



Review

Spoilt for choice: A critical review on the chemical and biological assessment of current wastewater treatment technologies



Carsten Prasse ^{a, b, *, 1}, Daniel Stalter ^{c, d, 1}, Ulrike Schulte-Oehlmann ^e, Jörg Oehlmann ^e, Thomas A. Ternes ^a

^a Federal Institute of Hydrology (BfG), Department of Aquatic Chemistry, Koblenz, Germany

^b Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, United States

^c National Research Centre for Environmental Toxicology, The University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia

^d Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Dübendorf, Switzerland

^e Goethe University Frankfurt, Department Aquatic Ecotoxicology, Frankfurt, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 2 June 2015

Received in revised form

2 September 2015

Accepted 11 September 2015

Available online 14 September 2015

Keywords:

Wastewater quality assessment

Conventional and advanced treatment

Sewage

Environmental chemistry

Ecotoxicology

Toxicity

ABSTRACT

The knowledge we have gained in recent years on the presence and effects of compounds discharged by wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) brings us to a point where we must question the appropriateness of current water quality evaluation methodologies. An increasing number of anthropogenic chemicals is detected in treated wastewater and there is increasing evidence of adverse environmental effects related to WWTP discharges. It has thus become clear that new strategies are needed to assess overall quality of conventional and advanced treated wastewaters. There is an urgent need for multidisciplinary approaches combining expertise from engineering, analytical and environmental chemistry, (eco)toxicology, and microbiology. This review summarizes the current approaches used to assess treated wastewater quality from the chemical and ecotoxicological perspective. Discussed chemical approaches include target, non-target and suspect analysis, sum parameters, identification and monitoring of transformation products, computational modeling as well as effect directed analysis and toxicity identification evaluation. The discussed ecotoxicological methodologies encompass *in vitro* testing (cytotoxicity, genotoxicity, mutagenicity, endocrine disruption, adaptive stress response activation, toxicogenomics) and *in vivo* tests (single and multi species, biomonitoring). We critically discuss the benefits and limitations of the different methodologies reviewed. Additionally, we provide an overview of the current state of research regarding the chemical and ecotoxicological evaluation of conventional as well as the most widely used advanced wastewater treatment technologies, *i.e.*, ozonation, advanced oxidation processes, chlorination, activated carbon, and membrane filtration. In particular, possible directions for future research activities in this area are provided.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction	238
2. Chemical and ecotoxicological methods for water quality assessment	239
2.1. Sampling and sample preparation	239
2.1.1. Sampling strategies and sample handling	239
2.1.2. Sample enrichment	239
2.2. Overview of chemical analytical methods for water quality assessment	240
2.2.1. Target analysis	240
2.2.2. Non-target and suspect screening	241
2.2.3. Sum parameters	241

* Corresponding author. Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, United States

E-mail address: carsten.prasse@gmail.com (C. Prasse).

¹ Both authors contributed equally to this review.

2.2.4.	Identification and monitoring of transformation products	242
2.2.5.	Computational modeling	243
2.2.6.	Effect-directed analysis and toxicity identification evaluation	243
2.3.	Overview of ecotoxicological methods for water quality assessment	244
2.3.1.	<i>In vitro</i> bioassays	244
2.3.2.	<i>In vivo</i> tests	246
3.	Water quality assessment of individual treatment technologies	248
3.1.	Conventional wastewater treatment	248
	Insufficient removal of most CECs in conventional treatment	248
	WWTP _x ≠ WWTP _y	249
	Searching for unknowns	249
	Elimination ≠ mineralization	249
	Modeling the fate of CECs in conventional treatment	250
	Ecotoxicological benefits and concerns	250
	The ecotoxicological perspective	251
3.2.	Advanced treatment	251
3.2.1.	Ozonation	252
	Ozonation is efficient in oxidizing CECs containing electron-rich moieties	252
	Elimination ≠ mineralization	252
	Transformation products of individual CECs	253
	Existing models allow for the estimation of removal efficiencies but not for the formation of OPs	253
	Ecotoxicological benefits and concerns	253
	Post treatment of ozonation	254
	Advanced oxidation processes (AOPs) might be of increasing importance in the future	254
	What's next? – challenges for analytical chemists and ecotoxicologists	255
3.2.2.	Chlorination	255
	Disinfection of wastewater	255
	CEC elimination as a beneficial side effect	255
	Disinfection by-product (DBP) formation	256
	Formation of halogenated TPs from reaction with CECs	256
	Unscrambling the pool of halogenated compounds	256
	Modeling has been proven useful in assessing DBP formation	257
	Ecotoxicological benefits and concerns	257
	What's next? Challenges for analytical chemists and ecotoxicologists	257
3.2.3.	Activated carbon (GAC, PAC) and biological activated carbon (BAC) filtration	257
	Effective removal of non-polar and medium polar CECs	257
	No formation of TPs	258
	Modelling of AC performance	259
	Ecotoxicological benefits and concerns	259
	What's next? – challenges for analytical chemists and ecotoxicologists	259
3.2.4.	Pressure-driven membrane treatment technologies	259
	CEC removal strongly depends on physico-chemical properties and membrane characteristics	259
	Insufficient removal of small, uncharged molecules	260
	Modelling of CEC rejection by membranes is challenging	260
	Ecotoxicological benefits and concerns	260
	Treatment of brines	260
	What's next? – challenges for analytical chemists and ecotoxicologists	261
4.	Conclusions	261
	Acknowledgment	261
	References	261

1. Introduction

The access to clean and safe water has become one of the major challenges of our modern society, due to the growing imbalance between freshwater availability and consumption (Jackson et al., 2001). Water scarcity often results from the increasing use for agricultural irrigation, industry, and domestic purposes (Jackson et al., 2001). Additionally, the quality of freshwater is threatened by a large number of pathogens (Rizzo et al., 2013) as well as anthropogenic chemicals entering the urban and rural water cycle (Schwarzenbach et al., 2006). Discharges from municipal and industrial wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) have been identified as one of the major sources of aquatic pollution in industrialized countries (Reemtsma et al., 2006). Considering the

predicted growth rate of the global population and constantly increasing number of people that are connected to WWTPs, the amount of treated wastewater (WW) is likely to increase in the future. Water shortages currently necessitate indirect non-potable and even potable reuse of treated WW. Advances in WWTP technologies are crucial to limit the burden of WW-originated contaminants, due to the importance of WWTPs as point sources for microbial and chemical contaminants entering surface waters. To date, one of the main challenges is to appropriately evaluate the different treatment technologies regarding their potential to minimize the toxicological risks for both, biota and human health.

In the past, advances in WW treatment in high-income countries have strongly improved the quality of wastewater discharged into the aquatic environment as well as minimized wastewater

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6365937>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6365937>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)