of Inuit and non-Inuit research professionals who have lived and worked in Inuit Nunangat who provided expert insights, context, and validation for analyzing findings and recommendations. This partnership was not planned in advance but rather came together as research needs arose and has resulted in a unique extension of the scientific study in the discussion section of the paper on reconciliation science. In addition to discussing research findings for trends in plastic pollution, we also provide critical reflection on research methods and findings in terms of Inuit-based research, reconciliation, and governance relationships (Loseto et al 2020; Pedersen et al 2020; Wong et al 2020; ITK 2018; Pfeifer 2018; Moffitt et al 2015; ITK & NRI 2007). Such reflections are crucial for ongoing and future research in Inuit Nunangat to ensure our work as scientists and research partners is part of reconciliation. We are calling this “reconciliation science.” Rather than dividing these reflections into a separate "opinion" piece or social science paper, we make the case that existing and ongoing Indigenous research relations should never be divided from scientific study and reporting, and our goal is to provide one model for how reconciliation science might be done.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Sample Collection

Samples for this study were collected in 2018 by a team of settler, non-Inuit authors based in St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, who were already traveling to Inuit Nunangat and southwestern Greenland for research unrelated to plastic pollution for seafloor mapping and biodiversity (via the Amundsen Science Leg 2c, 2018). Sample collection took place in July and August of 2018 near the capital city of Iqaluit in Tasiujarjuaq (Frobisher Bay), Nunavut, and in the Labrador Sea offshore from Qaqortoq and Narsaq in southwest Greenland aboard the Canadian Coast Guard Vessel (CCGS) *Amundsen* (Figure 1).

Sample collection sites were designed to answer two questions. (H1) First, we aimed to discern whether plastics that might have originated in the Iqaluit landfill, which burned for 178 days in 2014, were moving from land into Tasiujarjuaq, a local hypothesis that resulted in an invitation to do related plastic pollution research in the area (also see Watson 2014, Nunatsiaq News

2015, Varga 2015). Sampling locations in Tasiujarjuaq were grouped close to Iqaluit and further out in the bay to test that hypothesis, and plastics were inspected for signs of burning or melting. (H2) Secondly, the site in southwest Greenland was used as a comparison to determine whether the abundance and types of plastics in Tasiujarjuaq were markedly different than those of a location in another current but at a similar latitude. Tasiujarjuaq is macrotidal (11m tide range) with particularly strong tidal currents through the mid-bay islands, and southwest Greenland is dominated by the West Greenland current, bringing surface waters around Greenland from the northeast Atlantic Ocean (see S13). This sample collection design provided a snapshot of plastic profiles in two key locations and cannot be used for wider generalizations of geographic patterns of plastic pollution, given its relatively low sample size and limited duration of sampling.

Researchers used a Manta surface water trawl with a net mesh size of 335μm, and each trawl was conducted for 30 minutes. The mouth of the trawl is 0.53m, determining the maximum size of plastic we would have collected. A flowmeter was attached to the trawl to determine the amount of water sampled. Entire cod ends containing samples were placed in sample bags with 20mL of hydrogen peroxide (3%) for storage and frozen at -20 °C for later laboratory analysis. Contamination samples were taken each day from mittens, gloves, scarfs, toques (winter hats), jackets, and other fabrics of all personnel in contact with the trawl to ensure potential sources of contamination during data collection could be identified. The colour of the ship's paint, sampling gear, and ropes were also recorded as potential sources of contamination.

2.2 Permits

Permits, licenses, and/or permissions are required before conducting research in most areas, including the Arctic. Following research permitting protocols is particularly important in Indigenous land claim areas and traditional homelands as part of Indigenous sovereignty— the right of Indigenous peoples to govern Indigenous lands. Permits were sought and obtained by Amundsen Science, including: Nunavut Research Institute Scientific Research License # 0501318R-M; Department of Fisheries and Oceans License to Fish for Scientific Purposes in the waters of Nunavut # S-18/19-1012-NU; Vessel Clearance to conduct scientific work in Greenland waters; Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs file # 2018-15931; and Government of Greenland Survey License # G18-028. For an overview of research licensing bodies in Inuit Nunangat, see ITK 2018: 15-16 and Table S1.

2.3 Lab Analysis

After collection, samples were transferred to a team at the Civic Laboratory for Environmental Action Research (CLEAR) based in St. John's (Beothuk homelands) for processing and analysis. CLEAR team co-authors are non-Inuit: some are settlers and some are Indigenous from other places. Samples were transferred from the freezer to a bleach solution for 18-20 hours to discolour any organics to aid in identifying plastics. Once bleached, samples were sieved to eliminate items smaller than 425μm. This size cut off was chosen to align with existing plastic monitoring occurring in Nunatsiavut, another region of Inuit Nunangat, and because this size allows accurate visual identification (Song et al. 2015), a more accessible method for future comparisons (Government of Canada 2018). We visually examined sieve contents using a stereo microscope (Olympus SZ61, model SZ2-ILST) with a magnification range of 0.5–12x. Suspected plastics were extracted from the sample and placed into folded filter paper to dry for a minimum of 4 days, until a consistent weight was observed.

After the drying period, suspected plastics were re-examined under the microscope to further confirm plastic identification. Visually confirmed plastics were classified based on morphology, colour, size class, and whether and what types of erosion were present, including burning and melting (Table 1. See Table S2-S6 for detailed results and category definitions). Mass, length, width, and height of plastics were also recorded. Plastics were classified as microplastics (<5mm), mesoplastics (5-20mm) or macroplastics (>20mm) following other studies in the region for comparability (Baak et al. 2020; Avery-Gomm et al. 2018). Plastics were transferred into labeled scintillation jars for storage and then glass slides for fourier-transform infrared (FTIR) polymer analysis.

2.4 Contamination Measures and Controls

To mitigate contamination of samples by airborne microfibers, all equipment (petri dishes, sieves, tools, and the microscope) was rinsed or wiped down with paper kimwipes and tap water filtered by a 333μm mesh identical to that in trawl nets. Cotton lab coats were worn, and hair was tied back. Pinches of clothing fibres were part of contamination samples to account for possible contamination from our clothing. Separate blanks were taken for each sampling day. We used blanks to account for plastic contamination that may come from the air, our clothing, and/or lab equipment. Blanks were taken each day.

To eliminate contamination plastics from our analysis, sample plastics were compared with those in blanks from both the lab and the ship and any plastics in our sample that were identical to those in the control were eliminated. Criteria for elimination included identical: color, thickness, and “kinkiness” (shape characteristics) for microplastics, and color, morphology, and erosion patterns for non-microplastics such as paint chips or ropes. Any plastics confirmed as contamination were recorded and removed from the sample analysis.

2.5 Spectroscopy

Samples were sent to the Surface Science Western Lab at the University of Western Ontario on the homelands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak and Attawandaron peoples for FTIR spectroscopy to determine the polymer type of plastics and to validate visual identification. This technique involves shining a beam of many frequencies of light at an object, producing a spectral graph of absorption. Outputs from individual plastics were compared to outputs of known polymer types to determine identity.

2.6 Statistical analysis

Two statistical analyses were performed to address two questions: (1) to determine whether the total plastic abundance differed between the two research of Tasiujarjuaq and SW Greenland; and (2) to test the effect of local-scale latitude on plastic abundance within each site.

To determine whether the difference in abundance between the two sites was significant, we performed a t-test (two-sided) with a 95% confidence interval using the function t.test (R v.3.6.0). To determine the power of the t-test we performed a power analysis, using the function pwr.t2n.test (R v.3.6.0) for unequal sample sizes. We also conducted a power analysis to predict the number of samples that should be taken in future research to detect a difference in abundance. The power analysis was performed using the function pwr.t.test (R v.3.6.0) for equal sample sizes, with a power of 0.8 (standard), a significance level of 0.05, and the effect size of this study (Cohen’s d = 0.7335; the absolute mean difference divided by the standard deviation). The certainty (probability) of not committing an error (type 1 or 2) in this test is represented by the “power” of the test, which is low in this case: 0.19. This is primarily due to the small sample size. We performed an ANOVA on total plastic abundance as a function of latitude within each site independently of one another.

2.7 Literature review

To compare our findings to other plastic research in the region, the CLEAR research group conducted an exhaustive literature review for all English-language, peer reviewed publications on plastic pollution conducted in Inuit Nunangat and Greenland. To do so, we used Web of Science Core Collection and Scopus for the following terms in topic and title searches: Inuit Nunangat plastic, Arctic plastic, Arctic plastic Canada, Arctic plastic pollution, Arctic microplastic. Using Scopus, the following search terms were used in the title, keywords, and abstract category search feature: 'Arctic AND plastic', 'Inuit Nunangat AND plastic', 'Nunavut AND plastic', 'Nunatsiavut AND Plastic', 'Inuvialuit AND plastic', 'Nunavik AND 'plastic', 'Greenland AND plastic', 'Northwest Territories AND plastic', 'Yukon AND plastic', and 'Labrador AND plastic'.

Titles and abstracts were examined to ensure studies were scientific research on plastic pollution. We also contacted the Nunatsiavut Government and the Nunavut Research Institute for unpublished data sets. Duplicates and papers whose study areas did not fit the geographic area of interest or were not primary studies on plastic pollution were eliminated and all abstracts were reviewed to ensure fit.

We recovered a total of 18 peer reviewed papers and one grey literature report on plastic pollution from across regions of Inuit Nunangat, Greenland, and adjacent waters. These existing studies were organized based on region and location of study, type of plastic pollution study conducted (e.g. ingestion, surface trawl, benthic, ice core), plastic pollution findings (Table S7) and statements regarding research licensing (Table S8). Because a number of different methods were used in each study, we included a measurement unit reported as well as minimum detection limit so comparison between studies account for key methodological similarities and differences.

2.8 Analysis of methods for reconciliation science

A unique feature of this study is its framing of scientific methods and findings in terms of Inuit relationships and Northern governance, one aspect of reconciliation. We analyzed the scientific methods and findings according to key concepts and texts, supported by fluency in literature in the social studies of science (STS), decolonizing research and science in particular (e.g. Wilson 2008; Tuck 2009; Smith 2012; Kimmerer 2013), and settler colonial studies (e.g. Byrd 2011; Snelgrove et al. 2014). Key concepts include reconciliation, colonialism and research sovereignty (e.g. Liboiron 2021; Loseto et al. 2020; Carroll et al 2019; Pfeifer 2018; Rodriguez-

Lonebear 2016; Coulthard 2014; Walter and Anderson 2013; Gaudry and Lorenz 2018). To avoid a pan-Indigenous analysis that homogenizes thousands of different Indigenous cultures, we foreground locally salient Inuit texts such as Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami's publications on *National Inuit Strategy on Research* (2018) and *Negotiating Research Relationships with Inuit Communities* (2007), among others.

2.9 Community Peer Review

When CLEAR conducts plastic pollution research on Inuit lands and food webs, we engage in community peer review of findings before we disseminate to academic venues (Liboiron et al. 2018. Also see Loseto et al. 2020 and Wong et al. 2020). We shared a manuscript draft with key personnel in research institutions in Nunavut (Nunavut Arctic College, Nunavut Research Institute) and Nunatsiavut (Nunatsiavut Research Centre). Many reviewers provided substantial feedback and are co-authors.

2.10 *Author Order*

The method to determine author order followed Liboiron et al. (2017). The forms of labour in the study were discussed and ranked, and the people who performed those types of labour were listed. Forms of labour that attended to accountability were ranked highest for this report. Where two or more researchers were ranked identically, we considered issues of equity to order them. All authors as well as the full lab were invited to be part of these discussions, which were recorded. This process was revisited during review and subsequent edits as necessary.

3. Results

3.1 Abundance of plastics in surface waters

A total of 12 marine surface water trawls were deployed (Figure 1 & Table S2). Plastic pollution was found in all surface trawls. Plastic abundance ranged between 0.005 and 0.063 plastics/m^2 and averaged 0.018 plastics/m^2 across all samples (Figure 1). For lay reference, this represents an average of about 27 pieces of plastic in a body of water the size of a National Hockey League (NHL) ice rink. Southwestern Greenland samples averaged the highest plastic abundance at 0.026 (± 0.026 SD) plastics/m^2 compared to Tasiujarjuaq at 0.014 (± 0.008 SD) plastics/m^2. The highest abundance tow was the northernmost trawl (Trawl 9) in the Davis Straight/Labrador Sea by Qaqortoq, Greenland at 0.063 plastics/m^2 (Figure 1 & Table S2).

