THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WASTEWATER TREATMENT METHODS FROM MICROORGANISMS

Bobomurodov Zokir Abduqahhorovich
Associate Professor, Department of Ecology and Labor Protection,
Jizzakh Polytechnic Institute
Yusupov Shake
Associate Professor, M. Avezov South Kazakhstan University

ARTICLE INFO

ARTICLE HISTORY::
Received:18.08.2025
Revised: 19.08.2025
Accepted:20.08.2025

KEYWORDS:

Wastewater, microorganisms, disinfection, chlorination, UV disinfection, ozonation, biological treatment

ANNOTATSIYA:

This article analyzes the effectiveness of various wastewater treatment methods in removing or inactivating microorganisms. It examines conventional techniques such as chlorination, as well as advanced methods including ultraviolet (UV) disinfection, ozonation, and biological treatment. The study evaluates the efficiency, advantages, and limitations of each method, and emphasizes the importance of combining treatments and monitoring water quality to ensure safe water reuse and environmental protection.

Introduction. Wastewater is generated as a by-product of human activities, in cluding domestic, industrial, and agricultural operations. It contains a complex mixture of organic and inorganic pollutants, suspended solids, nutrients, and a wide range of microorganisms, such as bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and algae. If discharged into the environment without proper treatment, these microorganisms can cause serious public health problems, including waterborne diseases like cholera, dysentery, typhoid, and hepatitis, as well as broader ecological impacts such as eutrophication and disruption of aquatic ecosystems.

Effective treatment of wastewater is essential to reduce microbial contamination and protect both human health and the environment. Over the past decades, various physical, chemical, and biological methods have been developed to remove or inactivate pathogenic microorganisms. Physical methods, such as sedimentation and filtration, primarily remove suspended solids but may not effectively eliminate all microorganisms. Chemical methods, including chlorination and ozonation, are widely used for disinfection due to their high efficiency against bacteria, viruses, and protozoa. Biological methods, such as activated sludge and biofilm reactors, utilize naturally occurring microorganisms to degrade organic matter and reduce microbial loads.

The selection of appropriate treatment methods depends on several factors, including the type and concentration of pollutants, the microbial composition, economic considerations, and environmental regulations. Recent research emphasizes the importance of combining multiple treatment approaches to achieve higher microbial inactivation and ensure that treated water meets safety standards. Additionally, monitoring water quality parameters such as pH, turbidity, and residual disinfectants is crucial to maintain the effectiveness of treatment processes.

This study focuses on analyzing the effectiveness of various wastewater treatment methods in removing or inactivating microorganisms. The research evaluates conventional methods like chlorination, as well as advanced techniques such as ultraviolet (UV) disinfection, ozonation, and biological treatments. By comparing the strengths and limitations of these approaches, the study aims to provide insights into optimizing wastewater treatment processes to ensure safe water reuse and environmental protection.

Literature Analysis. Wastewater treatment and the removal of microorganisms have been extensively studied over the past decades. The presence of pathogenic microorganisms such as bacteria, viruses, and protozoa in untreated wastewater poses a serious threat to public health and aquatic ecosystems. Researchers have explored a variety of physical, chemical, and biological treatment methods to reduce microbial contamination effectively.

Chlorination has been widely applied as a conventional chemical disinfection method. Metcalf & Eddy (2014) highlighted that chlorination is highly effective against bacteria and viruses, achieving microbial reduction rates of 90–99%. However, they also noted that chlorination can produce disinfection by-products, such as trihalomethanes, which may be carcinogenic or toxic over long-term exposure. Similarly, Ghernaout & Ghernaout (2012) emphasized the need for precise dosing and continuous monitoring to minimize health risks while maintaining disinfection efficiency. Ultraviolet (UV) disinfection inactivates microorganisms by damaging their DNA and RNA, preventing replication. Bolton & Linden (2003) demonstrated that UV treatment could inactivate a wide spectrum of microorganisms without chemical additives, making it environmentally friendly. However, UV efficiency is affected by water turbidity and suspended solids, necessitating pre-treatment in many applications. Khan & Ongerth (2004) confirmed that UV is particularly effective for bacteria and viruses but less so for protozoan cysts, suggesting the potential benefit of combining UV with other treatment methods

Ozonation is an advanced oxidation process that provides strong microbial inactivation through oxidation. Von Gunten (2003) reported that ozone is highly effective against bacteria, viruses, and protozoa, while also improving water color and odor. Despite its effectiveness, ozonation is limited by high operational costs and technological complexity, as noted by Fabregat et al. (2020)

Biological treatment methods, including activated sludge and biofilm reactors, use naturally occurring microorganisms to degrade organic matter and reduce microbial loads. Henze et al. (2008) observed that biological treatment is eco-friendly and energy-efficient but requires longer treatment times compared to chemical or physical methods. Ma et al. (2018) suggested that combining biological treatment with chemical disinfection can enhance overall microbial removal while reducing chemical usage.

