Phototransformation of sulfamethoxazole (SMX) in open water treatment wetlands Unit process wetlands and riparian zones



Re-Inventing the Nation's Urban Water Infrastructure (ReNUWIt)

Abdoul Aziz Sandotin Coulibaly, Rachel Scholes, David Sedlak

Supported by the

National Science

Foundation at:

University of California, Berkeley

pH Effect Natural Organic Matter (NOM) Effect (pH 7) Background 1.2 Antibiotics are predominant contaminants which influence human health, livestock, With different amount of and aquatic life and also resist biological wastewater treatment. Therefore, there is Experiments were conducted 1.2 Natural Organic Matter an urgent need to remove them from wastewater. Among these antibiotics is over a range of pH from 6-(NOM), there is no effect on 0.8 sulfamethoxazole (SMX) which is ubiquitous in wastewater effluents. With increasing 10 the SMX removal rates. This 0.8 populations and with the expansion of water reuse, the amount and concentrations result indicates that nitrite-8 0.6 of contaminants such as SMX released to surface waters is of growing concern. The pH had no effect on the rate 8 0.6 sensitized photolysis occurs 0.4 goals of this project are to: of phototransformation of via pathways that are not 0.4 Provide a fundamental understanding of sulfamethoxazole phototransformation in SMX in the presence of affected (i.e., scavenged) by 0.2 open water wetlands used to treat wastewater effluent and reverse osmosis nitrite (5 mM). 0.2 NOM concentrate from water reuse. Evaluate factors influencing the rate of sulfamethoxazole removal via direct and 4 5 indirect (photosensitized) pathways. Time (Hours) -Ph 10, Borate Buffer, 5mM NO2- -Ph 9, Borate Buffer, 5mM NO2------ Ph 8. Phosphate Buffer, 5mM NO2-----Ph 7. Phosphate Buffer, 5mM NO2-Approach ----- Ph 6, Phosphate Buffer, 5mM NO2-Multiple factors affecting SMX removal were evaluated, including: pH, carbonate and bicarbonate concentrations, natural organic matter, and the use of different buffers **Bicarbonate Effect (pH 6)** under experimental conditions Conclusions 1.2 Experiments were conducted as follows: We notice that the type of buffer used does not impact the rate of elimination of · Experiments were conducted in phosphate or borate buffer, in black-painted SMX The addition of bicarbonate Nitrite contributes to the photolysis of SMX. Experiments were maintained at constant temperature in a water bath (20 C). 0.8 (up to 50 mg-C/L) had no The change in pH over a range of 6-10 has no effect on the rate of removal of SMX effect on SMX removal rates. All experiments were constantly stirred. in buffer solutions 80.6 indicating a lack of effect of Solutions were irradiated with a sunlight simulator. At pH 10, we notice that the concentration of carbonate does impact the rate of Sunlight simulator output was verified at the beginning of each experiment using a radical scavenging by removal of SMX. Higher carbonate concentrations result in faster removal. spectroradiometer. 0.4 bicarbonate. Natural organic matter does not affect removal rates of SMX in the presence of Nitrite and sulfamethoxazole (SMX) were spiked in buffer solutions. nitrite, even at high concentrations (50 mg/L NOM). 0.2 Overall, nitrite-sensitized phototransformation of SMX is not inhibited by common Sodium perchlorate was added as an ionic strength control. · Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) was used to quantify the wastewater constituents such as bicarbonate and organic matter. decrease in SMX concentration. 3 4 5 Pseudo-first order rate constants (k) were calculated based on linear regression of Time (H sure) Next Steps the natural log of concentration versus time. Conduct experiments in actual wastewater and reverse osmosis concentrate in Results Carbonate Effect (pH 10) order to verify the applicability of our results to a realistic scenario. Investigate SMX phototransformation when irradiated by a UV lamp (as used in Buffer Effect engineered water treatment). 1.2 20mgCL Carbonate, 2mM NO2-Acknowledgements 5mgCL Carbonate, 2mM NO2 I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my principal investigator, David 0.8 No effect of different buffers SMX removal was enhanced Sedlak, and my graduate student mentor, Rachel Scholes, at the University of was observed. Phosphate 8 0.6 by the presence of carbonate California, Berkeley. and borate buffers (both 5 (pH 10). This result indicates I thank my friends who provided me with much emotional support and advice through mM) result in the same SMX that carbonate radicals form 0.4 this journey. In particular, I am grateful to lyes Galley and Jalang Conteh, for advising removal rate. and react with SMX, me and encouraging me to give my best in the work I am doing. 0.2 increasing removal rates. 50mgCL Carbonate, 2mM NO2-Moreover I would like to express an ethos of gratitude to the ReNUWIt staff, mostly to Pamela Beth McLeod for her constant help and the video conference workshops she was helping facilitate. 2 3 4 5 Last but not the least, I would like to thank my family: my parents and my brothers 2 3 7 8 Time (Hours) and sisters for supporting me by all means and constituting my true hope. They are the reasons why I have the motivation to do what I am doing. -----PH7 5mM Phosphate Buffer, 1mM NO2------PH7 5mM Borate Buffer, 1mM NO2-

Learn more about our research: www.renuwit.org

beakers.

1.2

0.8

80.6

0.4

0.2