Evaluating the effectiveness of various control and water treatment processes on the membrane integrity and toxin fate of cyanobacteria

Jiajia Fan

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy



School of Earth and Environmental Sciences The University of Adelaide Australia

December 2013

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS
LIST OF FIGURESII
LIST OF TABLESVI
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONSVII
DECLARATION VIII
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS IX
ABSTRACTX
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION1
CHAPTER 2. EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COPPER SULPHATE, CHLORINE, POTASSIUM PERMANGANATE, HYDROGEN PEROXIDE AND OZONE ON CYANOBACTERIAL CELL INTEGRITY
CHAPTER 3. THE EFFECTS OF VARIOUS CONTROL AND WATER TREATMENT PROCESSES ON THE MEMBRANE INTEGRITY AND TOXIN FATE OF CYANOBACTERIA
CHAPTER 4. APPLICATION OF VARIOUS CHEMICALS FOR CYANOBACTERIA CONTROL AND CYANOTOXIN REMOVAL IN WASTEWATER TREATMENT
CHAPTER 5. IMPACT OF POTASSIUM PERMANGANATE ON CYANOBACTERIAL CELL INTEGRITY AND TOXIN RELEASE AND DEGRADATION
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS103
APPENDIX A
APPENDIX B110
ADDENDIV C

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Flow cytometry results following CuSO ₄ addition to Microcystis aeruginosa at
concentrations of (a) 0 mg L^{-1} , (b) 0.5 mg L^{-1} , (c) 1.0 mg L^{-1} and (d) 1.5 mg L^{-1} after 1 day
treatment. Poly-2 is region used to define populations as M. aeruginosa cell group. Histo-4
and Histo-5 were used to define populations as intact and lysed cells, respectively. Axes:
FL1-Green corresponds to SYTOX Green stain fluorescence detected at 530 nm, FL3-Red
corresponds to chlorophyll autofluorescence detected at 670 nm. FSC corresponds to full
scatter detected at 488nm16
Figure 2.2 Flow cytometry results following H ₂ O ₂ addition to Microcystis aeruginosa at
concentrations of (a) 0 mg L^{-1} , (b) 10.2 mg L^{-1} , (c) 51 mg L^{-1} and (d) 102 mg L^{-1} after 1 day
treatment. Poly-2 is region used to define populations as M. aeruginosa cell group. Histo-4
and Histo-5 were used to define populations as intact and lysed cells, respectively. Axes:
FL1-Green corresponds to SYTOX Green stain fluorescence detected at 530 nm, FL3-Red
corresponds to chlorophyll autofluorescence detected at 670 nm. FSC corresponds to full
scatter detected at 488nm
Figure 2.3 The change of Microcystis aeruginosa cells treated with CuSO ₄ at concentrations
of 0, 0.5, 1.0, and 1.5 (mg L ⁻¹ as copper) measured after 1, 2, 3 and 7 days treatment. (a)
Percentage of intact cells; (b) Cell densities. Error bars represent standard deviation from
triplicate analyses18
Figure 2.4 The change of Microcystis aeruginosa cells treated with chlorine at concentrations
of 3, 4, and 5 (mg L ⁻¹) measured at 0, 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 30 and 60 minute reaction time. (a)
Percentage of intact cells; (b) Cell densities. Error bars represent standard deviation from
triplicate analyses19
Figure 2.5 The change of Microcystis aeruginosa cells treated with KMnO ₄ at concentrations
of 1, 3, 5 and 10 (mg L ⁻¹) measured hourly for six hours. (a) Percentage of intact cells; (b)
Cell densities. Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses20
Figure 2.6 The change of Microcystis aeruginosa cells treated with H ₂ O ₂ at concentrations of
0, 10.2, 51, and 102 (mg L ⁻¹) measured after 1, 2, 3 and 7 days treatment. (a) Percentage of

intact cells; (b) Cell densities. Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses.
Figure 2.7 The change of Microcystis aeruginosa cells treated with ozone at concentrations of
0, 2, 4, and 6 (mg L ⁻¹) measured after 5 minutes. (a) Percentage of intact cells; (b) Cell densities. Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses22
Figure 3.1 Intracellular and extracellular MCs concentrations after treatment with CuSO ₄ (up
to 7 days contact time) at concentrations of (a) 0, (b) 0.5, (c) 1.0 and (d) 1.5 mg L ⁻¹ . Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses
Figure 3.2 Intracellular and extracellular MCs concentrations after treatment with H_2O_2 (up to
5 days contact time) at concentrations of (a) 0, (b) 10.2, (c) 51 and (d) 102 mg L ⁻¹ . Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses
Figure 3.3 Intracellular and extracellular MCs concentrations after treatment with chlorine
(up to 60 min contact time) at concentrations of (a) 3, (b) 4, and (c) 5 mg L ⁻¹ . Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses
Figure 3.4 Intracellular and extracellular MCs concentrations after treatment with KMnO ₄ (up to 7 hours contact time) at concentrations of (a) 1, (b) 3, (c) 5 and (d) 10 mg L ⁻¹ presented by Fan et al. (2013a). Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses
Figure 3.5 Intracellular and extracellular MCs concentrations after treatment with ozone (5 min contact time) at concentrations of 2, 4, and 6 mg L ⁻¹ . Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses
Figure 3.6 Comparison of experimental and model predicted results of MCs concentrations after treatment CuSO ₄ at initial concentrations of (a) 0.5 mg L ⁻¹ , (b) 1.0 mg L ⁻¹ and (c) 1.5 mg L ⁻¹
Figure 3.7 Comparison of experimental and model predicted results of MCs concentrations after treatment with H_2O_2 at initial concentrations of (a) 10.2 mg L^{-1} , (b) 51 mg L^{-1} and (c) 102 mg L^{-1}

