Nine Treatments of Metaldehyde in Water

Azlina Mat Saad
School of Environmental Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Perlis,
Kompleks Pengajian Jejawi 3, 02600 Arau, Perlis, Malaysia.
linasaad139@yahoo.com

Farrah Aini Dahalan
School of Environmental Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Perlis,
Kompleks Pengajian Jejawi 3, 02600 Arau, Perlis, Malaysia.

Fadli Fizari Abu Hassan Asari
Faculty of Business Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA,
Perlis Branch, Arau Campus, 02600 Arau, Perlis, Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

Metaldehyde is widely applied in the agricultural sector, largely in the removal of snails and slugs. Its water-soluble characteristic causes the compound to end up in our watery system. This is very dangerous as it is able to pollute drinking water and food source; thus adversely affect our health. Hence, removing metaldehyde is an important task for those involved with the treatment of water. For this reason, this paper gathers nine various methods which are proposed and used in treating water contaminated with metaldehyde. The simple but significant explanation will be able to assist those who are new in the fields of pesticide removal and water treatment. In parallel, it will be the basis for more advanced researches in the future.

Key Words: Metaldehyde, Water Treatment, Environmental Engineering

INTRODUCTION

Nearly 75% of the causes of infectious diseases are associated with water borne, as water is the main source of life especially in terms of drink and self-cleaning (Khan et al., 2017). However, contaminated sources of water, especially from chemical substances, are much disruptive. The pesticides will either dissolve or integrate with aquatic organism, plant and sediment (Salvestrini et al., 2017). Some of these pesticides are water soluble and can last long in the medium. Metaldehyde is one of them.

Metaldehyde is an effective molluscicide in overcoming the problem caused by snails and slugs (Brice et al., 2017). However, the metaldehyde fate will end in the water system through various ways such as leaching, spillage, run-off, erosion, absorption, adsorption and spray drift (BCMA, 2017). Metaldehyde taken through ingestion system can harm the stomach and intestines. In the long run, it causes failure of human vital organs such as liver and kidneys (Kidd & James, 1991; Sax & Bruce, 1975). This harmful effects triggered panic reactions of certain parties especially those related to water management.

Some of the researchers suggest a total ban on metaldehyde in agricultural areas due to difficulty in treatment and high cost (Brockett, 2016). There is another proposal, on a buffer zone creation at least 10 meters from the nearest water source (Rush, 2017). The polemic continues as there is a contradiction between commercial use and food security. Hence, it is important for water-related researchers to seek for the safest, cheapest and most practical treatment. For this reason, this paper explores some of the methods that have been proposed and applied in treating this harmful chemical, namely metaldehyde.

METALDEHYDE TREATMENTS

The presence of metaldehyde in drinking water sources was detected by Bristol Water, a water supply company in the United Kingdom (UK) (Blake, 2008). It was concluded based on samplings of water taken at the Sharpness Canal in 2007. This discovery triggered anxiety when the rate beyond the standard limit for pesticides set in the UK and European countries (Marshall, 2013). Metaldehyde toxicity is closely related to the food chain. As humans are positioned at the top of the food chain, the negative consequence is multiplied as a result of the biomagnification effect (Favari et al., 2002).

With the aim to reduce or eliminate metaldehyde compound from the watercourses, researchers have come out with various methods of treatments. In general, these treatments can be categorized into two which are carbon-based treatment and non-carbon-based treatment. Treatments that use carbon as a base are powdered activated carbon, granular activated carbon and phenolic carbon tailored. On the other hand, catchment management, photodegradation method and bio-filtration process are among non-carbon-based treatment, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Metaldehyde Treatments

Category	Type
Carbon-based treatment	Powdered activated carbon
	Granular activated carbon
	Phenolic carbon tailored
Non-carbon-based treatment	Catchment management
	Bio-filtration process
	Coupled adsorption with electrochemical destruction
	Photodegradation method
	Polymeric sorbent
	Chlorination and Ozonation

Carbon-Based Treatments

Powdered Activated Carbon

High carbon content such as charcoal is the main input to the powdered activated carbon. It is widely applied in the United Kingdom for water treatment purpose (TrojanUV, 2016). This technique uses adsorption process to degrade pollutants from industrial and agricultural wastes in water. It is applied to eliminate unwanted odour and taste in water, caused by high levels of pesticides used in certain seasons (Yoon et al., 2003). Approximately 90% of metaldehyde in water can be removed using this treatment. Physical properties of this carbon material, especially its small particle size and high surface area are the factors (Li et al., 2017). In the same study, this method has an absorption rate almost similar to the granular activated carbon. In contrast, it offers economical investment cost than granular activated carbon (Knappe et al., 1998). However, its extensive disposal of waste creates concern to the public (Renou et al., 2008).