Table 1: Abundance of plastics in surface water in Tasiujarjuaq, Nunavut and Southwest Greenland

Site	Sample size	Total Plastic Abundance		
		Median (#/m^2)	Mean (#/m^2)	SD
Tasiujarjuaq, Nunavut	8	0.0126	0.0143	0.0082
Southwest Greenland	4	0.0182	0.0262	0.0260



Figure 1. Abundance of plastics in surface water near Iqaluit and Qaqortoq. The map shows the

relative abundance of plastics (particles/m^2) for each surface water trawl. For a more detailed map of trawl sites near Iqaluit, see S10.

3.2 Characteristics of plastics

Samples yielded a total of 42 different plastics, 22 of which were from Tasiujarjuaq and 20 of which came from southwest Greenland. Plastics were arranged by site and categorized by size, morphology, polymer type, colour, and erosion. The majority of plastics were microplastics (81.0%, n=34) between 0.45 and 5mm in size (Table 1). This size trend was consistent across both study regions, including 82% of plastics from Nunavut (n=18) and 80% of plastics from Greenland (n=16). Mesoplastics between 5-20mm comprised 14.3% of all plastics (n=6), the majority of which were threads. Only two macroplastic pieces larger than 20mm were collected: one green polyacrylonitrile thread collected from southern Greenland and one clear polypropylene film from Tasiujarjuaq, Nunavut.

Table 2: Morphology and size of plastics near Iqaluit in Tasiujarjuaq (Frobisher Bay), Nunavut and southwest Greenland near Qaqortoq

Location	Film	Foam	Fragments	Microbeads	Microfibers	Pellets	Threads	Macro	Meso	Micro
Tasiujarjuaq, Nunavut	2	5	11	1	0	0	3	1	3	18
Southwest Greenland	2	0	10	0	0	0	8	1	3	16
Total	4	5	21	1	0	0	11	2	6	34

Fragments comprised the majority of all plastic types collected (50%, n= 21), followed by threads (26%, n=11), foam (12%, n=5), film (10%, n= 4), and a single microbead (2%). No microfibers were recovered, which is common when using a 0.45mm cut off size. While both regions had similar percentages of fragments and film, they varied in the abundance of other morphologies. All foam (n=5) was found in Frobisher Bay, for example, and more threads were found near Greenland (Table S2).

The most abundant colour was red (26%, split evenly between the two study sites). White and black were the second most plentiful at 12% of the total (Table S3). All plastics (100%, n= 42) had signs of erosion or wear. More than one erosion pattern can occur on a single plastic, and

75 erosion notes were gathered on the 42 plastics (Table S4). The most common erosion type was fraying, which was related to the high number of plastic threads recovered. Among plastics, 19% were discoloured, 19% were pitted, 14% were fragmented, and 9% were stretched. All other erosion patterns were noted on 5% of plastics or less. Four, all from Tasiujarjuaq, were melted and/or burned.

All suspected plastics were submitted for FTIR analysis to determine polymer type (Table 2). Four threads were cellulosic and likely from non-plastic textile sources (Athey et al. 2020). Two plastics could not be identified, and 39 plastics were identified as synthetic polymers. The most common polymer was polyethylene (21%, n=8), followed by epoxy blends (18%, n = 7), and polystyrene (15%, n = 6), though all polystyrene was recovered from Tasiujarjuaq. Table 2 shows polymer types at each location. We also include common uses of each polymer type in anticipation of diverse users of this data.

Table 3: Polymer types of plastics recovered in surface water in Tasiujarjuaq near Iqaluit and the Labrador Sea near Qaqortoq (SW Greenland)

Polymer type	Common uses	Tasiujarjuaq (count)	Tasiujarjuaq (%)	SW Greenland (count)	SW Greenland (%)	Total (count)	Total (%)
Acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS)	Automotive components, pipe fittings, consumer goods (like Lego)	0	**0%**	0	**0%**	0	**0%**
Acrylate	Cosmetics, paints, diapers, textiles	0	**0%**	1	**5%**	1	**3%**
Alkyd Resin	Paints and varnishes, furniture and architectural coatings	0	**0%**	0	**0%**	0	**0%**
Acrylonitrile styrene acrylate (ASA)	Automotive components, home appliances	0	**0%**	1	**5%**	1	**3%**
Polyamide/Nylon (PA)	Textiles, carpets, automotive components, fishing gear	1	**5%**	0	**0%**	1	**3%**
Polyacrylonitrile (PAN)	Textiles, cement reinforcement	0	**0%**	3	**16%**	3	**8%**
Polyethylene (PE)	Packaging, trash bags, wire and cable insulation	6	**30%**	2	**11%**	8	**21%**
Polyethylene terephthalate (PET)	Packaging, soda pop bottles, textiles	0	**0%**	2	**11%**	2	**5%**
Polypropylene (PP)	Packaging, textiles, medical applications, fishing gear	2	**10%**	3	**16%**	5	**13%**

Polystyrene (PS)	Foam packaging and coolers, medical applications	6	**30%**	0	**0%**	6	**15%**
Polyurethane (PUR)	Coatings, spray and rigid foams common in construction, transportation, and furniture	0	**0%**	0	**0%**	0	**0%**
Silicone	Sealants and adhesives, medical applications	0	**0%**	0	**0%**	0	**0%**
Epoxy blends	Sealants and adhesives	2	**10%**	5	**26%**	7	**18%**
Other polymer	-	3	**15%**	2	**11%**	5	**13%**
Totals		**20**	**100%**	**19**	**100%**	**39**	**100%**

3.3. Spatial distribution of plastics between and within study sites

There was no significant difference in total plastic density between both locations (p = 0.4335. DF = 3.3022). In short, the difference in averages between the abundance of plastics in Tasiujarjuaq and southeast Greenland cannot be differentiated from chance (H2 is null). However, this test had a power of 0.19, indicating a high potential for type 2 error. This result is somewhat surprising given that the currents and land use patterns for each site are different. A power analysis shows that a minimum sample size of 30.2 samples (or 30 trawl tows per site) would allow future studies to detect a significant difference from these findings.

The ANOVA test also showed that abundance within each site was not related to local-scale latitude, which was also somewhat unanticipated, especially given that in Tasiujarjuaq, the location of the City of Iqaluit is located further north in the bay and thus is anticipated to be a source of urban plastic pollution (H1 is null) (p-value was > 0.05. It was 0.662 for Tasiujarjuaq and 0.04738 for SW Greenland). The F value was 0.2112 for Tasiujarjuaq and 0.7658 for SW Greenland.

3.4 Comparison of findings with existing studies in the literature

The systemic literature search for all research on plastic pollution in the Arctic resulted in 1,116 title results, of which 1,099 were excluded because they were not primary research on plastic pollution (merely mentioning the Arctic and plastics in passing), or were outside of the study area, or were duplicates. One additional grey literature report was found by contacting Inuit governments.

The final 18 English-language, published studies on plastic pollution in Inuit Nunangat and Greenland (Table S7) were dominated by ingestion studies (66%, n= 12), almost exclusively in birds (61%, n=11). Ingestion studies comprised all of the studies in Inuit Nunangat regions of Nunavut (100%, n= 8), Nunatsiavut (100%, n= 1) and Inuvialuit (100%, n=1), while a greater variety of plastic pollution research has been conducted outside of Inuit Nunangat in Greenland, including ingestion (50%, n= 3), subsurface water trawl (33%, n= 2) and ice core studies (17%, n=1). Studies conducted in polar areas adjacent to Inuit Nunangat (e.g. Labrador Sea, Arctic Central Basin) likewise included more diverse study types including ingestion (33%, n=2), surface water (17%, n= 1), subsurface water (17%, n=1), ice core (17%, n=1), and benthic studies (17%, n=1). Amongst all studies examined, over half of sample locations were in Nunavut (51.2%, n= 32) and in the Qikiqtani Inuit Region in particular (38%, n=24), which include prominent migratory bird monitoring sites such as Prince Leopold Island (Provencher et al. 2009, 2010; Poon et al. 2017).

We conducted a comparison of plastic abundance among water studies (i.e. surface water, subsurface water, ice) in all of Inuit Nunangat and the nearby Arctic and subarctic in relation to the findings in this study (Table 4, S11). Findings from published studies show a greater abundance of plastics at higher latitudes in the Arctic, and particularly high concentrations in sea ice (S11). The average abundance in our study is 0.018 plastics/m^2, lower than an average abundance of 0.063 plastics/m^2 found by Cózar et al. (2017) in the Greenland and Barents Seas north of our study sites using similar surface water methods. Subsurface water studies in Ukalqearteq (Amelineau et al. 2016), Northeastern Greenland (Morgana et al. 2018), and the Arctic Central Basin (Kanhai et al. 2018) also found higher abundances further north of our study area but used different methods and are not directly comparable (Table 4). Studies find a lower abundance in plastics south of our sites: published studies that used identical methods to our own shows Nunatsiavut to the south averaged 0.008 plastics/m^2 (Liboiron et al. 2020), followed by the more southerly region of Newfoundland and Labrador outside of the Arctic, which averaged 0.007 plastics/m^2 of surface water (Liboiron et al. 2020).

Table 4. Plastic density figures from surface water, subsurface water, and sea ice core studies in waters surrounding Inuit Nunangat and Greenland

Citation	Year	Environment	Sample depth (m)	Location	n	(#/unit)	Unit	Detection limit (mm)
Cózar et al., 2017	2013	surface water	0.15	"Rest of Arctic Ocean"	42	0.0000	m^2	0.5
Liboiron et al. 2020	2017	surface water	surface	Ramah Bay	1	0.0000	m^3	0.425
Liboiron et al. 2020	2017	surface water	surface	L'Anse aux Meadows	3	0.0049	m^2	0.425
Liboiron et al. 2020	2017	surface water	surface	Indian Island	2	0.0074	m^2	0.425

Liboiron et al. 2020	2017	surface water	surface	Grady Island,	3	0.0084	m^2	0.425
Liboiron et al. 2020	2017	surface water	surface	Nunajnguk (Nain)	4	0.0093	m^2	0.425
Liboiron et al. 2020	2017	surface water	surface	Tongait Kakkasuangita SilakKijapvinga	1	0.0094	m^2	0.425
Liboiron et al. this study	2018	surface water	surface	Frobisher Bay Nunavut	8	0.0144	m^2	0.425
Liboiron et al. this study	2018	surface water	surface	East Greenland	4	0.0263	m^2	0.425
Cózar et al., 2017	2013	surface water	0.15	"Greenland and Barents Seas"	42	0.0630	m^2	0.5
Kanhai et al. 2018	2016	subsurface water	8.5	"Arctic Central Basin"	58	0.9700	m^3	0.25
Amelineau et al., 2016	2005	subsurface water	50	Ukalqearteq	18	0.9900	m^3	0.5
Amelineau et al., 2016	2014	subsurface water	50	Ukalqearteq	20	2.3800	m^3	0.5
Morgana et al. 2018	2018	subsurface water	6	Northeastern Greenland	7	2.4000	m^3	0.08
Peeken et al., 2018	2014	sea ice	-	Fram Strait	1	4.1000	m^2	0.011
Obbard et al. 2014	2014	sea ice	1.07	"Arctic Ocean"	1	50	L	-
Obbard et al. 2014	2014	sea ice	1.35	"Arctic Ocean"	1	238	L	-

4. Discussion

4.1 Spatial trends of plastics abundance

Arctic and subarctic regions (north of 60° latitude), which include many Inuit communities, are less populated than locations further south and there are no sources of plastic production in the Arctic. Yet, both models (van Sebille et al. 2012) and published studies (Obbard et al. 2014; Lusher et al. 2015; Bergmann et al. 2016; Cozar et al. 2017) find high plastic accumulation in the northern and easternmost areas of the Greenland and Barents seas and the Arctic Polar Circle generally. For this reason, we chose two sites at relatively similar latitudes (between 60-63°) to compare the abundance of plastics in surface water in each, and to locations further north and south (via other published literature).

We did not find a statistically significant spatial trend of abundance within either site, even though in Tasiujarjuaq one cluster of trawl tows were close to Iqaluit and its landfill, which is located on a cliff overlooking the ocean, and the others ran out into the bay including two tows near the mouth of the bay. We expected a statistically significant increase of abundance close to urban centers (Iqaluit population is 7,740) (City of Iqaluit, 2021) and its landfill as per H1, but this was not the case. While proximity to urban centers and latitude are not synonymous, in the specific case of Tasiujarjuaq they have an equivalency. Based on our statistics, differences in abundance between trawls, as a function of latitude, was likely due to chance.