Figure 3.8 Comparison of experimental and model predicted results of MCs concentrations
after treatment with chlorine at initial concentrations of (a) 3 mg L ⁻¹ , (b) 4 mg L ⁻¹ and (c) 5
$\operatorname{mg} L^{-1}$ 53
Figure 3.9 Comparison of experimental and model predicted results of MCs concentrations
after treatment with KMnO ₄ at initial concentrations of (a) 1 mg L ⁻¹ , (b) 3 mg L ⁻¹ , (c) 5 mg L ⁻¹
¹ and (d) 10 mg L ⁻¹ presented by Fan et al. (2013a)
Figure 4.1 Oxidant residual of Microcystis aeruginosa cultures treated with (a) chlorine at 3,
$4, 5 \text{ and } 6 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (b) } KMnO_4 \text{ at } 1, 3, 5 \text{ and } 10 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (c) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ and } 51 \text{ mg } L^{1}; \text{ (d) } H2O2 \text{ at } 10.2, 30.6 \text{ at } 10.2, 30$
and (d) ozone at 4 and 6 mg $L^{\text{-1}}$. $KMnO_4$ and H_2O_2 added to ASM-1 Medium and DAFF
water mixture are included as control
Figure 4.2 Concentrations of intracellular and extracellular MCs after 2 days treatments with
(a) $CuSO_4$ (0.0, 0.5 and 1.0 mg L^{-1}) and (b) H_2O_2 (0.0, 10.2, 30.6 and 51 mg L^{-1}). Error bars
represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses
Figure 4.3 Concentrations of intracellular and extracellular MCs after treatments with (a)
chlorine (3, 4 and 5 mg $L^{\text{-1}}$) at 30 min contact time, (b) KMnO ₄ (1, 3, 5 and 10 mg $L^{\text{-1}}$) at 180
min contact time, and (c) ozone (4 and 6 mg L ⁻¹) at 5 min contact time. Error bars represent
standard deviation from triplicate analyses74
Figure 4.4 Comparison of experimental and model predicted results of MCs concentrations
after treatments with (a) chlorine at initial concentration of 5 mg L^{1} and (b) KMnO ₄ at initial
concentration of 10 mg L ⁻¹ . Error bars represent standard deviation from triplicate analyses.
76
Figure 5.1 KMnO ₄ residual of Microcystis aeruginosa cultures treated with KMnO ₄ at 1, 3, 5
and 10 mg L^{-1} . $KMnO_4$ added to $ASM-1$ Medium and Milli Q water are included as control93
Figure 5.2 Microcystis aeruginosa cells treated with KMnO ₄ at concentrations of 1, 3, 5 and
10 mg L ⁻¹ measured hourly for six hours. (a) Percentage of intact cells; (b) Cell densities. The
initial cell numbers was approximately 7 \times 10 5 cells mL-1. Error bars equal \pm Standard
Deviation. 93

Figure 5.3 Intracellular and extracellular microcystin concentrations after treatment wi	th
KMnO ₄ (up to 7 hours contact time) with KMnO ₄ at concentrations of (a) 1 mg L ⁻¹ ; (b) 3 m	າຍ
L^{-1} ; (c) 5 mg L^{-1} ; and (d) 10 mg L^{-1} . Error bars equal \pm Standard Deviation) 4
Figure 5.4 Comparison of experimental and model predicted results of Microcyst	
concentrations after treatment with KMnO ₄ at initial concentrations of (a) 1 mg L ⁻¹ ; (b) 3 n	ng
L ⁻¹ ; (c) 5 mg L ⁻¹ ; and (d) 10 mg L ⁻¹) 5

List of Tables

Table 2.1 The concentrations of chlorine, KMnO ₄ , H ₂ O ₂ and ozone during the oxidation with
the <i>Microcystis aeruginosa</i> cultures
Table 2.2 The cell lysis rates for algicides/oxidants in <i>Microcystis aeruginosa</i> cultures27
Table 3.1 The rate constants and evaluation of model performance
Table 4.1 Pseudo-first-order rate constants (k) for the degradation of oxidants in <i>Microcystis</i>
aeruginosa samples. Linear regression coefficient (R2) values for the first-order fits presented
in parentheses71
Table 4.2. The cell integrity data for for algicides/oxidants in <i>Microcystis aeruginosa</i> samples
at time 0 and specific contact time
Table 5.1 The rate constants and evaluation of model performance