Granular Activated Carbon

Still applying the same source as in 2.1, but the output is in a bigger form. Using granular, a study by Salvestrini et al. (2017) shows its high capability of absorption and adsorption for metaldehyde treatment. This is due to higher specific surface area and high point of zero charge. Furthermore, absorption of metaldehyde on the surface of granular is due to electrostatic interactions and/or hydrogen bonding between molecular electronegative oxygen molecules and positive surfaces imposed by the adsorbents. In Tao & Fletcher (2013), the granular system adsorbs metaldehyde faster than a non-functionalised hyper-cross-linked polymer Macronet (MN200). For its weakness, more than 25% of adsorbed metaldehyde is leached due to the destruction of adsorbate molecules in the granular. In treating metaldehyde from water, this treatment faces shorten life span. In other word, the materials need to be replaced regularly and this this pulls a lot of money from water treatment companies (Franks, 2017).

Phenolic Carbon Tailored

This innovation is based on the preliminary idea, suggested by Ragan et al. (2012). It is stated that the elimination of pesticides is not merely dependent on the surface of a medium, but is also determined by the efficiency of porosity control. This statement is successfully supported by results recorded in Busquets et al. (2014). Tailored phenolic resin-derived carbon sealed up to three times the metaldehyde as compared to its own surface. At the same time, the conventional granular activated carbon method only sought to absorb metaldehyde twice over. In comparison, this method absorbs metaldehyde up to 63mg/g more rather than the granular method. Compared to other activated carbon sources, this activated carbon is in the form of fine beads and is derived from phenolic resins. This research also serves as the foundation for the comparison in a recent study, as written by Li et al. (2017).

Non-Carbon-Based Treatments

Catchment Management

Catchment management is an effort run by several parties including governments, water supply companies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In this alternative system, farmers are introduced to alternative pesticides which are easier to degrade in the environment (WCMA, 2016). For those who still want to use the metaldehyde, they are exposed to the right way. This is to avoid negative effects of spillage and leaching (Castle et al., 2017). Another initiative undertaken is building up a shallow waterway. In absorbing this chemical compound from flowing into the main drinking water source, the grass is planted along the waterway (BCMA, 2017). However, this method has a minimal impact. This is due to the reluctance of the relevant parties, especially farmers. In addition, cost is one of the obstacles. Alternative pesticides are likely to involve high input costs, but provide a reverse return (Thames Water, 2017).

Bio-Filtration Process

Slow sand filter is a biological method to treat water. Basically, this method only requires a container filled with one layer of sand followed by a layer of gravel that serves as a filter to treat water (Logsdon, 2002). This cost saving system is not only easy to design but also works effectively in filtering water for residents up to 5,000 people (WHO, 2000). Also emphasized in this report, it is an eco-friendly water management as no by-products are generated from this technique. This is confirmed through a study conducted by Rolph et al. (2014). This filter positively removes metaldehyde from water in a full scale and lab scale experimental set-up. However, it must be adjusted under suitable conditions such as length time and flow rate. Sharing the same view is Gasperi et al. (2010). Compactness, modularity and intensiveness are the three main reasons why this method is preferred as compared to activated sludge tank.

Coupled Adsorption with Electrochemical Destruction

This method which combines two types of procedures; absorption and electrochemical destruction was applied by Ashgar et al. (2012). The study was further developed by Mohammed et al. (2012) and Nabeerasool et al. (2015). In Mohammed et al. (2012), focus is given to two important entities in this system, absorbent medium (low cost but capable) and electrochemical medium (expensive but less efficient).

In Nabeerasool et al. (2015), metaldehyde is the only focus in the use of this treatment. It is concluded that this combined technique removes metaldehyde from natural water effectively. At the same time, the results obtained comply with the standards set by the United Kingdom and other European countries. The key to this success is the complete oxidation process (Brown et al., 2004). This process is able to degrade and abolish chemical compounds. Furthermore, no poisonous spinoff is leaved out in the aquatic environment.