There was also no a statistically significant difference in the two abundance measures between Tasiujarjuaq and southwest Greenland (p-value = 0.4335) (H2). However, the number of samples in this study makes the certainty of these measures relatively low. More samples (30 per site, based on power analysis) would allow not only more certainty, but would be able to show a demonstrable change in future studies. It should be highlighted that deploying 30 trawls per site, at 30 minutes each, would represent an important time commitment during any expedition, particularly during inter-disciplinary surveys, and in practice it might be challenging to obtain such elevated number of samples.

The literature review allowed us to situate our findings within other studies of plastic abundance in water and ice further north and south of our sites. Our study found abundances of microplastics that are similar to those found in Arctic surface waters at comparable latitudes, such as off the coast of Svalbard, Norway (0.028 plastics/ m^2), though this study sampled subsurface water and had a lower cut off size than our study (Lusher et al. 2015). As mentioned above, our results show a lower abundance of plastics than in the suspected plastic accumulation zone further north near the Greenlandic and Barents seas using similar surface water methods and cut off sizes (0.0630 plastics/ m^2) (Cózar et al. 2017; also see van Sebille 2012 for a model). Subsurface water studies in Ukalqearteq (Amelineau et al. 2016), Northeastern Greenland (Morgana et al. 2018), and the Arctic Central Basin (Kanhai et al. 2018) also found higher abundances further north of our study area but used different methods and are not directly comparable (Table 4). However this trend in higher abundance at northern latitudes is complicate by the study by Cózar et al. (2017), which included 42 sites across the Arctic Circle, 37% of surface net tows were free of plastic, while none of the tows in this study were plastic-free.

The average abundance in both our locations was higher than those in adjacent southern Arctic, subarctic and North Atlantic regions including an average of 0.008 plastics/m^2 in Nunatsiavut and 0.005 plastics/m^2 near L'Anse aux Meadows just south of Labrador in studies that used identical methods and cut off sizes (Liboiron et al. 2020). Indeed, the highest abundance found in this study (trawls 3 and 6 in Tasiujarjuaq and trawls 9 and 12 in southwest Greenland) were closer to those found in more heavily populated south Pacific waters (0.027 plastics/m^2) with similar methods (Eriksen et al. 2013). Caution should be exercised when doing these sorts of comparisons, however, as sampling and laboratory methods are not standardized across all studies. For this reason, Table 4 includes the environment sampled, sample depth, number of samples, and the lowest detection size, all of which can influence findings. We have consistently noted where results are more or less comparison due to these different methods in the text above.

Such a comparison leads us to believe that the effects of latitude on plastic abundance occur over large scales rather than those of single bays or study areas, and our findings do not invalidate research that shows the high Arctic as a sink for long-range transport of plastics that originate further south. Thus, we propose that spatial nuance in studies is important, as studies that consider localities and scales that have meaning to local Arctic residents may well have different spatial patterns than those that consider entire oceans or regions of the Arctic. In the future, a greater number and more even coverage of sampling within a bay such as Tasiujarjuaq is recommended for making meaningful data about local plastic conditions.

4.2 Trends of plastics type (morphology, polymer, erosion) and relationships to local or long-range sources

One of the core questions in a study like this is whether plastics might be local or from long-range sources. This is a difficult question to answer, as it is impossible to definitively determine the source of plastics in nearly all cases. In this study, there are conflicting indications of local and long-range plastics, and it is likely that both sources are represented here.

The polymer type most commonly found in this study was polyethylene (21%), which likewise comprised the largest percentage of polymers found in studies of surface water in Northwest Greenland (41%) (Morgana et al. 2018) and in Arctic sea ice cores (48%) (Peeken et al. 2018). A similar percentage was found in the Greenland Sea (23%), though in this last case polyester was more abundant (53%) (Amélineau et al. 2016). Polyethylene is commonly found in plastic packaging materials and other ‘user’ plastics, though this does not indicate that these plastics are from local sources. The prevalence of polyethelene is in line with many other studies and may indicate long-range sources, our percentage (21%) was comparatively low. Uniquely, the polymer types identified in this study were more diverse that other studies in water and ice in the Arctic and we found an unusually high prevalence of epoxy blends (18% of the overall study, and 26% of those in SW Greenland), which are not noted in other Arctic water and ice studies in our literature review. Likewise, polystyrene is rarely or never mentioned in these other studies, but it was our second most abundant category (15%), all of which was found in Tasiujarjuaq.

We found five burned and/or melted erosion patterns on plastics, all from Tasiujarjuaq. As the dump in Iqaluit has been a source of both controlled and uncontrolled burning of plastics in the past (Watson 2014, Varga 2015, Zahara 2015, Zahara 2018), this may indicate the plastic is local in origin. However, other studies have found burned plastics in regions further south where burning is not a part of official waste management (Saliu et al 2018). Avery-Gomm et al., (2016), for example, found that 37% of plastics ingested by dovekies (*alle alle)* on the island of Newfoundland south of this study were burned or melted. It is likely these are local plastics, though we cannot be sure.

Finally, most studies of Arctic sea water and ice found that blue plastics are the most prevalent (e.g. Obbard et al. 2014; Morgana et al. 2018, Kanhai et al. 2018), but we found that red was the most prevalent (26% of plastics overall, split evenly between sites), followed by white and black (both 12%). Taken together, these findings on polymer type and erosion patterns may indicate a unique profile of plastics in these regions or at this latitude.

At the same time, there are indications that some of the plastics are likely from long-range transport. We found the presence of erosion on all plastics (100%, n= 42). Following Cozar et al. (2017: 1), "an abundant presence of aged debris" is a possible indicator that plastics "originated from distant sources." Of course, aged plastics do not necessarily mean they are from distant sources as they could accumulate in local areas over time, and indeed, the freezing and thawing cycles at high latitudes can contribute to fragmentation and other erosion patterns, as can warm and sunny shorelines (Cooper and Corcoran, 2010).

Cozar et al. (2017) and others have used the high abundance of plastics in the Arctic in juxtaposition to low local populations to argue that Arctic plastics are likely not local. Our findings on abundance are consistent with this hypothesis. Abundance compared to population, ubiquitous erosion patterns, and the lack of statistical evidence that areas closer to Iqaluit have a higher abundance of plastics appear to support the idea that many Arctic plastics are not originating locally (van Sebille et al. 2012), though very likely some are. More research that considers plastics along entire potential pathways into local regions would be able to shed more light on the issue.

There are several explanations for long-range transport of plastics from the south to the Arctic. Studies have predicted hotspots of plastic accumulation in Arctic waters caused by converging currents (van Sebille et al. 2012), for example. The West Greenland Current is a northerly flowing current with inputs of southern waters (Yang et al. 2016) and is a potential source of plastics found in our samples collected off the coast of Greenland. The West Greenlandic Current merges with the East Greenlandic Current and may indirectly receive plastics from highly populated regions of northern Europe (Morgana et al. 2018) in addition to those brought north from Atlantic regions (Cózar et al. 2017). In Tasiujarjuaq, southerly flowing water from the Baffin Current may also be a source of plastics, given high abundance of plastics found in nearby sea ice (Obbard et al. 2014; Peeken et 2018), likely deposited from Pacific waters. Yet, other studies hypothesize that plastics in the Greenland Sea originated from the higher Arctic via melting sea ice traveling on the East Greenland current rather than originating from the south directly (Amelineau et al. 2016). See S13 for a map of currents.

Other potential sources of plastic pollution include atmospheric transport (Bergmann et al. 2019) and biotransport via migrating animals (Provencher et al. 2010; Mallory et al. 2006), which disproportionately deposit plastics in Arctic regions (Bourdages et al. in press; Evangeliou et al. 2020). At the same time, there are complex oceanographic factors at play in the circulation of plastics in and to the Arctic. This includes the reduced buoyancy of material in cold water and Enders et al., (2015) have suggested a strong dispersal of small plastics throughout the surface mixed layers. Cozar et al., (2017) have noted that forces impacting the density of water, including melting ice creating a freshwater layer and differences in salinity, may impact transport as well as where in the water column plastics accumulate. Future studies might investigate both surface and subsurface water for plastics and consider a full range of indicators of local and long-range transport.

4.3 Reflection on research relationships to Inuit Nunangat in this study

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami is an Inuit-led non-profit organization that protects and advances the rights and interests of Inuit in Canada, including in research. Their *National Inuit Strategy on Research* (2018) makes the legacy and context of research in Inuit Nunangat clear: “The relationship between Inuit and the research community is replete with examples of exploitation and racism. Research has largely functioned as a tool of colonialism, with the earliest scientific forays into Inuit Nunangat serving as precursors for the expansion of Canadian sovereignty and the dehumanization of Inuit. Early approaches to the conduct of research in Inuit Nunangat cast Inuit as either objects of study or bystanders. This legacy has had lasting impact on Inuit and it continues to be reflected in current approaches to research governance, funding, policies, and practices" (2018: 5. Also see Smith 2012). We and many other researchers understand that this legacy is not in the past and signs of it exist in this study. This is not a legacy that individual researchers or research organizations can opt out of, even if we are respectful in other ways such as using local place names or fostering anti-racist cultures in our workplaces. The moment researchers decide to pursue research in Indigenous territories and homelands, we inherit these legacies and we work within this context (O'Brien 1993; McGregor 2004; Tuck 2009; Smith 2012; Moffitt et al. 2015). For this reason, the discussion below highlights the ways that normal aspects of research, from permitting to categorization of plastics, are engaged in these relationships, usually in ways that are difficult to see because they are part of scientific norms. We aim to bring some of these contexts and legacies to light so that we, as settler and non-Inuit researchers, can actively make choices to conduct reconciliatory science that align with Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami's call to change research in Inuit Nunangat.

4.3.1 *Permissions and permitting*

Nearly all areas in Inuit Nunangat have research permitting and permission processes in place (Table S1). Of the 18 peer reviewed articles collected in our systematic literature review, seven (39%) included a statement regarding whether a research permit was obtained (Table S8). Two of these were in the methods section rather than the acknowledgments. Of these, five (28%) mentioned whether a permit from an Inuit Nunangat research centre was obtained. Others included statements about federal permits, boating permits, or statements of community consultations and partnerships. A third (n= 6, 33%) of all papers did not include any type of statement on research permitting or permissions of any kind. This does not mean permits and permissions were not sought and obtained, but it does indicate that the formal protocols of permissions, permits, and consent as highlighted by Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (2018) and Inuit researchers (Pederson et al. 2020; Bull and Hudson 2019) are not a core part of research discussions in one of the most authoritative places that research is discussed: peer reviewed publications.

Though all researchers in this study obtained required permits and permissions, CLEAR has been asked by others to process samples collected in Inuit Nunangat without permits or to reanalyze samples when reanalysis was not part of the original permit. We decline to process samples obtained without permit. It is clear to us that permits and permission for research in Indigenous homelands is not to be taken for granted as common knowledge or practice. We encourage researchers to report Indigenous permits in methods sections to formalize their critical nature in doing research, rather than relegating them to a "helping" role as per acknowledgements (Loseto et al. 2020).

Following research permits and permission processes is a simple step establishing good research relations, but at the same time it must be stressed that in many parts of Inuit Nunangat, permits and permissions are carried out by territorial or other settler state bodies that do not necessarily have Inuit staff, nor do they necessarily consult with Inuit. If they do, there is often no formal requirement to heed Inuit requests in the permit. Indeed, there are cases where research permits were granted in Nunavut despite the protests of Inuit (Qikiqtani Inuit Association. V. Canada 2010; Riddell-Dixon 2011). The role of Inuit in decision-making around research in their homelands is uneven across Inuit Nunangat and is in constant development.

4.3.2 Personnel

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami argues that "the primary beneficiaries of Inuit Nunangat research continue to be [non-Inuit] researchers themselves, in the form of access to funding, data and information, research outcomes, and career advancement" (ITK 2018: 5). This observation held for this study: we mapped the locations ("research bases") of first authors in all papers in our comparative analysis of plastics in water in the Eastern Arctic (Figure 3). 100% of leads are based in the south.