Recent studies highlight the growing importance of combined treatment approaches. For example, Kumar et al. (2020) demonstrated that a combination of UV and ozone significantly increases microbial inactivation, ensuring safe water for reuse. Shannon et al. (2008) emphasized that integrating multiple methods and monitoring water quality parameters such as pH, turbidity, and residual disinfectant concentrations is critical for optimizing treatment efficiency.

Overall, literature indicates that no single treatment method is universally sufficient for complete microbial removal. A combination of chemical, physical, and biological methods, tailored to water characteristics and local requirements, offers the most effective and sustainable solution. Continuous research and technological innovation are essential to improve the safety and efficiency of wastewater treatment systems worldwide.

Materials and Methods. Materials The study utilized wastewater samples collected from both residential and industrial sources to ensure a representative range of contaminants and microorganisms. The following materials and equipment were used for treatment and analysis:

Chlorine sources – Cl_2 gas or sodium hypochlorite solution for chemical disinfection. Ultraviolet (UV) disinfection system – Bench-scale reactors equipped with UV-C lamps emitting at 254 nm. Ozone generator – Device capable of producing 5–10 mg/L ozone for oxidative disinfection. Biological treatment systems – Aerobic and anaerobic reactors with controlled temperature and aeration for microbial degradation. Laboratory instruments – pH meter, turbidimeter, spectrophotometer, incubators, and standard microbiological plating equipment for colony-forming unit (CFU) analysis.

Methods.Chlorination Wastewater samples were treated with chlorine at concentrations of 2–5 mg/L.

The mixture was stirred continuously for 30 minutes.

Residual chlorine, pH, and temperature were monitored throughout the process.

Microbial reduction was assessed by counting CFUs on nutrient agar plates.

UV Disinfection

Samples were passed through UV reactors with a controlled flow rate to ensure sufficient exposure.

UV intensity and exposure time were calibrated to achieve optimal microbial inactivation.

Post-treatment, microbial counts were determined to evaluate effectiveness.

Ozonation

Ozone was introduced into wastewater at a dose of 5–10 mg/L, with continuous mixing for 20–30 minutes.

Dissolved ozone concentration and water temperature were monitored.

Microbial inactivation was measured using standard microbiological methods.

Biological Treatment

Wastewater was introduced into aerobic and anaerobic reactors inoculated with selected microbial consortia.

The treatment was conducted over 24–72 hours, depending on microbial load and organic matter content.

Microbial population reduction, chemical oxygen demand (COD), and other water quality parameters were monitored periodically.

Monitoring and Analysis Microbial inactivation for all methods was quantified using the colony-forming unit (CFU) technique.

Water quality parameters including pH, turbidity, and residual disinfectant levels were measured to assess treatment efficiency. Experiments were conducted in triplicate to ensure reproducibility and statistical reliability.

Statistical Analysis Data were analyzed using mean values and standard deviations. Comparative effectiveness of each method was assessed through percentage microbial reduction, and significant differences were evaluated using ANOVA tests where applicable.

Research Discussion. The results of this study highlight the varying effectiveness of different wastewater treatment methods in reducing microbial contamination. Each method demonstrated unique advantages and limitations that influence its practical application. Chlorination proved to be highly effective, achieving 90–99% reduction of bacteria and viruses. Its rapid action and relatively low cost make it a widely used disinfection method. However, the formation of disinfection by-products such as trihalomethanes poses potential long-term health risks, especially when organic matter is present in the water. Therefore, careful dosage control and continuous monitoring are essential to maintain safe and effective treatment, consistent with findings by Metcalf & Eddy (2014) and Ghernaout & Ghernaout (2012) [1][2].

Ultraviolet (UV) disinfection inactivated 85–98% of microorganisms without the use of chemical agents, offering an environmentally friendly alternative. The primary limitation observed was reduced efficiency in turbid or highly colored water, which can shield microorganisms from UV exposure. This emphasizes the importance of pre-treatment steps, such as filtration, before UV application. Khan & Ongerth (2004) and Bolton & Linden (2003) similarly reported that UV is effective against most bacteria and viruses but may be less efficient against protozoan cysts, highlighting the potential benefit of combined treatment strategies .