Photodegradation Method

In general, pollutants in water are mineralized to carbon dioxide and water by hydroxyl particles that are generated from ultraviolet radiation (Krishnan et al., 2017). In a laboratory scale, a combined method using photo-oxidation with advanced oxidation process and ultraviolet radiation with titanium dioxide (UV/TiO_2) and hydrogen peroxide (UV/H_2O_2) successfully removes metaldehyde from water (Autin et al., 2012). The degradation process happened due to the chemical characteristics of materials used. However, the situation is quite different in the actual water system. Presence of non-target organic matter such as other pesticide compounds reduces the degradation development of metaldehyde (Autin et al., 2013). At the same time, its high cost makes it more appropriate in treating industrial wastewater rather than be applied for sewage treatment in the agricultural sector, as highlighted in the same study.

Polymeric Sorbent

Ion-exchange resin is a material that acts as an ion exchange medium. It is an insoluble polymer and micro in size. The main ingredient of ion-exchange is resin, which is derived from plants (McNaught & McNaught, 1997). This method removes metaldehyde by replacing its ions with similarly charged ions (NHDES, 2009). Both chemical compounds with similar charges are eliminated in the next process. A research by Tao & Fletcher (2013), discovered that ion exchange resin S957 which comprised of macroporous with high phosphonic and sulfonic acid assemblage, excellently removes metaldehyde compound from raw water. It is also a strong acid cation and an efficient chelating agent. In the same study, no leaching of any other compound is observed. A fact given by Polysciences Inc. (2016) acknowledged that ion exchange method is the most economical and capable of treating high quality water including nuclear power plants.

Chlorination and Ozonation

Chlorination and ozonation are two common methods applied in treating contaminated water, and are still subjects of research until now (Khatun et al., 2017; Wei et al., 2017). Occasionally comparisons are made in finding the best solution between these two treatments (Chapdeline, 1993). If used in excessive doses, both treatments can risk endusers. However, practicality factor dominates everything. Unfortunately, these two methods are not compatible in removing metaldehyde in water. One of the proofs that supported this statement comes from Marshall (2013). This happens as this compound cannot be broken into more simple elements. This is due to its chemical properties and physical properties of metaldehyde which is a cyclic tetramer of acetaldehyde. This makes metaldehyde a tough chemical to eradicate from water system, as compared to another type of pesticides as emphasized in both OWT (2013) and Nabeerasool (2015).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, various types of treatments have been proposed and applied in treating metaldehyde in water. Apart from being distinguished by their respective carbon input, the treatments are also differentiated by their processing method. Some are successful and others need continuous improvements. This will definitely open up for more relevant studies in the future. This is the hope of writers of this article. It is written on simple but significant basis, in assisting those who are new in the field of pesticide removal and water treatment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to thank the Government of Malaysia and Ministry of Education (Fundamental Research Grant: 9003-00386), MyBrain15 (MyPhD scholarship) and Universiti Malaysia Perlis.

REFERENCES

Asghar, H. M. A., Roberts, E. P. L., Hussain, S. N., Campen, A. K., & Brown, N. W. (2012). Wastewater treatment by adsorption with electrochemical regeneration using graphite-based adsorbents. *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry*, *42*(9), 797-807.

Autin, O., Hart, J., Jarvis, P., MacAdam, J., Parsons, S. A., & Jefferson, B. (2012). Comparison of UV/H2O2 and UV/TiO2 for the degradation of metaldehyde: Kinetics and the impact of background organics. *Water Research*, *46*(17), 5655-5662.

Autin, O., Hart, J., Jarvis, P., MacAdam, J., Parsons, S. A., & Jefferson, B. (2013). The impact of background organic matter and alkalinity on the degradation of the pesticide metaldehyde by two advanced oxidation processes: UV/H2O2 and UV/TiO2. *Water Research*, *47*(6), 2041-2049.