Figure 2: Places associated with marine surface water plastic research in the Eastern Arctic, including research sites, researcher home bases for first authors on published research on plastics in water in the region, and settlements in homelands. Inuit Nunangat is coloured for reference with different regions of Inuit Nunangat in different shades (Nunatsiavut in orange, Nunavut in yellow, and Nunavik in green), and settlements in Inuit Nunangat are coloured orange. The map shows a clear trend of researchers in the south producing all research in the north germane to this study.

This study only brought in Inuit and Northerners at the end, rather than at the beginning, which is not ideal. As contributors to this study, some consented to be co-authors. Several studies in our literature review mention working with Inuit hunters and guides, but few are listed as co-authors or appear to be considered researchers despite these activities generating samples and knowledge crucial to the success of scientific studies and despite the existence and excellence of Inuit researchers (Sawatzky et al. 2020). Our author list addresses the way northern and Inuit intellectual labour is often dismissed and unnamed in dominant scientific culture.

An investigation into the impacts of research personnel in plastic pollution research in the eastern Arctic yielded an unexpected outcome: while the majority of studies in the circumpolar Arctic are on surface water, in Inuit Nunangat they are on plastic ingestion (of 65 sites, 77%), and mainly in birds (54% of all species and sites)(Table S7). We hypothesize that this is due to the low diversity of published researchers working in this area, resulting in an overall regional skew of knowledge in the direction of particular research team's or leads' interests and skills, even when they work with Inuit partners.

4.3.3 Categorization of plastics

Scientific categories can seem benign, exempt from social relationships by simply describing the natural world. However, categories and their standardization dictate what is counted and what is not, what is considered the best unit of measurement, and how different things are grouped together into measurable entities through categorization (Pine & Liboiron 2015; Bowker 2000; O'brien 1993; Porter 1996). For example, the categories of "user" and "industrial" plastics are common in the literature (Eriksen et al 2020; Provencher et al. 2010) but when used in Inuit Nunangat, they infer that plastics are locally sourced and users are Inuit despite the vast majority of these likely arriving from hundreds or thousands of kilometers away (Obbard 2018). Moreover, research on waste and disposability argues that the production of "user" plastics are expressions of industry production goals and their circulation are not usually based on user behaviour, but rather on waste infrastructure and investment (MacBride 2011; Lepawsky 2018). All plastics have roots in industrial extraction, design, production, and circulation regardless of consumer choice (Liboiron 2016; Amélineau et al. 2016). This mismatch between the agency of industry versus end consumers as sources of plastic pollution is amplified in the North, as consumer choice, the ability to choose between disposable packaging or other forms of plastic waste or not, and recycling and composting are often unavailable (Keskie et al. 2018; Liboiron 2018b ECCC 2017; exp Services 2014; Dawley 2013; Eisted & Christensen 2013; Cantin et al. 2012; Arktis Solutions 2011). Categorization should match this reality.

This may seem like an insignificant detail, but Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami opens their case for a *National Inuit Strategy on Research* with the argument that evidence provided by research is foundational to strong public policies, decision making, and governance (2018: 4). Measurements and their categories are related to governance and therefore to sovereignty. Sovereignty is not only about the right to self-determination and self-governance, but also the ability to access the resources, including data, to govern well (Carroll et al. 2019; Rodriguez-Lonebear 2016). The use of user and industrial categories make implicit arguments about sources and thus intervention. Sociologist Stephen Lukes refers to this latent or potential shaping of governance through the measurements it depends on as a "mobilization of bias," or the ability to shape agendas before overt political conflict even emerges (in Scott 1998: 58). This view is summed up in the truism, "You can't manage what you can't measure" and its inverse, "you can only manage what you do measure." Indeed, for this reason we have included a large number maps, detailed supplementary material, lay understandings of measures (number of plastics in a hockey rink), checklists, and transparency in data—we anticipate that if Inuit groups wish to use this data for decision-making, it will have to be complete enough for such uses.

The relationship between scientific categories and evidence-based governance is why "threads" appear as a morphological category for plastics in this study. While plastic pollution research in the 1970s included the category of threads, more recent morphological standardizations do not (e.g. Rochman et al. 2019). For many places this makes sense. Yet, threads (Figure 3) are the second highest category of plastic type in this study, accounting for 26% of plastics overall (Table 1). Threads typically originate from fishing gear (Saturno 2020, Richardson et al., 2019). As such, our lab includes the category in all studies occurring in areas with high fishing activity to guide the governance of likely sources of plastic pollution.



Figure 3: Examples of threads from this study, which likely originate from fishing gear. Threads are sturdier than microfibers, even though they may be small. They are less kinked and often occur in woven bundles. Fraying of the ends is a common erosion pattern. Squares in images are 1mm x 1mm.

4.4 Research as a source of waste and pollution

Research activities, usually conducted with gear and personnel from the south (Figure 2), are a known source of plastic pollution and waste transport in Inuit Nunangat. In their baseline study of surface water plastics in the Southern Ocean, Suaria et al. (2020) found that more than half (58%) of plastics collection via neuston samples were paint fragments from survey ships. They explain, “Although most presumably came from our survey vessels, paint chips are continuously generated during ongoing repair, maintenance and cleaning of all ship decks and superstructures, including research vessels, cruise liners and fishing boats” (p. 6). A study by Caylarde et al. (2021) found that while paint fragments “were 30 times more abundant than other plastic particles in the surface waters around the Antarctic peninsula,” they are often not included in estimates of plastics abundance, making them a potential underestimated and understudied source of plastics (3). Other studies have found that the paint from research vessels are a source of pollution stemming from research activity (Lacerda et al. 2019; Song et al. 2014), and Peeken et al. (2018) found 27.2% of all microplastics in their study of the Arctic Ocean were acrylic or varnish, likely indicative of paint. In this study we found paint chips in both study locations; two acrylate fragments found in southwest Greenland did not match any sources of plastics on the research vessel, but four red fragments that FTIR classified as “other commercial polymers” were red on one side, with yellow or rust colours on the other (Figure 4). The *Amundsen*’s hull is red and they may have originated from our research vessel. While none of the chips were identical to the ones on our contamination samples/blanks, the chips we archived account for only a small portion of the ship’s paint. Any materials brought on research expeditions from the south to Inuit Nunangat left in the environment, from trash to sewage, is also part of the transport of waste from the south to the north through research activities. As one co-author based in Iqaluit can attest, researchers routinely leave plastic research disposables such as baggies and vials as well as toxic research materials such as acetone in Nunavut, where there are no safe methods of disposal. Other researchers have noted the extreme carbon footprint of Arctic research based in the south (Brook 2009).



Figure 4: Plastics fragments from surface water trawls likely to be paint chips. The squares in each image are 1mm x 1mm.

We suggest that researchers include research-based waste, pollution, and contamination as a form of harm within their research applications and designs. We also recommend researchers take samples of paint from their research vessels, not to eliminate paint as a form of contamination in samples but to compare to trawl samples as a potentially identifiable point source of marine plastic pollution.

5. Conclusion

This paper has two distinct, yet inextricably interrelated and dependant parts: (1) a traditional scientific study of plastic pollution in surface waters that aligns with other studies, finding that abundance of plastics are greater at higher latitudes in the Arctic; and (2) a reflective analysis of methods and findings with an eye to Inuit relationships and governance in the research area.

Focusing on these usually unintentional relationships gives us, in the scientific community, the opportunity to recognize that colonial relationships often exist in our work so we can then change relationships towards those characterized by reconciliation and respecting Indigenous sovereignty. While good intentions are a prerequisite to address colonial aspects of research, good intentions alone are not sufficient to challenge embedded colonial research practices; this requires a deliberate and rigorous change in behaviour, practices, and institutional paradigms and policies. Research methodologies are one such route for such change (Wilson 2008; Kovach 2010; Smith 2012; Walter and Andersen 2013; Wong et al. 2020; Liboiron 2021).

Ensuring we gain permits and permissions to access Indigenous homelands, stepping back to allow and foster Inuit-led researchers and thus to decrease the need for outsider access to Inuit homelands, paying attention to the way categories, metrics, and standards are used in research and their ties to Inuit governance and sovereignty, and framing research findings for use by Inuit are all aspects of doing reconciliatory science (see also S8 for a summary of recommendations). This list should only be understood as a compliment to already existing documents such as the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami's *National Inuit Strategy on Research* (2018) and *Negotiating Research Relationships with Inuit Communities* (2007) that clearly lay out desired researcher-Inuit relationships, principles, and protocols from an Inuit perspective. Research relations to Indigenous homelands will vary between homelands— what works for Inuit in Inuit Nunangat will almost certainly be different for Kumeyaay in US-Mexico borderlands, for example. Indeed, what works in Nunatsiavut will be different than what is needed in Nunavut, even though both are part of Inuit Nunangat (See Obed 2017; Cunsolo Willox et al. 2012). But we do believe that some of the insights outlined here generalize to other Indigenous homelands in the Arctic and beyond.

Finally, the framing of action and good relations here falls squarely within definitions of reconciliation, based in "the promise of redemption and resolution" (Stein 2018: 156) in a way that largely leaves existing land relations intact (Daigle 2019). Gaudry and Lorenz (2018) articulate a spectrum of definitions, goals, and actions for indigenization. The first is Indigenous inclusion, into which our recommendation in section 4.3.2. on foregrounding Inuit research personnel falls (also see Anonymous 2019). The second is Indigenous reconciliation, which "locates indigenization on common ground between Indigenous and Canadian ideals, creating a new, broader consensus on debates such as what counts as knowledge, how should

Indigenous knowledges and European-derived knowledges be reconciled, and what types of relationships academic institutions should have with Indigenous communities" (219). This is where we see this article falling. Finally, they describe decolonial indigenization, which would reorient "knowledge production based on balancing power relations between Indigenous peoples and Canadians, transforming the academy [and science] into something dynamic and new" (219). Our recommendations fall short of this final goal. That is, our framing of reconciliation science is more a call to reform of existing, dominant system rather than decolonization (Tuck and Yang 2012, Gaudry and Lorenz 2018), #Land Back (Briarpatch 2020; Yellowhead Institute 2019), or even allyship (Indigenous Action 2014). This is a limitation. As such, we understand the reconciliatory moves in scientific research outlined here as the bare minimum of what might count as taking up land acknowledgements and meeting existing requirements of Inuit governance (Wong et al. 2020). Future projects may think about what other relations can take Arctic science further.

6. Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the land upon which samples were collected as the homelands of diverse Inuit groups in Inuit Nunangat. The land upon which samples were processed and this article was written is the traditional homelands of the Beothuk, and the larger island of Newfoundland is the homelands of the Mi'kmaq and the Beothuk. Analysis of polymer types conducted by SSW occurred on the traditional homelands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak and Attawandaron peoples.

Thank you to Amundsen Science, chief scientist Dr. Philippe Archambault, and the captain and crew of CCGS *Amundsen* for a successful expedition. Thank you to participants in the equity in author order meeting (Liboiron et al. 2017): Dominique David-Chavez, Jesse Jacobs, Katherine Crocker, Taylor Thompson, Lydia Jennings, Taylor Hess, Noah Hutton, Nadia Duman, Natasha Healey, Molly Rivers, Arif Abu, Doménica Lombeida, John Atkinson, Nicole Power, and Charles Mather. A special thank you to those that reviewed drafts of this article to ensure it was in good relations and standing: Norm Catto and Jackie Price.

This research was supported by ArcticNet, a Network of Centres of Excellence Canada; an NSERC ship time grant to Edinger et al.; a Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Insight grant to Liboiron; Memorial University's Undergraduate Career Experience

Program (MUCEP); and Memorial University's International Student Work Experience Program (ISWEP).

References

AMAP/ EU-PolarNet. (2020). *AMAP/ EU-PolarNet International Stakeholder Workshops on Research Needs*. Tromsø, Norway: Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme.

Amélineau, F., Bonnet, D., Heitz, O., Mortreux, V., Harding, A. M. A., Karnovsky, N., Walkusz, W., Fort, J., & Gremillet, D. (2016). Microplastic pollution in the Greenland Sea: Background levels and selective contamination of planktivorous diving seabirds. *Environmental Pollution*, 219, 1131-1139. DOI: 10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.017

Anonymous. (2020). Indigenization is Indigenous. *The Gazette*, February 12. https://gazette.mun.ca/campus-and-community/indigenization-is-indigenous/

Arktis Solutions. (2011). *Report on Current State of Solid Waste Management and Facilities in Nunavut and Cost-Benefit Analysis of Selected Solid Waste Management Approaches* (GN-CGS PROJECT #2010-27). Retrieved from: https://assembly.nu.ca/library/Gnedocs/2011/000359-e.pdf.