List of Abbreviations

AWQC Australian Water Quality Centre

DAFF Dissolved Air Flotation and Filtration

DOC Dissolved Organic Carbon

EDTA Ethylene-Diamine-Tetra-Acetic Acid

EOM Extracellular Organic Matters

Fe Iron

HPLC High Performance Liquid Chromatography

MCs Microcystins

Mn Manganese

NOM Natural Organic Matters

THM Trihalomethanes

WHO World Health Organisation

WSP Waste Stabilization Ponds

WTPs Water Treatment Plants

WWTP Waste Water Treatment Plants

Declaration

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any

other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution in my name and, to the

best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by

another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify

that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other

degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of

the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the

joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made

available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis

resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web,

via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web

search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a

period of time.

Name: Jiajia Fan

Signature:

Date: 08/12/2013

VIII

Acknowledgments

This work was undertaken at the Australian Water Quality Centre (AWQC) and was funded by the AWQC. China Scholarship Council and The University of Adelaide are gratefully acknowledged for funding the Joint PhD scholarship.

There are many people to thank during the past four years. First and foremost is my principal supervisor Justin Brookes. His wise knowledge, encouragement, patience and invaluable guidance helped me become mature in the personality and professional ability during my PhD candidature. I also would sincerely thank my co-supervisors, Peter Hobson and Lionel Ho for their great suggestions, laboratory support and significant contribution for editing thesis. Peter and Lionel also deserve a special mention as support for me to work at the AWQC. Thanks also to Rob Daly who helped me to develop a novel model to explain my experimental data and his kindness for sharing his smart ideals and professional knowledge.

I would also like to thank all the numbers of AWQC who have provided laboratory technique support or fruitful advices for my experiments. Special thanks to Sandy Dickson, Lyudmila Tsymbal, Jenny House, Qiong Huang, Edith Kozlik, Con Kapralos, Mike Burch, Tim Tang, Virginie Gaget, Melody Lau, Leon Van der Linden, Jennifer Dreyfus, Martin Harris, Julie Culbert.

Last but not least, I am grateful to all my families and friends for their emotional support and encouragement during my PhD study. Honestly, there have been many difficulties for PhD study and staying overseas alone. Thanks to my dear friends back me up and always cheer me up. It was a bit hard for my parents to support my decision coming overseas for post-graduate study since we cannot take care of each other for a long time. However, they still encouraged me to self-develop and chase the dream as a future scientist. Thanks!

Abstract

Cyanobacterial blooms could reduce the available volume of source water for use as drinking, sanitation and irrigation due to the associated toxins which could be severely harmful to humans and animals. Generally, the majority of cyanotoxins are intracellular in healthy populations but they could be released into the surrounding waters when the membranes are compromised by aging or chemical stress. However, conventional water treatment processes are not able to remove the dissolved toxins but only intracellular toxins in the intact cells. Although various chemical compounds have trialled for cyanobacterial bloom control or cyanobacterial cells/metabolites removal in water treatment processes, the effect of these treatments on the membrane integrity and toxin fate of cyanobacterial cells have not been systematically studied and compared. This study evaluated the effectiveness of copper sulphate (CuSO₄), chlorine, potassium permanganate (KMnO₄), hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) and ozone on the cell integrity, densities, toxin release and degradation of Microcystis aeruginosa cultured with ASM-1 medium. All of these technologies can compromise the cell membrane of cyanobacteria to varying degrees. Chlorine showed the strongest ability to impair the cell integrity with a majority ($\geq 88\%$) of the cells compromised within the first minute. Ozone dose of 6 mg L⁻¹ also could induce 90% lysis of the cyanobacterial cells in 5 minutes and the cell lysis rate of KMnO₄ (10 mg L⁻¹) was 0.829 h⁻¹. CuSO₄ and H₂O₂ could not only destroy the viability of cyanobacterial cells but also showed algistatic potential over the 7 day treatment. All the chemicals expect CuSO₄ could remove the total toxins and chlorine was the most effective one with the fastest rate up to 2161 M⁻¹s⁻¹. Although the intracellular toxins were liberated due to cell lysis, there was no build-up of dissolved toxins detected during chlorine and H₂O₂ exposure which may due to the faster toxin oxidation rates than release rates. 1 and 3 mg L⁻¹ KMnO₄ degraded both the intracellular and extracellular toxins with the cyanobacterial cells remaining intact while ozone induced significant increase of dissolved toxins. Wastewater reuse is important for irrigation; however, cyanobacterial blooms occurred frequently in the wastewater treatment systems with the ideal conditions for cyanobacterial growth. Tertiary treated effluent water was applied to investigate the cell lysis and toxin kinetics based on culture medium study. Similar impacts on the cyanobacterial cells were found using wastewater and medium but higher oxidant demand may be needed for wastewater treatment due to the higher concentrations of dissolved organic materials. In addition, the advantages and drawbacks of these chemicals on the downstream water quality were assessed to suggest the water authorities to choose the suitable option against cyanobacterial issues.