(BCMA) British Columbia Ministry of Agriculture. (2017) Environmental protection and pesticides. Retrieved from http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/farming-natural-resources-and-industry/agriculture-and-seafood/animal-and-crops/plant-health/environmental-protection-and-pesticides.pdf

Blake, A. (2008). Slug control threatened by metaldehyde residues being found in water. Retrieved from http://www.fwi.co.uk/arable/slug-control-threatened-by-metaldehyde-residues-being-found-in-water.htm

Brice, K. N. D., Fai, P. A. B., Norbert, N. T., & Mbida, M. (2017). Environmental and human health assessment in relation to pesticide use by local farmers and the Cameroon Development Corporation (CDC), Fako Division, South-West Cameroon. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, *13*(21).

Brockett, J. (2016). Water quality experts call for metaldehyde ban. Retrieved from http://utilityweek.co.uk/news/water-quality-experts-call-for-metaldehyde-ban/1281182#.WbD60sgjG M8.

Brown, N. W., Roberts, E. P. L., Chasiotis, A., Cherdron, T., & Sanghrajka, N. (2004). Atrazine removal using adsorption and electrochemical regeneration. *Water Research*, *38*(13), 3067-3074.

Busquets, R., Kozynchenko, O. P., Whitby, R. L., Tennison, S. R., & Cundy, A. B. (2014). Phenolic carbon tailored for the removal of polar organic contaminants from water: A solution to the metaldehyde problem? *Water Research*, *61*, 46-56.

Castle, G. D., Mills, G. A., Gravell, A., Jones, L., Townsend, I., Cameron, D. G., & Fones, G. R. (2017). Review of the molluscicide metaldehyde in the environment. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*, *3*(3), 415-428.

Chapdelaine Jr, P. A. (1993). Chlorination or ozonation? *American Journal of Public Health*, *83*(9), 1347-1348.

Dong, F., Li, C., He, G., Chen, X., & Mao, X. (2017). Kinetics and degradation pathway of sulfamethazine chlorination in pilot-scale water distribution systems. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, *321*, 521-532.

Favari, L., López, E., Martínez-Tabche, L., & Dıaz-Pardo, E. (2002). Effect of insecticides on plankton and fish of Ignacio Ramirez reservoir (Mexico): A biochemical and biomagnification study. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, *51*(3), 177-186.

Franks, G. (2017). Carbon filtration: What it does, what it doesn't. Retrieved from http://www.purewaterproducts.com/articles/carbon

Gasperi, J., Rocher, V., Gilbert, S., Azimi, S., & Chebbo, G. (2010). Occurrence and removal of priority pollutants by lamella clarification and biofiltration. *Water Research*, *44*(10), 3065-3076.

Khan, S. A., Suleman, M., & Asad, M. (2017). Assessment of pollution load in marble waste water in Khairabad, District Nowshera, Khyber Pukhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Int. J. Economic and Environmental Geology*, *8*(2), 35-39.

Kidd, H & James D.R. (1991). *The agrochemicals handbook*, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry.

Knappe, D. R., Matsui, Y., Snoeyink, V. L., Roche, P., Prados, M. J., & Bourbigot, M. M. (1998). Predicting the capacity of powdered activated carbon for trace organic compounds in natural waters. *Environmental Science & Technology*, *32*(11), 1694-1698.

Khatun, M. S., Rahman, M. M., Islam, M. A., & Ali, A. (2017). Effect of chlorination on bacterial load in brackishwater shrimp culture pond. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, *3*(6),542-545.

Krishnan, S., Rawindran, H., Sinnathambi, C. M., & Lim, J. W. (2017, June). Comparison of various advanced oxidation processes used in remediation of industrial wastewater laden with recalcitrant pollutants. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* (Vol. 206, No. 1, p. 012089). IOP Publishing.

Landeros, C. R., Díaz, C. E. B., Cháves, A. A., & Morales, G. R. (2017). Evaluation of a coupled system of electro-oxidation and ozonation to remove the pesticide Thiodan® 35 CE (endosulfan) in aqueous solution. *Fuel*, *198*, 91-98.

Li, Z., Kim, J. K., Chaudhari, V., Mayadevi, S., & Campos, L. C. (2017). Degradation of metaldehyde in water by nanoparticle catalysts and powdered activated carbon. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *24*(21), 17861-17873.

Logsdon, G. S., Kohne, R., Abel, S., & LaBonde, S. (2002). Slow sand filtration for small water systems. *Journal of Environmental Engineering and Science*, *1*(5), 339-348.