Athey, S. N., Adams, J. K., Erdle, L. M., Jantunen, L. M., Helm, P. A., Finkelstein, S. A., & Diamond, M. L. (2020). The Widespread Environmental Footprint of Indigo Denim Microfibers from Blue Jeans. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 7, 840-847. DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00498

Avery-Gomm, S., Provencher, J. F., Liboiron, M., Poon, F. E., & Smith, P. A. (2018). Plastic pollution in the Labrador Sea: an assessment using the seabird northern fulmar (*Fulmarus glacialis*) as a biological monitoring species. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 127, 817-822. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.10.001.

Baak, J. E., Linnebjerg, J. F., Barry, T., Gavrilo, M. V., Mallory, M. L., Price, C., & Provencher, J. F. (2020). Plastic ingestion by seabirds in the circumpolar Arctic: A review. *Environmental Reviews*, 28(4), 506-516. DOI: 10.1139/er-2020-0029

Bergmann, M., Sandhop, N., Schewe, I., & D'Hert, D. (2016). Observations of floating anthropogenic litter in the Barents Sea and Fram Strait, Arctic. *Polar Biology*, 39(3), 553-560. DOI: 10.1007/s00300-015-1795-8

Bergmann, M., Mützel, S., Primpke, S., Tekman, M. B., Trachsel, J., & Gerdts, G. (2019). White and wonderful? Microplastics prevail in snow from the Alps to the Arctic. *Science Advances*, 5(8), eaax1157. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aax1157

Bourdages, M.P.T., Provencher, J.F., Sudlovenick, E., Ferguson, S.H., Young, B.G., Pelletier, N., Murphy, M.J.J., D'Addario, A., & Vermaire, J.C. (2020). No plastics detected in seal (Phocidae) stomachs harvested in the eastern Canadian Arctic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 150, 110772. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.110772

Bourdages, M. P., Provencher, J. F., Baak, J. E., Mallory, M. L., & Vermaire, J. C. (In Press). Breeding seabirds as vectors of microplastics from sea to land: Evidence from colonies in Arctic Canada. *Science of The Total Environment*, 142808. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142808

Bowker, G.C. (2000). Biodiversity Datadiversity. *Social Studies of Science,* 30, 643–683. DOI: 10.1177/030631200030005001

Briarpatch Magazine. (2020). *The Land Back Issue*. September/October.

Brook, R. K. (2009). Ignoring the elephant in the room: the carbon footprint of climate change research. *Arctic*, *62*(2), 253-255. DOI: 10.14430/arctic144

Bull, J., & Hudson, A. (2019). Research governance in NunatuKavut: engagement, expectations and evolution*. International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, 78(2), 1556558. DOI: 10.1080/22423982.2018.1556558

Byrd, J. A. (2011). *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cantin, P., Bury, D., & Vaillancourt, P. (2012). *Inventory and Feasibility Assessment of Electronic Waste Recovery in the Northwest Territories: Final Report* (068-P-0000378-0100-MR-R0100-01). Retrieved from: www.dessau.com

Carroll, SR, Rodriguez-Lonebear, D and Martinez, A. (2019). Indigenous Data Governance: Strategies from United States Native Nations. *Data Science Journal*, 18(31), 1-15. DOI: 10.5334/dsj-2019-031

City of Iqaluit. (2021). Demographics. https://www.iqaluit.ca/visitors/explore-iqaluit/demographics

Cooper, D. A., & Corcoran, P. L. (2010). Effects of mechanical and chemical processes on the degradation of plastic beach debris on the island of Kauai, Hawaii. *Marine pollution bulletin*, *60*(5), 650-654. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.12.026

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cózar, A., Martí, E., Duarte, C.M., García-de-Lomas, J., Van Sebille, E., Ballatore, T.J., Eguíluz, V.M., González-Gordillo, J.I., Pedrotti, M.L., Echevarría, F. & Troublè, R. (2017). The Arctic Ocean as a dead end for floating plastics in the North Atlantic branch of the

Thermohaline Circulation. *Science Advances*, 3(4), e1600582. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.1600582

Cunsolo Willox, A., Harper, S. L., Ford, J. D., Landman, K., Houle, K., & Edge, V. L. (2012). “From this place and of this place:” Climate change, sense of place, and health in Nunatsiavut, Canada. *Social Science and Medicine*, 75(3), 538–547. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.03.043

Daigle, M. (2019). The spectacle of reconciliation: On (the) unsettling responsibilities to Indigenous peoples in the academy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 37(4), 703-721. DOI: 10.1177/0263775818824342

Dawley, D. (2013). *Municipal Hazardous Waste Inventory Beaufort Delta/Arctic Pilot Project* (SC437531). Retrieved from: https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/haz_waste_inventory_report.pdf.

Eisted, R., & Christensen, T. H. (2011). Waste management in Greenland: Current situation and challenges. *Waste Management and Research,* 29(10), 1064–1070. DOI: 10.1177/0734242X10395421

Enders, K., Lenz, R., Stedmon, C. A., & Nielsen, T. G. (2015). Abundance, size and polymer composition of marine microplastics≥ 10 μm in the Atlantic Ocean and their modelled vertical distribution. *Marine pollution bulletin*, *100*(1), 70-81. doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.09.027

Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) (2017). *Solid Waste Management for Northern and Remote Communities.* Gatineau, QC: Government of Canada.

Eriksen, M., Borgogno, F., Villarrubia-Gómez, P., Anderson, E., Box, C., & Trenholm, N. (2020). Mitigation strategies to reverse the rising trend of plastics in Polar Regions. *Environment International*, 139, 105704. DOI: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105704

Eriksen, M., Maximenko, N., Thiel, M., Cummins, A., Lattin, G., Wilson, S., Hafner, J., Zellers, A., & Rifman. S. (2013). Plastic pollution in the South Pacific subtropical gyre. *Marine Pollution Bulletin,* 68(1-2), 71-76. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.12.021

Evangeliou, N., Grythe, H., Klimont, Z., Heyes, C., Eckhardt, S., Lopez-Aparicio, S., & Stohl, A. (2020). Atmospheric transport is a major pathway of microplastics to remote regions. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 3381. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-020-17201-9

exp Services Inc. (2014). Nunavut Solid Waste Management Plan. Retrieved from: http://www.cgs.gov.nu.ca/rfp/Past%20Documents%20Sanikiluaq/Nunavut%20Solid%20Waste%20Management%20Plan.pdf.

Furgal, C.M., Powell, S., & Myers, H. (2005). Digesting the message about contaminants and country food in the Canadian North: a review and recommendations for future research and action. *Arctic* 58(2): 103-114. DOI: 10.14430/arctic404.

Gaudry, A., & Lorenz, D. (2018). Indigenization as inclusion, reconciliation, and decolonization: Navigating the different visions for indigenizing the Canadian Academy. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *14*(3), 218-227. DOI: 10.1177/1177180118785382

Gaylarde, C. C., Neto, J. A. B., & da Fonseca, E. M. (2021). Paint fragments as polluting microplastics: A brief review. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *162*, 111847.

Goldstein, M. C., Titmus, A. J., & Ford, M. (2013). Scales of spatial heterogeneity of plastic marine debris in the northeast Pacific Ocean. *PloS one*, *8*(11), e80020. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0080020

Government of Canada. (2018). *Community Based Monitoring and Research*. Northern Contaminants Funded Projects 2018-2019. Retrieved from: https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_97916.html?Open=1&wbdisable=true#9

Indigenous Action. (2014) *Accomplices Not Allies: Abolishing the Ally Industrial Complex*. Indigenous Action Media. Retrieved from: http://www.indigenousaction.org/accomplices-not-allies-abolishing-the-ally-industrial-complex/

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) (2018). *National Inuit Strategy on Research*. Ottawa, Canada: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami.

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Nunavut Research Institute (ITK& NRI) (2007). *Negotiating Research Relationships with Inuit Communities: A Guide for Researchers*. Nickels, S., Shirley, J. & Laidler, G. (eds). Ottawa & Iqaluit: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Nunavut Research Institute.

Kanhai, L.K., Gårdfeldt, K., Lyashevska, O., Hassellöv, M., Thompson, R.C., O'Connor, I. (2018). Microplastics in sub-surface waters of the Arctic Central Basin. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 130, 8-18. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.03.011

Keske, C. M., Mills, M., Godfrey, T., Tanguay, L., & Dicker, J. (2018). Waste management in remote rural communities across the Canadian North: Challenges and opportunities. *Detritus*, 2(1), 63-77. DOI: 10.31025/2611-4135/2018.13641

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants*. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.

Kovach, M. (2010). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Lacerda, A.L.D.F., Rodrigues, L.D.S., Van Sebille, E., Rodrigues, F.L., Ribeiro, L., Secchi, E.R., Kessler, F. & Proietti, M.C. (2019). Plastics in sea surface waters around the Antarctic Peninsula. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 1-12. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-40311-4.

Law, K. L., Morét-Ferguson, S., Maximenko, N. A., Proskurowski, G., Peacock, E. E., Hafner, J., & Reddy, C. M. (2010). Plastic accumulation in the North Atlantic subtropical gyre. *Science*, *329*(5996), 1185-1188. DOI: 10.1126/science.1192321

Lepawsky, J. (2018). *Reassembling Rubbish: Worlding Electronic Waste*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Liboiron, M. (2016). Municipal versus Industrial Waste: Questioning the 3-97 ratio. *Discard Studies*, March 2. Retrieved from: https://discardstudies.com/2016/03/02/municipal-versus-industrial-waste-a-3-97-ratio-or-something-else-entirely/ Accessed 10/18/2020.

Liboiron, M. (2018a). Waste colonialism. *Discard Studies*, November 11. Retrieved from: https://discardstudies.com/2018/11/01/waste-colonialism/ Accessed 8/03/2020.

Liboiron, M. (2018b). How plastic is a function of colonialism. *Teen Vogue*, December 21. Retrieved from: https://www.teenvogue.com/story/how-plastic-is-a-function-of-colonialism Accessed 8/18/2020.

Liboiron, M. (2021). *Pollution is Colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Liboiron, M., Ammendolia, J., Winsor, K., Zahara, A., Bradshaw, H., Melvin, J., Mather, C., Dawe, N., Wells, E., Liboiron, F., Fürst, B., Coyle, C., Saturno, J., Novacefski, M., Westscott, S., & Liboiron, G. (2017). Equity in author order: a feminist laboratory's approach. *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*, *3*(2), 1-17. DOI: 10.28968/cftt.v3i2.28850

Liboiron, M., Zahara, A., & Schoot, I. (2018). Community peer review: A method to bring consent and self-determination into the sciences. *Preprints,* 2018060104. DOI: 10.20944/preprints201806.0104.v1

Liboiron, M., Duman, N., Bond, A., Charron, L., Liboiron, F., Ammendolia, J., Hawkins, K., Wells, E., Melvin, J., Dawe, N., Novacefski, M. (2020). *Regional Report on plastic pollution in Newfoundland and Labrador, 1962-2019.* St. John's, NL: Civic Laboratory for Environmental Action Research (CLEAR), Memorial University.

Loseto, L.L., Breton-Honeyman, K., Etiendem, D.N., Johnson, N., Pearce, T.D., Allen, J., Amos, A., Arqviq, J., Baak, J., Bélanger, É. and Bourdages, M. (2020). Indigenous participation in peer review publications and the editorial process: Reflections from a workshop. *Arctic Science*, 6(3), 352-360. DOI: 10.1139/AS-2020-0023.

Lusher, A. L., Tirelli, V., O'Connor, I., & Officer, R. (2015). Microplastics in Arctic polar waters: the first reported values of particles in surface and sub-surface samples. *Scientific Reports*, *5*, 14947. DOI: 10.1038/srep14947

MacBride, S. (2011). *Recycling Reconsidered: the Present Failure and Future Promise of Environmental Action in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mallory, M. L (2008). Marine plastic debris in northern fulmars from the Canadian high Arctic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin,* 56: 1501-1504. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.04.017

Mallory, M. L., Roberston, G. J., & Moenting, A. (2006). Marine plastic debris in northern fulmars from Davis Strait, Nunavut, Canada. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 52(7), 813-815. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2006.04.005

McGregor, D. (2004). Coming full circle: Indigenous knowledge, environment, and our future. *The American Indian Quarterly* 28(3), 385-410. DOI: 10.1353/aiq.2004.0101

Moffitt, M., Chetwynd, C., & Todd, Z. (2015). Interrupting the Northern research industry: Why Northern research should be in Northern hands. *Northern Public Affairs,* December 3. Retrieved from: http://www.northernpublicaffairs.ca/index/interrupting-the-northern-research-industry-why-northern-research-should-be-in-northern-hands/ Accessed 8/18/2020.

