Cost-effective and effect-based evaluation of the

wastewater quality using a battery of in vitro bioassays





<u>Kelsey Ng ^{1,2*}, Nikiforos Alygizakis ^{1,3}, Niki Maragou ³, Sylvana Alirai ³, Peter Behnisch ⁴, Harrie</u> Besselink ⁴, Peter Oswald ¹, Ľuboš Čirka ^{1,5}, Nikolaos S. Thomaidis ³ and Jaroslav Slobodnik ¹

¹ Environmental Institute, Okružná 784/42, 97241 Koš, Slovakia

² Faculty of Science, Masaryk University, RECETOX, Kamenice 753/5, Building D29, 62500 Brno, Czech Republic

³ Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Panepistimiopolis

Zografou, 15771 Athens, Greece

⁴ BioDetection Systems b.v., Science Park 406, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands



***Presenting author** – contact: <u>ng@ei.sk</u>

<u>527416@muni.cz</u>

⁵ Faculty of Chemical and Food Technology, Institute of Information Engineering, Automation, and Mathematics, Slovak University of

Technology (STU), Radlinského 9, 81237 Bratislava, Slovakia

Background

Effluent wastewater is a major point source for contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) in surface water in regions including the Danube River Basin (DRB). Chemical screening is the conventional monitoring approach for wastewater effluents, which provides holistic chemical profiles of the wastewater. However, a highly standardized laboratory with advanced analytical instruments is required for such analysis. Bioassays with reference to effect-based trigger values (EBTs) could assess the mixture toxicity effect of wastewater. It is a complementary analytical tool for evaluating wastewater quality, which acts as an effect-based and costeffective early warning system for wastewater management. This is a feasibility study of such approach on wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) effluents collected in 11 DRB countries.

Proposed action plans for WWTP operators

| Table 3. Proposed actions in case of exceedance of EBTs. | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Extent of exceedance | Mitigation Plans Proposed for WWTP Operators | | | | | |
| Below 1 | -No further action | | | | | |
| Between 1 and 3 | -Perform quality check of data; -Monitor every 3 months for 1 year until EoE is below 1. | | | | | |
| Between 3 and 10 | -All actions of the category above; -Resample and reanalyze immediately to confirm EBT exceedance; -Quantify toxicity drivers. | | | | | |
| | -All actions of the category above; -Enhance program for source identification; -Monitor the distribution system closer to the point of exposure to confirm attenuation of CECs and to confirm the magnitude of assumed safety factors associated with removal efficiency, dilution, and post treatment. | | | | | |
| More than 100 | -All actions of the category above; -Consult the local environmental authorities immediately to determine the required response action; -Confirm plant corrective actions through additional monitoring to establish an EoE at least below 100. | | | | | |

Objectives

To evaluate: mixture toxicity effects of effluent wastewater of **11 DRB countries collected in the Joint Danube Survey 4**

To propose: action plans at WWTP operator level for prioritized cases of effect-based risk assessment

To provide: future outlook for the application of effect-based bioanalytical monitoring for wastewater management

Future outlook for wider application

Regular application – complementary to chemical analysis

Effect-based assessment with bioassays

Seven CALUX® bioassays (incorporated with firefly luciferase gene) previously proposed by the NORMAN Association and Water Europe were applied to effluent wastewater samples which underwent optimized solidphase extraction. Extent of exceedance (EoE) to EBTs was established based on the measured signals and bioanalytical equivalents of reference compounds of the assay. Based on the EoE, risk assessment was performed and action plans were proposed.

Table 1. Performance indicator bioassays and their effect-based trigger values

| Activity | | Antiandro genic (anti- AR) | | receptor | | stress | Pregnane X receptor (PXR) |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| EBT value (bioanalytical equivalents) | 0.1 ng 17ß- Estradiol- eq/L | 14 μg Flutamide- eq/L | 100 ng Dexame- thasone- | 10 ng Rosiglita- zone-eq/L | 6.2 ng B[a]P-eq/L | 10 μg Curcu- mine-eq/L | 3 μg Nicardi- pine-eq/L |
| | | | eq/L | | | | |

Effect-based risk assessment of DRB wastewater

 Table 2. Extent of exceedance (EoE) of EBTs based on the in vitro bioassays

- Bridge chemical data to effect data to identify toxicity driver
- Establish relative effect potency values of the detected CECs

Evaluation of removal efficiency at WWTPs

Measure toxicity endpoints at WWTP effluents and sludge

Inclusion of *in vivo* bioassays

- Include *in vitro* and *in vivo* assays to target more endpoints
- Address wisely selected apical effects

Discussion & Conclusion

- Feasibility study on wastewater effluents collected in 11 DRB countries demonstrated the applicability of the proposed battery of 7 *in vitro* bioassays for effect-based assessment for wastewater management.
- Risk assessment revealed that CECs causing **PAH activity, xenobiotic** metabolism, estrogenicity and oxidative stress are present in WWTP effluents in the DRB, with highest EoE observed for PAH activity.
- A regular application (once every 6 months) of the present battery on

| Effluent Wastewater Sampling Site | PAH | ER _α | Nrf ₂ | PXR | Anti-AR | PPAR _γ | GR |
|--------------------------------------|------|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Asten, AT | 17.7 | 13.0 | 6.8 | <lod< th=""><th>1.6</th><th><lod< th=""><th>0.4</th></lod<></th></lod<> | 1.6 | <lod< th=""><th>0.4</th></lod<> | 0.4 |
| Vratsa, BG | 11.0 | 29.0 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""><th>1.9</th><th><lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""><th>1.9</th><th><lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<> | 1.9 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Hodonín, CZ | 14.8 | 24.0 | <lod< th=""><th>85.7</th><th>1.6</th><th><lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<> | 85.7 | 1.6 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Donauwörth, DE | 5000 | 15.0 | 29.0 | 41.7 | 2.2 | 63.0 | 1.2 |
| Županja, HR | 14.2 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 49.3 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Győr, HU | 13.9 | 8.5 | 16.0 | 23.0 | 0.9 | 82.0 | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Giurgiu, RO | 5.6 | 22.0 | 3.9 | 25.0 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""><th>0.6</th></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""><th>0.6</th></lod<> | 0.6 |
| Šabac, RS | 11.8 | 16.0 | 2.4 | 34.3 | 0.8 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Novo Mesto, SI | 9.0 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 21.0 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Bratislava, SK | 27.4 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 28.7 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Uzhgorod, UA | 16.1 | 19.0 | 3.3 | 22.7 | 0.8 | <lod< th=""><th><lod< th=""></lod<></th></lod<> | <lod< th=""></lod<> |
| Samples with EoE >1 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Mean EoE value | 467 | 15 | 8 | 30 | 1 | 13 | 0.2 |
| Standard deviation | 1503 | 8 | 9 | 24 | 1 | 30 | NA |

WWTP effluent is recommended as a time- and cost-effective **<u>complement to chemical analysis</u>**, which provides a **<u>'safety net' for the</u>** aquatic ecosystems.

Acknowledgement & References

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 859891. This presentation reflects only the authors' view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. Special thanks to Dr. Jaroslav Slobodnik and Dr. Nikiforos Alygizakis for supervising the study. Reference: Alygizakis, N., Ng, K., Maragou, N., et al., *Battery of In Vitro* Bioassays: A Case Study for the Cost-Effective and Effect-Based Evaluation of Wastewater Effluent Quality. Water, 2023. 15(4).