Perspective
Volume 12:12, 2022

Journal of Environmental & Analytical Toxicology

ISSN: 2161-0525 Open Access

Environmental Pollution Pathways in Mining Sites with Arsenic

Kishore Kumar*

Department of Environmental Engineering, Kwandong University, Gangneung-si, Gangwon-do, South Korea

Introduction

The emanation and amassing of harmful components, for example, arsenic in different ecological compartments have become progressively continuous essentially because of anthropogenic activities, for example, those saw in agrarian, modern and mining exercises. The operation of a gold mine in the city of Paracatu, MG, Brazil, is one example of environmental arsenic contamination. This study aims to assess the trophic transfer of arsenic as well as the routes and effects of arsenic contamination in environmental compartments (air, water and soil) and environmental organisms (fish and vegetables) from mining regions for a population risk assessment. In this study, the waters of the Rico stream contained high levels of arsenic, ranging from 4.05 g/L in the summer to 72.4 g/L in the winter. In addition, soil samples, which are influenced by seasonal variation and proximity to the gold mine, had the highest As concentration of 1.668 mg kg1. Both organic and inorganic arsenic species were found in biological samples above the allowed limit, indicating the transfer of arsenic from the environment and posing a significant threat to the local population. This study demonstrates the significance of environmental monitoring for the identification of contamination and the promotion of the search for novel interventions and population risk assessments.

Description

Arsenic contamination of groundwater is widespread and arsenic contamination of drinking water is significant in a number of locations. Arsenic-contaminated water has been consumed by an estimated 140 million people in at least 70 nations at levels above the WHO provisional guideline value of 10 g/L. Recent statistical modelling suggests that between 94 and 220 million people could be exposed to elevated arsenic concentrations in groundwater and this is in line with this. Long-term elevated exposure to inorganic arsenic has different effects on different people, groups of people and locations. As a result, arsenic-related diseases are not standardized. This confounds the appraisal of the weight on wellbeing of arsenic. In a similar vein, there is no way to distinguish cases of arsenic-induced cancer from others. As a result, there is no accurate estimate of the problem's global scope [1].

The effects of arsenic on human health were re-evaluated by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) in 2010, taking into account new data. JECFA came to the conclusion that there is some evidence of adverse effects in drinking water in certain regions of the world where inorganic arsenic concentrations exceed 50–100 g/L. JECFA came to the conclusion that, despite the possibility of negative effects, there are other locations where arsenic concentrations in water are elevated (10–50 g/L). In epidemiological studies, these would have a low incidence that would be difficult to detect. In this review, elevated degrees of arsenic were found in soil tests and in the waters of the Rico stream, which were impacted via occasional variety and by vicinity to the mother lode, showing that albeit the locale's dirt is plentiful in arsenic minerals, for example, arsenopyrite, handling affects the scattering of this semimetal in the climate [2].

Additionally, there was an increase in As in areas with domestic effluent discharge, indicating that residents of the region had As in their bodies. As values above the limit were found in biological samples (fish, corn and cassava), this indicates trophic transfer of this element and characterizes ecological damage that harms species in this region and threatens human health. According to the findings of this study, it is necessary to use effective strategies to encourage environmental remediation of the affected area and to lessen the amount of as that people living nearby are exposed to. The provision of a safe water supply for drinking, food preparation and the irrigation of food crops is the most significant action in the affected communities. This will prevent further exposure to arsenic. Arsenic levels in drinking water can be reduced in a variety of ways. Replace sources with high arsenic levels, like groundwater, with low arsenic ones, like rainwater and treated surface water that are safe for microbes. High-arsenic water can be used for things like bathing and laundry, while low-arsenic water can be used for drinking, cooking and irrigation [3].