Morgana, S., Ghigliotti, L., Estévez-Calvar, N., Stifanese, R., Wieckzorek, A., Doyle, T., Christiansen, J., Faimali, M., & Garaventa, F. (2018). Microplastics in the Arctic: A case study with sub-surface water and fish samples off Northeast Greenland. *Environmental Pollution*, 242, 1078-1086. DOI: 10.1016/j.envpol.2018.08.001

Nunatsiaq News. (2015). Photo: Garbage collectors: volunteers planning Iqaluit clean up. July 23. https://nunatsiaq.com/stories/article/65674photo_garbage_collectors_volunteers_planning_iqaluit_clean_up/

Obbard, R. W. (2018). Microplastics in polar regions: the role of long range transport. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, *1*, 24-29. DOI: 10.1016/j.coesh.2017.10.004

Obbard, R. W., Sadri, S., Wong, Y. Q., Khitun, A. A., Baker, I., & Thompson, R. C. (2014). Global warming releases microplastic legacy frozen in Arctic Sea ice. *Earth's Future*, 2(6), 315-320. DOI: 10.1002/2014EF000240.

Obed, D. (2017). *Illiniavugut Nunami: Learning from the Land Envisioning an Inuit-centered Educational Future.* Master's thesis, Halifax, NS: Saint Mary's University.

O'Brien, M. H. (1993). Being a scientist means taking sides. *BioScience*, *43*(10), 706-708. DOI: 10.2307/1312342

Pedersen, C., Otokiak, M., Koonoo, I., Milton, J., Maktar, E., Anaviapik, A., Milton, M., Porter, G., Scott, A., Newman, C., & Porter, C. (2020). SciQ: an invitation and recommendations to combine science and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit for meaningful engagement of Inuit communities in research. *Arctic Science*, 6(3), 326-339. DOI: 10.1139/AS-2020-0015

Peeken, I., Primpke, S., Beyer, B., Gütermann, J., Katlein, C., Krumpen, T., Bergmann, M., Hehemann, L. and Gerdts, G (2018). Arctic sea ice is an important temporal sink and means of transport for microplastic. *Nature communications*, 9(1): 1-12. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-018-03825-5

Pfeifer, P. (2018). From the credibility gap to capacity building: An Inuit critique of Canadian Arctic research. *Northern Public Affairs*, *6*(1), 29-34.

Pine, K. H., & Liboiron, M. (2015). The politics of measurement and action. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 3147-3156. DOI: 10.1145/2702123.2702298

Poon, F. E., Provencher, J. F., Mallory, M. L., Braune, B. M., & Smith, P. A. (2017). Levels of ingested debris vary across species in Canadian Arctic seabirds. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 116(1-2), 517-520. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.051

Porter, T.M. (1996). *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Provencher, J. F., Gaston, A. J., & Mallory, M. L. (2009). Evidence for increased ingestion of plastics by northern fulmars (Fulmarus glacialis) in the Canadian Arctic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 58(7), 1092-1095. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.04.002

Provencher, J. F., Gaston, A. J., Mallory, M. L., O'hara, P. D., & Gilchrist, H. G. (2010). Ingested plastic in a diving seabird, the thick-billed murre (Uria lomvia), in the eastern Canadian Arctic. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 60(9), 1406-1411. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2010.05.017

Qikiqtani Inuit Association. v. Canada (Minister of Natural Resources). (2010). NUCJ 12. 08-10-42-CVC. Iqaluit, Nunavut.

Richardson, K., Hardesty, B. D., & Wilcox, C. (2019). Estimates of fishing gear loss rates at a global scale: A literature review and meta-analysis. *Fish and Fisheries*, *20*(6), 1218–1231. DOI: 10.1111/faf.12407

Riddell-Dixon, E. (2011). Seismic testing in Lancaster Sound: Lessons Learned. *Policy Opinions,* October 1. Retrieved from: https://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/the-new-normal-majority-government/seismic-testing-in-lancaster-sound-lessons-learned/ Accessed 12/02/2020.

Rochman, C.M., Brookson, C., Bikker, J., Djuric, N., Earn, A., Bucci, K., Athey, S., Huntington, A., McIlwraith, H., Munno, K., De Frond, H., Kolomijeca, A., Erdle, L., Grbic, J., Bayoumi, M., Borelle, S.B., Wu, T., Santoro, S., Webowski, L.M, Zhu, X., Giles, R.K., Hamilton, B.M, Thaysen, C., Kaura, A., Klasios, N., Ead, L., Kim, J., Sherlock, C., Ho, A., & C. Hung. (2019). Rethinking microplastics as a diverse contaminant suite. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 38(4), 703-711. DOI: 10.1002/etc.4371

Rodriguez-Lonebear, D. (2016). 'Building a data revolution in Indian country'. In Kukuta, T. & Taylor, J. (eds.) *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda,* 253-272. Canberra, AU: ANU Press.

Royal Canadian Geographical Society. (2018). *Inuit: Indigenous peoples atlas of Canada/ Inuit: Atlas des peuples autochtones du Canada*. Retrieved from: https://indigenouspeoplesatlasofcanada.ca/section/inuit/ Accessed 12/02/2020.

Saliu, F., Montano, S., Garavaglia, M. G., Lasagni, M., Seveso, D., & Galli, P. (2018). Microplastic and charred microplastic in the Faafu Atoll, Maldives. *Marine pollution bulletin*, *136*, 464-471. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.09.023

Saturno, J. (2020). *Investigating the Role of Fishing Gear on Plastic Pollution: The Occurrence of Fishing Gear-Related Plastic Ingested by Atlantic Cod (Gadus morhua) and the Fragmentation of Polymer Ropes*. Master's thesis, St. John's, NL: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Sawatzky, A., Cunsolo, A., Jones-Bitton, A., Gillis, D., Wood, M., Flowers, C., Shiwak, I., The Rigolet Inuit Community Government, & Harper, S. L. (2020). "The best scientists are the people that's out there": Inuit-led integrated environment and health monitoring to respond to climate change in the Circumpolar North. *Climatic Change*, 160, 45-66.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition have Failed.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York, NY: Zed Books.

Snelgrove, C., Dhamoon, R. K., & Corntassel, J. (2014). Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *3*(2): 1-32

Song, Y. K., Hong, S. H., Jang, M., Kang, J-H., Kwon, O. Y., Han, G. M., & Shim, W. J. (2014). Large accumulation of micro-sized synthetic polymer particles in the sea surface microlayer. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48(16), 9014-9021. DOI: 10.1021/es501757s.

Song, Y.K., Hong, S.H., Jang, M., Han, G.M., Rani, M., Lee, J., Shim, W.J. (2015). A comparison of microscopic and spectroscopic identification methods for analysis of microplastics in environmental samples. *Marine Pollution Bulletin,* 93, 202–209. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.01.015.

Suaria, G., Perold, V., Lee, J. R., Lebouard, F., Aliani, S., & Ryan, P. G. (2020). Floating macro- and microplastics around the Southern Ocean: Results from the Antarctic Circumnavigation Expedition. *Environment International*, 136, 105494. DOI: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105494

Sudlovenick, E. (2019). *A serological survey and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit of Ringed seals (Nattiit) in Frobisher Bay, Nunavut.* Master's thesis, Charlottetown, PEI: University of Prince Edward Island.

Stein, S. (2020). 'Truth before reconciliation': the difficulties of transforming higher education in settler colonial contexts. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(1), 156-170.

Tirelli, V., Suaria, G., & Lusher, A. L. (2020). 'Microplastics in Polar Samples' in Rocha-Santos, T., Costa, M., Mouneyrac, C. (eds.) *Handbook of Microplastics in the Environment,* 1-42. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-10618-8_4-1

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*(3), 409-428. DOI:10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.

Van Oostdam, J., Donaldson, S.G., Feeley, M., Arnold, D., Ayotte, P., Bondy, G., Chan, L., Dewaily, É., Furgal, C.M., Kuhnlein, H., Loring, E., Muckle, G., Myles, E., Receveur, O., Tracy, B., Gill, U., & Kalhok, S. (2005). Human health implications of environmental contaminants in Arctic Canada: a review. *Science of the Total Environment*, 351, 165-246. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.03.034

Van Sebille, E., England, M. H., & Froyland, G. (2012). Origin, dynamics and evolution of ocean garbage patches from observed surface drifters. *Environmental Research Letters*, *7*(4), 044040. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044040

Varga, P. (2015). Iqaluit tries new wate management practices at voerloaded dump. *Nunatsiaq News,* May 4. https://nunatsiaq.com/stories/article/65674iqaluit_tries_new_waste_management_practices_at_overloaded_dump/

Walter, M., & Andersen, C. (2013). *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Watson, A. (2014). Iqaluit's long-smouldering 'dumpcano' garbage fire is finally out. *The Globe and Mail*, September 16. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/iqaluits-long-smouldering-dumpcano-garbage-fire-finally-out/article20620273/

Watt-Cloutier, S. (2015). *The Right to be Cold: One Woman's Story of Protecting her Culture, the Arctic and the Whole Planet*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Books.

Wong, C., Ballegooyen, K., Ignace, L., Johnson, M., & Swanson., H. (2020). Towards reconciliation: 10 Calls to Action to natural scientists working in Canada. *FACETS*, 5, 769-783. DOI: 10.1139/facets-2020-0005

Yang, Q., Dixon, T. H., Myers, P. G., Bonin, J., Chambers, D., van den Broeke, M. R., Ribergaard, M. H., & Mortensen, J. (2016). Recent increases in Arctic freshwater flux affects Labrador Sea convection and Atlantic overturning circulation. *Nature Communications*, *7*(1), 10525. DOI: 10.1038/ncomms10525

Yellowhead Institute (2019). *Land Back: A Yellowhead Institute Red Paper*. Toronto, ON: Yellowhead Institute.

Zahara, A. (2015). *The Governance of Waste in Iqaluit, Nunavut* (Queen's University, CA: Master's thesis).

Zahara, A. (2018). On sovereignty, deficits and dump fires: Risk governance in an Arctic 'dumpcano. *Inevitably Toxic: Historical Perspectives on Contamination, Exposure, and Expertise*, 259-283.

Supplementary material

Table S1: Research permitting bodies in Inuit Nunangat

Inuit Nunangat region	Licensing Body	Type of research	Governing Legislation	Mandatory
Inuvialuit Settlement Region	Aurora Research Institute & Inuvialuit Land Administration	All research	Inuvialuit Final Agreement and Government of Northwest Territories *Scientist Act (*double check)	Yes
Nunavut	Nunavut Research Institute	All research	Nunavut Land Claim Agreement & Nunavut *Scientist Act*	Yes
Nunavik	Nunavik Research Centre	All research	Consultation with institute expected	No
Nunavik	Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife board	Wildlife research in Nunavik Marine Region	Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement	Yes
Nunatsiavut	Nunatsiavut Research Centre	All research	Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement & Nunatsiavut Research procedure	Yes

Table S2. Details of all surface water trawls covered in this study.