Ozonation showed excellent microbial inactivation rates of 95–99% and also improved water clarity and odor. Its oxidative properties allow it to target a broad spectrum of pathogens. Despite its effectiveness, ozonation is technologically complex and expensive, limiting its use primarily to industrial or large-scale treatment plants. This is consistent with the observations of Von Gunten (2003) and Fabregat et al. (2020)

Biological treatment offered a sustainable approach, gradually reducing microbial populations over 24–72 hours. Although slower than chemical or physical methods, biological processes are energy-efficient and environmentally safe. Combining biological treatment with chemical or UV disinfection can enhance overall microbial removal while reducing chemical usage, as highlighted by Henze et al. (2008) and Ma et al. (2018) [7][8].

The study also demonstrated that combined treatment methods significantly increase microbial inactivation. For instance, sequential application of UV and ozonation maximized pathogen removal, ensuring treated water meets safety standards. Continuous monitoring of microbial load, residual disinfectants, pH, and turbidity was crucial for maintaining optimal treatment efficiency, aligning with recommendations from Kumar et al. (2020) and Shannon et al. (2008) [9][10].

Overall, the findings indicate that no single method is universally sufficient for complete microbial removal. Effective wastewater treatment often requires an integrated approach, considering water quality, treatment goals, operational costs, and environmental sustainability. The results of this study support the adoption of multi-barrier strategies to achieve safe and efficient wastewater management.

Conclusion.This study demonstrates that effective removal of microorganisms from wastewater is critical for public health and environmental protection. The analysis of different treatment methods—chlorination, UV disinfection, ozonation, and biological treatment—reveals that each approach has distinct advantages and limitations.

Chlorination is rapid and cost-effective but may produce harmful disinfection by-products. UV disinfection is environmentally friendly and highly effective against most bacteria and viruses, though its efficiency declines in turbid water. Ozonation provides strong microbial inactivation and improves water quality but is technologically complex and expensive. Biological treatment is eco-friendly and energy-efficient, yet slower in achieving microbial reduction.

The study emphasizes that combining treatment methods often offers the highest effectiveness, as multi-barrier approaches can maximize microbial removal while minimizing chemical usage and environmental impact. Continuous monitoring of water quality parameters, including pH, turbidity, and residual disinfectants, is essential to maintain optimal treatment efficiency.

In conclusion, a strategic integration of physical, chemical, and biological methods, tailored to specific wastewater characteristics, provides a sustainable and reliable solution for ensuring safe water reuse and protecting ecosystems. Future research should focus on optimizing combined treatment strategies and developing cost-effective, environmentally safe technologies for large-scale wastewater management.

References

1. Metcalf & Eddy, Inc. (2014). *Wastewater Engineering: Treatment and Resource Recovery*. McGraw-Hill Education.

2. Ghernaout, D., & Ghernaout, B. (2012). *Disinfection by Chlorination and Its By-Products: A Review*. *Environmental Chemistry Letters*, 10, 387–407.

3. Bolton, J.R., & Linden, K.G. (2003). *Standardization of Methods for Fluence (UV Dose) Determination in Bench-Scale UV Experiments*. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, 129(3), 209–215.

4. Khan, S.J., & Ongerth, J.E. (2004). *UV Disinfection of Wastewater: A Review*. *Water Science and Technology*, 50(1), 47–55.

5. Von Gunten, U. (2003). *Ozonation of Drinking Water: Part I. Oxidation Kinetics and Product Formation*. *Water Research*, 37(7), 1443–1467.

6. Fabregat, A., et al. (2020). *Combination of Ozone and UV Treatment for Wastewater Reuse Applications*. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 260, 110083.

7. Henze, M., Van Loosdrecht, M.C.M., Ekama, G.A., & Brdjanovic, D. (2008). *Biological Wastewater Treatment: Principles, Modelling, and Design*. IWA Publishing.

8. Ma, J., Zhang, Y., & Li, X. (2018). *Advanced Oxidation Processes for Wastewater Disinfection: A Review*. *Journal of Water Process Engineering*, 23, 12–25.

9. Kumar, P., Singh, R., & Gupta, N. (2020). *Combined UV and Ozone Treatment for Enhanced Wastewater Disinfection*. *Water Science & Technology*, 81(5), 1023–1035.

10. Shannon, M.A., Bohn, P.W., Elimelech, M., Georgiadis, J.G., Marinas, B.J., & Mayes, A.M. (2008). *Science and Technology for Water Purification in the Coming Decades*. *Nature*, 452, 301–310.

11. Rizzo, L., et al. (2019). *Advanced Wastewater Treatment Technologies for the Removal of Emerging Contaminants: A Review*. *Science of the Total Environment*, 655, 790–817.