Make a distinction between sources with high and low arsenic levels. For instance, test water for arsenic levels and paint tube wells or hand siphons various varieties. When combined with effective education, this can be a cost-effective method for rapidly reducing arsenic exposure. To attain an acceptable arsenic concentration, combine water with lower arsenic levels with water with higher arsenic levels. Install centralized or domestic arsenic removal systems and ensure that the arsenic removed is disposed of appropriately. Arsenic can be removed using techniques like oxidation, coagulation-precipitation, absorption, ion exchange and membranes. Although there is a growing number of low-cost and effective options for removing arsenic from small or household items, there is still a lack of evidence regarding the extent to which these systems are utilized effectively for extended periods of time. To lessen occupational exposure to industrial processes, long-term measures are also necessary [4,5].

Successful interventions depend heavily on community involvement and education. Community members must comprehend the dangers of high arsenic exposure and the sources of arsenic exposure, such as arsenic being ingested by crops (like rice) from irrigation water and food from cooking water. Additionally, high-risk populations should be monitored for early arsenic poisoning symptoms, typically skin issues. One of the WHO's ten major public health concerns is arsenic. Setting guidelines, looking over the evidence and offering advice on risk management are all part of WHO's efforts to reduce arsenic exposure. In its Guidelines for the Quality of Drinking Water, WHO publishes an arsenic guideline value. The Guidelines are intended to serve as the foundation for international regulation and standardization.

Conclusion

Although this guideline value is designated as provisional due to practical difficulties in removing arsenic from drinking water, the current recommended limit for arsenic in water is 10 g/L. As a result, whenever resources are available, concentrations should be kept as low as reasonably possible and below the

***Address for Correspondence:** kishore Kumar, Department of Environmental Engineering, Kwandong University, Gangneung-si, Gangwon-do, South Korea; E-mail: harikishore7869@gmail.com*

Received: 01 December, 2022, Manuscript No: Jeat-23-93049; **Editor Assigned:** 03 December, 2022, Pre-QC No. P-93049; **Reviewed:** 17 December, 2022, QC No. Q-93049; **Revised:** 22 December, 2022, Manuscript No: R-93049; **Published:** 29 December, 2022, DOI: 10.37421/2161-0525.2022.12.694

guideline value. But because millions of people worldwide are exposed to arsenic at concentrations much higher than the guideline value (100 g/L or higher), reducing these people's exposure should be the top priority for public health. Member States may set higher limits or interim values where it is difficult to achieve the guideline value as part of an overall strategy to gradually reduce risks, taking into account local circumstances, resources available and risks from low arsenic sources that are contaminated microbiologically. Progress toward global drinking water targets is monitored by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene. The indicator of "safely managed drinking water services" in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development calls for tracking the population's access to drinking water that is free of feces and priority chemical contaminants, such as arsenic.

References

1. Cheng, Dongle, Huu Hao Ngo, Wenshan Guo and Soon Woong Chang, et al. "A critical review on antibiotics and hormones in swine wastewater: Water pollution problems and control approaches." *J Hazard Mater* 387 (2020): 121682.
2. Lei, Kai, Chun-Ye Lin, Ying Zhu and Wei Chen, et al. "Estrogens in municipal wastewater and receiving waters in the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region, China: Occurrence and risk assessment of mixtures." *J Hazard Mater* 389 (2020): 121891.
3. Shehab, Zakariya Nafi, Nor Rohaizah Jamil and Ahmad Zaharin Aris. "Occurrence, environmental implications and risk assessment of Bisphenol A in association with colloidal particles in an urban tropical river in Malaysia." *Sci Rep* 10 (2020): 1-16.
4. Pratush, Amit, Xueying Ye, Qi Yang and Jie Kan, et al. "Biotransformation strategies for steroid estrogen and androgen pollution." *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 104 (2020): 2385-2409.
5. Cartinella, Joshua L., Tzahi Y. Cath, Michael T. Flynn and Glenn C. Miller, et al. "Removal of natural steroid hormones from wastewater using membrane contactor processes." *Environ Sci Technol* 40 (2006): 7381-7386.

How to cite this article: Kumar, Kishore. “Environmental Pollution Pathways in Mining Sites with Arsenic.” J Environ Anal Toxicol 12 (2022): 694.