Location	Year	latitude	longitude	Sample ID	total plastics	Abundance m^2	film	foam	fragments	microbeads	microfibers	pellets	threads	macro	meso	micro	Acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS)	Acrylate	Alkyd Resin	Acrylonitrile styrene acrylate (ASA)	Polyamide (PA)	Polyacrylonitrile (PAN)	Polyethylene (PE)	Polyethylene terephthalate (PET)	Polypropylene (PP)	Polystyrene (PS)	Polyurethane (PUR)	Silicone	Epoxy blends	Other polymer
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	63.64688	-68.5221	Trawl-1	3	0.0183	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	63.6757	-68.5341	Trawl-2	3	0.01409	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	63.67017	-68.5981	Trawl-3	4	0.02066	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	63.64192	-68.5866	Trawl-4	2	0.01122	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	63.1326	-67.4407	Trawl-5	1	0.004973	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	62.68736	-66.7709	Trawl-6	6	0.02928	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	62.43105	-65.895	Trawl-7	2	0.01056	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Frobisher Bay, Nunavut	2018	62.43132	-65.8976	Trawl-8	1	0.005308	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
SW Greenland	2018	60.41441	-48.4548	Trawl-9	12	0.06312	2	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	2
SW Greenland	2018	60.38912	-48.4532	Trawl-10	1	0.005144	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SW Greenland	2018	60.36307	-48.4563	Trawl-11	2	0.01109	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SW Greenland	2018	60.33705	-48.4586	Trawl-12	5	0.02535	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0

Table S3: Colour of recovered plastics

Colour	Nunavut	Greenland	Total plastics	Percentage Total Plastics
Red	6	5	11	26.2%
Brown	1	0	1	2.4%
White	5	0	5	11.9%
Grey	0	1	1	2.4%
Clear	5	2	7	16.7%
Orange	0	0	0	0.0%
Black	2	3	5	11.9%
Yellow	1	3	4	9.5%
Blue	1	3	4	9.5%
Green	1	3	4	9.5%
Totals	**22**	**20**	**42**	**100.0%**

Table S4: Erosion patters of recovered plastics

Erosion Type	Nunavut	Greenland	Total	% total
Pitted	8	6	14	18.7%
Stretched	2	5	7	9.3%
Frayed	11	13	24	32.0%
Melted	4	0	4	5.3%
Fragmented	7	4	11	14.7%
Discolored	8	6	14	18.7%
Burnt	1	0	1	1.3%
Cracked	0	0	0	0.0%

Table S5: Definitions of plastic morphologies

Morphological category	**Definition**
Film	Sheet plastics such as plastic bags. However, not synonymous with plastic bags
Foam	Plastics such as Styrofoam. Bounces back to the touch, has air pockets
Fragment	Hard plastic fragments, though they can be flexible. Paint chips included in this category, which are often very brittle
Industrial Pellets	Industrial pre-production pellets or nurdles
Microbead	Small spheres often from cosmetics, usually brightly colored
Microfibre	Thinner and kinked plastics compared to threads. Usually from synthetic fabrics, often too small for erosion patterns
Thread/Fibre Bundle*	Tightly interwoven threads or fibres that are bundled together and are difficult to separate, often noted as conglomerates in the note section in past studies.
Thread	Thick filaments, such as fishing line, large enough to see erosion patterns

*Term from Rochman et al. 2019.

Table S6: Definitions of erosion patterns

Erosion pattern	**Definition**
Burnt	Burnt parts charred from flame along with visible melting around the burns
Cracked	Fissures in plastic particles without full separation into pieces
Discoloured	Stained or ‘dirty’ looking parts of plastic particles. Parts of plastics a different colour i.e. not uniform
Fragmented	Splitting into fragments, newly split pieces will have smooth shiny edges where it fragmented
Frayed	Worn at the edges with pieces fraying off
Melted	Visible parts of the plastic are melted and disformed (shiny and shrunken)
Stretched	Visible parts that have been 'stretched' or are thinner than other parts. Common in threads.
Pitted	Often found in fragments, grooves or pits in the plastic's surface, where chunks have been scrapped off

Table S7: Published plastic pollution research conducted in Inuit Nunangat and Greenland

Region	Year	Study type	Location	Lat.	Long.	Environment	Measurement	Plastic contamination	Detection Limit (mm)	Citation
Nunavut										
	2007	Ingestion	Coats Island	63.63	-82.00	Thick-billed murre	% FO	4% (n=25)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2008	Ingestion	Akpatok Island	60.97	-68.13	Thick-billed murre	% FO	23% (n= 31)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2008	Ingestion	Digges Sound	62.55	-77.58	Thick-billed murre	% FO	17% (n=30)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2007	Ingestion	Minarets	67.00	-62.33	Thick-billed murre	% FO	6% (n=30)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2008	Ingestion	Minarets	67.00	-62.33	Thick-billed murre	% FO	10% (n=20)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2008	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74.03	-90.00	Thick-billed murre	% FO	8% (n=32)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2008	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74.03	-90.00	Thick-billed murre	% FO	13% (n=18)	N/A	Provencher et al. 2010
	2008	Ingestion	Devon Island	76.25	-89.25	Northern fulmar	% FO	31% (n=102)	N/A	Mallory 2008
	2008	Ingestion	Arviat	61.11	-96.04	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=32)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
	2008	Ingestion	Arviat	61.11	-96.04	Bearded seal	% FO	0% (n=5)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
	2008	Ingestion	Arviat	61.11	-96.04	Harbour seal	% FO	0% (n=1)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
	2018	Ingestion	Arviat	61.11	-96.04	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=1)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
	2008	Ingestion	Naujaat	66.53	-86.24	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=38)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
	2007	Ingestion	Sanikiluaq	56.54	-79.22	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=33)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
	2007	Ingestion	Sanikiluaq	56.54	-79.22	Bearded seal	% FO	0% (n=1)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020

2008	Ingestion	Sanikiluaq	56.54	-79.22	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=11)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
2018	Ingestion	Iqaluit	63.75	-68.52	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=18	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
2019	Ingestion	Iqaluit	63.75	-68.52	Ringed seal	% FO	0% (n=2)	0.425	Bourdages et al., 2020
2008	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Northern fulmar	% FO	80% (n=10)	1	Poon et al., 2017
2013	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Northern fulmar	% FO	89% (n= 9)	1	Poon et al., 2017
2008	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Thick-billed murre	% FO	0% (n=10)	1	Poon et al., 2017
2013	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Thick-billed murre	% FO	0% (n= 10)	1	Poon et al., 2017
2013	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Black-legged kittiwake	% FO	9% (n= 11)	1	Poon et al., 2017
2013	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Black guillemot	% FO	0% (n= 3)	1	Poon et al., 2017
2008	Ingestion	Nuvuttiq (Cape Searle)	67.25	-62.58	Northern fulmar	% FO	87% (n= 15)	N/A	Provencher et al., 2009
2008	Ingestion	Prince Leopold Island	74	-90	Northern fulmar	% FO	80% (n= 10)	N/A	Provencher et al., 2009
2002	Ingestion	Davis Strait	68.43	-61.81	Northern fulmar	% FO	36% (n=42)	N/A	Mallory et al., 2006
1998	Ingestion	Sanikiluaq (Belcher Island)	N/A	N/A	Common eider	% FO	0% (n=388)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
2000	Ingestion	Kinngait (Cape Dorset)	N/A	N/A	Common eider	% FO	0% (n= 108)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
2011	Ingestion	Kinngait (Cape Dorset)	N/A	N/A	Common eider	% FO	1% (n=100)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014

	2006	Ingestion	Akpatordjuark (Coats Island)	N/A	N/A	Thick-billed murre	% FO	0% (n=15)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	2007	Ingestion	Nasaruvaalik Island	N/A	N/A	Arctic tern	% FO	0% (n= 41)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
Nunatsiavut										
	2006	Ingestion	Nunainguk (Nain)	N/A	N/A	Surf scoter	% FO	0% (n= 38)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	2006	Ingestion	Gannet Islands	N/A	N/A	Thick-billed murre	% FO	0% (n=15)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	2006	Ingestion	Gannet Islands	N/A	N/A	Common murre	% FO	0% (n=15)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
Inuvialuit										
	2017	Ingestion	Hendrickson Island	69	-133	Beluga whale	% FO	100% (n=4)	0.02	Moore et al., 2020
	2018	Ingestion	Hendrickson Island	69	-133	Beluga whale	% FO	100% (n=3)	0.02	Moore et al., 2020
Greenland										
	1991	Excrement	Nansen Land, North Greenland	83	-43	Arctic wolf feces	% FO	3% (n= 110)	N/A	Marquard-Petersen, 1998
	1991	Excrement	Hold with Hope, East Greenland	74	-22	Arctic wolf feces	% FO	0% (n=351)	N/A	Marquard-Petersen, 1998
	2005	Ingestion	Ukaleqarteq, East Greenland	74.73	-21.58	Little auk	% FO	100% (n=26)	0.5	Amelineau et al., 2016
	2014	Ingestion	Ukaleqarteq, East Greenland	74.73	-21.58	Little auk	% FO	100% (n=18)	0.5	Amelineau et al., 2016
	1988	Ingestion	Southwest Greenland	N/A	N/A	Thick-billed murre	% FO	6% (n=202)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	1988	Ingestion	Nuuk	N/A	N/A	Dovekie	% FO	0% (n= 19)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	1997	Ingestion	Hakluyt Island	N/A	N/A	Thick-billed murre	% FO	0% (n= 40)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	1999	Ingestion	Nuuk	N/A	N/A	Common eider	% FO	0% (n= 241)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014

	2006	Ingestion	Nuuk	N/A	N/A	Thick-billed murre	% FO	0% (n=15)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	2012	Ingestion	Nuuk	N/A	N/A	Common eider	% FO	0% (n= 135)	0.5	Provencher et al. 2014
	2005	Trawl	Ukalqearteq	74.73	-21.58	Subsurface water	Plastics / m^3	0.99	0.5	Amelineau et al., 2016
	2014	Trawl	Ukalqearteq	74.73	-21.58	Subsurface water	Plastics/ m^3	2.38	0.5	Amelineau et al., 2016
	2014	Ice core	Fram Straight	78.27	-14.71	Sea ice	Plastics / N x m^3	$4.1 \pm 2.0 \times 10^6$	0.011	Peeken et al., 2018
	2018	Trawl	Northeastern Greenland	75.50	-10.87	Subsurface water	Plastics/ m^3	2.4	0.08	Morgana et al., 2018
	2018	Ingestion	Northeastern Greenland	76.14	-9.03	Bigeye sculpin	% FO	34% (n= 71)	0.07	Morgana et al., 2018
	2018	Ingestion	Northeastern Greenland	76.14	-9.03	Polar cod	% FO	18% (n= 85)	0.07	Morgana et al., 2018
Other										
	2013	Trawl	Greenland and Barents Seas	60-80	NA	Surface water	Plastics/ m^2	0.063	0.5	Cózar et al., 2017
	2013	Trawl	‘Rest of Arctic Ocean’	60-80	NA	Surface water	Plastics/ m^2	0	0.5	Cózar et al., 2017
	2014	Ice core	Arctic Ocean	78.29	-176.7	Sea ice	Plastics/ m^3	0.050	N/A	Obbard et al. 2014
	2014	Ice core	Arctic Ocean	84.31	-149.1	Sea ice	Plastics/ m^3	0.250	N/A	Obbard et al. 2014
	2014	Ingestion	Labrador Sea	55	-58	Northern fulmar	% FO	64% (n=39)	1	Avery-Gomm et al., 2018
	2015	Ingestion	Labrador Sea	55	-58	Northern fulmar	% FO	97%(n=31)	1	Avery-Gomm et al., 2018
	2015	Ingestion	Labrador Sea	55	-58	Northern fulmar	% FO	47% (n=30)	1	Provencher et al. 2018
	2016	Sediment	Arctic Central Basin	87.4	-110.5	Benthos	Plastics/ kg	117	0.100	Kanhai et al., 2019
	2016	Trawl	Arctic Central Basin	N/A	N/A	Subsurface water	Plastics/ m^3	0.7	0.250	Kanhai et al., 2018

Table S8: Research licensing information provided in plastic pollution research articles from Inuit Nunangat, Greenland and Canadian polar waters

Region	Citation	Study type	Indigenous Licensing stated	Wording of research licensing	Location in paper
Nunavut	Mallory et al., 2006	Ingestion	Unclear	Forty-two northern fulmars were retrieved between 15 August and 10 September 2002, by a fisheries observer stationed aboard a Norwegian longliner fishing for Greenland halibut, Reinhardtius hippoglossoides, operating under licence in Canadian waters (North Atlantic Fisheries Organization Division 0A).	Main text
Nunavut	Mallory 2008	Ingestion	Yes	Collections were in accordance with Canadian Council on Animal Care guidelines, and were conducted under the following permits: research (NUN-SCI-03-02, WL000190, WL000714) animal care (2003PNR017, 2004PNR021, 2005PNR- 021), and land use (59A/7-2-2).	Acknowledgements
Nunavut	Provencher et al. 2009	Ingestion	Yes	Scientific studies and collections were conducted in accordance with guidelines from the Canadian Council on Animal Care, and under appropriate territorial and federal research permits.	Acknowledgements