Marshall, J. (2013). Water UK briefing paper on metaldehyde. Retrieved from http://www.water.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Policy-Briefings/Water%20UK%20Policy%20 briefing%20Metaldehyde%2013%20Aug%202013_0.pdf.

McNaught, A. D., & McNaught, A. D. (1997). *Compendium of chemical terminology* (Vol. 1669). Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Mohammed, F. M., Roberts, E. P., Campen, A. K., & Brown, N. W. (2012). Wastewater treatment by multi-stage batch adsorption and electrochemical regeneration. *Journal of Electrochemical Science and Engineering*, *2*(4), 223-236.

Nabeerasool, M. A., Campen, A. K., Polya, D. A., Brown, N. W., & van Dongen, B. E. (2015). Removal of metaldehyde from water using a novel coupled adsorption and electrochemical destruction technique. *Water*, *7*(6), 3057-3071.

(NHDES) New Hampshire Department of Environmental Service. (2009). Ion exchange treatment of drinking water. Retrieved from https://www.des.nh.gov/organization/commissioner/pip/factsheets/dwgb/documents/dwgb-2-12.pdf

(OW) TOsmio Water Technology. (2013). What will filter out Metaldehyde from water. Retrieved from https://www.osmiowater.co.uk/osmioblog/what-will-filter-out-metal dehyde -from-water

Polysciences Inc. (2016). Purolite resins. Retrieved from http://www.polysciences.com/default/catalog-products/monomers-polymers/ion-exchange-resins-cartridges/purolite –resins

Ragan, S., Whitby, R. L. D., & Cundy, A. B. (2012). Old and new carbons for wastewater treatment. *Water and Sewerage Journal*, (3), 34-35.

Renou, S., Givaudan, J. G., Poulain, S., Dirassouyan, F., & Moulin, P. (2008). Landfill leachate treatment: review and opportunity. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *150*(3), 468-493.

Rolph, C. A., Jefferson, B., & Villa, R. (2014). Switching on pesticide degraders in biological filters used in drinking water production. *Progress in Slow Sand and Alternative Biofiltration Processes*, 195.

Rush, T. (2017). New 10 metre buffer zone for metaldehyde slug pellets. Retrieved from https://www.fginsight.com/news/news/new-10-metre-buffer-zone-for-metaldehyde-slug-pellets-21504

Salvestrini, S., Vanore, P., Bogush, A., Mayadevi, S., & Campos, L. C. (2017). Sorption of metaldehyde using granular activated carbon. *Journal of Water Reuse and*

Desalination, *7*(3), 280-287.

Sax, N.I., & Bruce, R.D. (1975). *Dangerous properties of industrial materials*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

TrojanUV. (2016). TrojanUV solutions: Removal of metaldehyde, a pesticide found in UK drinking water sources. Retrieved from http://www.trojanuv.com/resources/trojanuv/casestudies/ECT/Lincoln__United_Kingdom_Removal_of_Metaldehyde_Case_Study___Environmental_Contaminant_ Treatment.pdf

Yoon, Y., Westerhoff, P., Snyder, S. A., & Esparza, M. (2003). HPLC-fluorescence detection and adsorption of bisphenol A, 17β-estradiol, and 17α-ethynyl estradiol on powdered activated carbon. *Water Research*, *37*(14), 3530-3537.

Tao, B., & Fletcher, A. J. (2013). Metaldehyde removal from aqueous solution by adsorption and ion exchange mechanisms onto activated carbon and polymeric sorbents. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *244*, 240-250.

Thames Water. (2017). Metaldehyde. Retrieved from https://corporate.thameswater.co.uk/About-us/Protecting-our-environment/Managing-our-impact/Catchment-management/Metaldehyde.

(WCMA) Wimmera Catchment Management Authorities. (2016). What is a Catchment Management. Retrieved from http://www.wcma.vic.gov.au/about-us/WhatIsCMA

Wei, C., Zhang, F., Hu, Y., Feng, C., & Wu, H. (2017). Ozonation in water treatment: The generation, basic properties of ozone and its practical application. *Reviews in Chemical Engineering*, *33*(1), 49-89.

WHO (World Health Organization). (2000). Water treatment in WHO seminar pack for drinking-water quality. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/dwq/S12.pdf