Nunavut	Provencher et al. 2010	Ingestion	Yes	Scientific studies and collections were conducted in accordance with guidelines from the Canadian Council on Animal Care, and under appropriate territorial and federal research permits.	Acknowledgements
Nunavut	Poon et al., 2017	Ingestion	Unclear	The fieldwork component of this project was supported by Environment and Climate Change Canada, Acadia University (48-0-504807) and the Northern Contaminants Program (58-0-205554) (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada).	Acknowledgements
Nunavut	Bourdages et al., 2020	Ingestion	Yes	Tissues from the seals were harvested with permits from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) (DFO LFSP S-17/181005-NU), approval from the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB), and support from the Arviat, Arviq, Sanikiluaq, and Amaruq Hunter and Trapper Organizations.	Introduction/ Methods

Inuvialuit	Moore et al., 2020	Ingestion	Unclear	For over 30 years, morphometric measurements, observations, and tissues of beluga have been collected throughout the Inuvialuit Settlement Region as part of a community-partnered harvest-based monitoring program… In this study, we worked with the Hendrickson Island Beluga Monitoring Program and the community of Tuktoyaktuk to secure samples from beluga whales with the goal of characterizing presence and degree of potential contamination by microplastics in this cetacean population… The authors thank staff at Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Pacific Region and Central & Arctic Region), the Canada-Inuvialuit Fisheries Joint Management Committee, the Tuktoyaktuk Hunters and Trappers Committee, and the Tuktoyaktuk Community Corporation for their support… We thank the Tuktoyaktuk harvesters for allowing us to sample from their harvests.	Introduction & Acknowledgements
Greenland	Marquard-Petersen, 1998	Excrement analysis	No	No statement given	N/A

Greenland	Amelineau et al., 2016	Ingestion and sub-surface trawl	Yes	All field work in East Greenland was conducted with the permission of the Greenland Home Rule Government, Ministry of Environment and Nature (Danish Polar Center Scientific Expedition Permit 512-240 and 2014-098814), and under permits granted by the Ethics Committee of the French Polar Institute (MP/12/24/05/ 05).	Methods
Greenland	Peeken et al., 2018	Ice core	No	No statement given	N/A
Greenland	Morgana et al., 2018	Ingestion and subsurface trawl	No	No statement given	N/A
Arctic ocean	Obbard et al. 2014	Ice core	No	No statement given	N/A
Various	Provencher et al. 2014	Ingestion	Unclear	[Samples] were collected by hunters as part of larger studies led by Environment Canada, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and/or the Sea Duck Joint Venture in Canada, the Greenland Institute of Natural Resources in Greenland and the Natural Museum in the Faroe Island	Main text
Arctic ocean	Cózar et al. 2017	Surface water	Unclear	We are also grateful to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs for supporting the expedition and to the	Acknowledgements

				countries that granted sampling permissions.	
Labrador sea	Avery-Gomm et al. 2018	Ingestion	Yes	The collection of fulmars was permitted by the Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment and Climate Change Canada under the Migratory Birds Regulations (Scientific Permit # SC2790)	Acknowledgements
Labrador sea	Provencher et al. 2018	Ingestion	Yes	Collections for this work were done in conjunction with an Environment and Climate Change Canada project funded by the Environmental Studies Research Fund (ESRF). Scientific Permit from Environment and Climate Change Canada: SC2790.	Acknowledgements
Arctic ocean	Kanhai et al. 2018	Subsurface water	No	No statement given	N/A
Arctic ocean	Kanhai et al. 2019	Sediment	No	No statement given	N/A

S9: Summary of interventions into research to foreground good relations with Inuit governance and sovereignty in Inuit Nunangat

1. Researchers should be familiar with research reports, guidelines, priorities and other issues articulated by Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and other Inuit organizations before research begins in order to align research design and partnerships to calls in those documents.
2. Researchers should be familiar with Indigenous and anticolonial research methodologies, using texts such as Kovach's (2010) *Indigenous Methodologies*, Smith's (2012) *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Walter and Andersen's (2013) *Indigenous Statistics*, Liboiron's (2021) *Pollution is Colonialism*, or Wilson's (2008) *Research is Ceremony*.
3. Researchers should be fluent in the land relations they are engaged with, both in the Arctic in terms of communities, organizations, and permits, but also at home in terms of whose land and relations they are already engaged in.
4. Researchers should obtain permits and permissions from all required bodies, including Inuit governments and communities. Researchers should be aware that obtaining state permits does not guarantee Inuit consultation or consent.
5. Waste that researchers bring into the north, both in terms of solid waste and disposables but also in terms of unintentional waste from gear wear, microfibres releasing, and other forms of microplastic pollution, should be listed as a potential form of harm on permit applications.
6. Permits and permissions should be listed in the methods section.
7. Researchers should endeavour to support Inuit-led research by Inuit researchers rather than consistently launching research in the North from the south.
8. Research teams should include Inuit researchers.
9. Ensure maps and other place descriptors show Inuit and other settlements and land use, rather than depicting the Arctic as an empty space.
10. Inuit researchers, including all personnel who contribute value, samples, or knowledge to a study or study design, should be recognized as co-authors.
11. Categories and measures of plastic should reflect the needs of Inuit users, including local and regional governments. This may include using morphological categories such as "threads" when fishing gear is predominant in a region, translating abundance and other measures into lay terms, conducting brand audits on macroplastics, documenting when plastics are burned or are likely paint chips, and other markers that local experts can use to identify or posit sources.
12. Use Inuktitut place names.
13. Research should take samples of plastics in research gear and on vessels to identify when their work is a source of plastic pollution uncovered in their study, rather than eliminating it as contamination antithetical to findings.
14. Raw data should be accessible to Northern and Inuit governments and use Indigenous data sovereignty and OCAP® principles.
15. Engage in community peer review before submission of papers to academic venues.

S10: Detailed map of plastics in Tasiujarjuaq, Nunavut



S11: Map of plastic abundance from published literature and this study

Plastic abundance in water in the eastern Arctic from published literature, grey literature reports, and this study. Several studies reported a regional average without indicating density or abundance figures for specific trawls or subareas, so several points on the map represent an average density or abundance by general location. Some locations are reported in quotation marks based on location descriptors used in the articles. See Table 3 for more details on each study. Data from surface water measured in plastics/m^2, including this study, are marked with circles; data from subsurface water measured in plastics/m^3 are marked with downward-facing triangles; and sea ice studies measured with plastics/litre, which contain heavily concentrated plastics, are marked with a snowflake. Settlements and cities are indicated with triangles. Overall, these data show that higher abundance of plastics are found at higher latitudes and in sea ice.

S12: References for Supplementary Material

Amélineau, F., Bonnet, D., Heitz, O., Mortreux, V., Harding, A.M., Karnovsky, N., Walkusz, W., Fort, J. and Gremillet, D (2016). Microplastic pollution in the Greenland Sea: Background levels and selective contamination of planktivorous diving seabirds. Environmental Pollution, 219: 1131-1139.

Avery-Gomm, S., Provencher, J. F., Liboiron, M., Poon, F. E., & Smith, P. A. (2018). Plastic pollution in the Labrador Sea: an assessment using the seabird northern fulmar Fulmarus glacialis as a biological monitoring species. Marine pollution bulletin, 127, 817-822.

Bourdages, M.P., Provencher, J.F., Sudlovenick, E., Ferguson, S.H., Young, B.G., Pelletier, N., Murphy, M.J., D'Addario, A. and Vermaire, J.C. (2020). No plastics detected in seal (Phocidae) stomachs harvested in the eastern Canadian Arctic. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 150: 110772.

Cózar, A., Martí, E., Duarte, C.M., García-de-Lomas, J., Van Sebille, E., Ballatore, T.J., Eguíluz, V.M., González-Gordillo, J.I., Pedrotti, M.L., Echevarría, F. and Troublè, R. (2017). The Arctic Ocean as a dead end for floating plastics in the North Atlantic branch of the Thermohaline Circulation. Science advances, 3(4): p.e1600582.

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) (2018). National Inuit Strategy on Research. Ottawa, Canada: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami.

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Nunavut Research Institute (ITK& NRI) (2007). Negotiating Research Relationships with Inuit Communities: A Guide for Researchers. Nickels, S., Shirley, J. & Laidler, G. (eds). Ottawa & Iqaluit: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Nunavut Research Institute.

Kanhai, L.K., Gårdfeldt, K., Lyashevska, O., Hassellöv, M., Thompson, R.C., O'Connor, I. (2018). Microplastics in sub-surface waters of the Arctic Central Basin. Marine Pollution Bulletin 130, 8-18.

Kanhai, L.K., Johansson, C., Frias, J.P.G.L., Gardfeldt, K., Thompson, R.C., O'Connor, I. (2019). Deep sea sediments of the Arctic Central Basin: A potential sink for microplastics. Deep Sea Research Part 1: Oceanographic Research Papers 145: 137-142.

Kovach, M. (2010). Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Liboiron, M. (2021). Pollution is Colonialism. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mallory, M. L (2008). Marine plastic debris in northern fulmars from the Canadian high Arctic. Marine Pollution Bulletin 56: 1501-1504

Mallory, M. L., Roberston, G. J., & Moenting, A. (2006). Marine plastic debris in northern fulmars from Davis Strait, Nunavut, Canada. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 52(7), 813-815.

Marquard-Petersen, U. (1998). Food habits of arctic wolves in Greenland. Journal of Mammalogy, 79(1), 236-244.

Morgana, Silvia, Laura Ghigliotti, Noelia Estévez-Calvar, Roberto Stifanese, Alina Wieckzorek, Tom Doyle, Jørgen S. Christiansen, Marco Faimali, and Francesca Garaventa. "Microplastics in the Arctic: A case study with sub-surface water and fish samples off Northeast Greenland." Environmental pollution 242 (2018): 1078-1086.

Moore, R. C., L. Loseto, M. Noel, A. Etemadifar, J. D. Brewster, S. MacPhee, L. Bendell, and P. S. Ross. (2020) Microplastics in beluga whales (Delphinapterus leucas) from the Eastern Beaufort Sea. Marine pollution bulletin 150: 110723.

Obbard, R. W., Sadri, S., Wong, Y. Q., Khitun, A. A., Baker, I., & Thompson, R. C. (2014). Global warming releases microplastic legacy frozen in Arctic Sea ice. Earth's Future, 2(6), 315-320.

Peeken, I., Primpke, S., Beyer, B., Gütermann, J., Katlein, C., Krumpen, T., Bergmann, M., Hehemann, L. and Gerdts, G (2018). Arctic sea ice is an important temporal sink and means of transport for microplastic. Nature communications, 9(1): 1-12.

Poon, F. E., Provencher, J. F., Mallory, M. L., Braune, B. M., & Smith, P. A. (2017). Levels of ingested debris vary across species in Canadian Arctic seabirds. Marine pollution bulletin, 116(1-2), 517-520.

Provencher, J. F., Gaston, A. J., & Mallory, M. L. (2009). Evidence for increased ingestion of plastics by northern fulmars (Fulmarus glacialis) in the Canadian Arctic. Marine pollution bulletin, 58(7), 1092-1095.

Provencher, J. F., Gaston, A. J., Mallory, M. L., O’hara, P. D., & Gilchrist, H. G. (2010). Ingested plastic in a diving seabird, the thick-billed murre (Uria lomvia), in the eastern Canadian Arctic. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 60(9), 1406-1411

Provencher, J.F., Bond, A.L., Hedd, A., Montevecchi, W.A., Muzaffar, S.B., Courchesne, S.J., Gilchrist, H.G., Jamieson, S.E., Merkel, F.R., Falk, K. and Durinck, J., (2014). Prevalence of marine debris in marine birds from the North Atlantic. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 84(1-2): 411-417.

Provencher, J. F., Vermaire, J. C., Avery-Gomm, S., Braune, B. M., & Mallory, M. L. (2018). Garbage in guano? Microplastic debris found in faecal precursors of seabirds known to ingest plastics. Science of the Total Environment, 644, 1477-1484.

Wilson, S. (2008). Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Books.

Walter, M., & Andersen, C. (2013). Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.



S13: Currents near sample sites. In addition to those depicted, the sample site in southwest Greenland is additionally influenced by the three cross sections of current, the Paamiut Section, Cape Desolation Section, and Cape Farewell Section. Currents and sections based on Yang et al. 2015.