

Article



1

2

3

4

5 6 7

8

9

An Assessment of Physico-chemical Properties and Microbial Count in Dairy Wastewater in Savar Area, Bangladesh

Fatema Rezwana¹, Hamida Akter¹, Mohammed Abdus Samad² and Mohammad Majibur Rahman^{1,*}

1	Department of Environmental Sciences, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka 1342, Bangladesh; rez-
	wanaepty07@gmail.com (FR); sahamida73@gmail.com (HA)
2	

Animal Health Research Division, Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute (BLRI), Dhaka 1342, Bangladesh; msamad@blri.gov.bd (MAS)

* Correspondence: majibur@juniv.edu (MMR)

Abstract: The dairy sector in Bangladesh releases huge amounts of wastewater in the open environ-10 ment. Dairy wastewater is enriched with hazardous contaminants, which can cause various health 11 complications. The objective of this study was to evaluate the water quality of dairy wastewater by 12 determining the physicochemical properties of tap water, and wastewater from three farms from 13 Islamnagar zone, Savar, Dhaka, and also assess the significant impacts of wastewater on the envi-14ronment. The most important physicochemical properties investigated, thereby, include pH, total 15 dissolved solids (TDS), electrical conductivity (EC), dissolved oxygen (DO), and microbial colony 16 count. Results reveal that in tap water, the pH ranges from 7.11 to 7.20, and in wastewater, it was 17 7.30 to 7.77. The TDS in tap water ranged from 109 to 116 mg/L, and in wastewater, it went from 451 18to 2000 mg/L. The EC values were found in tap water from 0.22 to 0.23 mS/cm, whereas in 19 wastewater, they ranged from 0.86 to 13.20 mS/cm. And for DO, the tap water ranged from 4.21 to 20 6.25 mg/L; in wastewater, it was found from 0.98 to 1.86 mg/L. The pH and TDS stayed within the 21 standard limits in the physical-chemical parameters assessed. However, the EC and DO are not 22 within the DoE (Department of Environment, Bangladesh) allowed limits. In addition, more micro-23 bial colonies have occurred in wastewater than in tap water. The study demonstrates that the dis-24 charge of dairy wastewater in the open field is detrimental to our ecosystem, and a proper treatment 25 facility is essential. 26

Keywords: Dairy wastewater; Tap water; Physico-chemical; Microbial colony

27 28

29

Published: date

name

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Citation: Lastname, F.; Lastname, F.;

Lastname, F. Title. Eng. Proc. 2022, 4,

x. https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx

Academic Editor: Firstname Last-



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/license s/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

In Bangladesh, the most prevalent livestock are dairy animals. like cows and buffa-30 loes, which are very important to the development of the nation's economy. Because of 31 the fast rate of population growth, the expansion of education, and greater nutrition 32 awareness, the demand for milk and milk products is expanding. As a result of these fac-33 tors, dairy development has become a top priority in Bangladesh's economy. Apart from 34 milk production, they offer a large amount of organic manure, which is one of the most 35 important agricultural inputs in Bangladesh. Dairy farming is a side-line for practically 36 all Bangladeshi farmers [1]. In terms of essential nutrients, dairy products are among the 37 highest sources in the diets of people and play a significant role in meeting their nutri-38 tional needs. Dairy products have a relatively short life span, and as they break down, 39

they cause a lot of environmental problem. Compared to other industries, the dairy industry has become one of the significant wastewater generators in Bangladesh [2]. 41

Wastewater management has been a major issue in recent years. The effluents pro-42 duced by domestic and industrial activities are the primary sources of pollution in natural 43 water. The bad quality of wastewater effluents causes the deterioration of receiving water 44 bodies because untreated or improperly treated wastewater effluent can promote eu-45 trophication in receiving water bodies and generate circumstances that encourage the ex-46 pansion of toxin-producing cyanobacteria pathogens in the water [3]. The dairy sector is 47 one of the leading sources of wastewater, cleaning requires a large volume of water; there-48 fore, the wastewater produced may contain detergent, base, sanitizers, salts, and organic 49 materials, depending on the source (equipment cleaning vs. spills on the floor) [4]. Tem-50 perature, color, DO, COD, pH (6.5-8.0), BOD, dissolved solids, suspended particles, chlo-51 rides, sulphate, oil and grease are all factors that contain in dairy effluent. In addition, 52 dairy effluent contains soluble organics, suspended solids, and trace organics. All of these 53 factors contribute to the high biological oxygen demand (BOD) and chemical oxygen de-54 mand (COD) in the water body [5]. 55

Bacillus cereus, Bacillus subtilis, Pseudomonas fluorescens, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Esch-56 erichia coli, Enterobacter, Streptococcus faecalis, and other heterotrophic bacteria can be de-57 tected in dairy wastewater. Yeasts from the genera Candida, Saccharomyces and Cryptococ-58 cus can also be found [6]. Pathogenic bacteria, including E. coli O157:H7, Salmonella, Cam-59 pylobacter, and others, have been linked to cow manure and could contaminate crops. 60 Pathogenic bacteria and nutrients, such as sodium chloride, phosphate, and nitrate can 61 build up in soils and leach into surface and groundwaters, rendering them unfit for hu-62 man and animal use [7]. Dairy effluents degrade quickly, depleting the dissolved oxygen 63 level in receiving streams and develop anaerobic conditions and the formation of strong 64 foul odors. Wastewater disposal into rivers, land, fields, and other aquatic bodies, without 65 or with partial treatment in crude tanks, will pose many severe health and hygiene prob-66 lems in foreseeable future [4]. 67

The properties of wastewater that will be released into the aquatic environment or treated and reused must be appropriately characterized to assess its quality. Hence, this research focuses on determining the physicochemical properties of tap water and wastewater effluent from dairy farms and the bacterial colony count of both water samples to assess their quality.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Sample collection

Three domestic dairy farms in the Islamnagar region of Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 75 were selected to collect the water samples. On each farm, two samples were collected from 76 two different sources (tap water and wastewater). The selected three farms provided a 77 total of 12 samples. Tap water and wastewater samples were collected in 6 disinfected 78 plastic bottles for evaluating the physical and chemical characteristics, while samples for 79 viable microbiological count were collected in 6 falcon tubes. Plastic bags were used to 80 retain the samples. Permanent marker pens were used to write down the numbers on the 81 samples. 82

2.2. Work plan and materials

Laboratory experiments were carried out in the two specialized laboratories: 84 Department of Environmental Sciences, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka, and 85 Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute (BLRI), Savar, Dhaka. Various apparatus, instruments, and chemicals were used to carry out this study. They are as the following: 87 plastic sample bottles, falcon tubes, plastic bags, hand gloves, beaker and petridish, pH 88 meter, EC meter, DO meter, TDS meter, autoclave, incubator, vortex mixture, interscience 89 easy spiral dilute and laminar flow cabinet, distilled water, and nutrient agar media. 90

74

83

91

95

104

110

111

The color of the water samples was observed with the naked eye. Sensory measures 92 using the nose as a detector were used to determine odor. Temperature, DO, TDS, EC, and 93 pH were measured in the laboratory using their respective meters. 94

2.4. Count of microbial colony

2.3. Physicochemical properties analysis

After collecting the samples, they were taken to the laboratory and thoroughly mixed 96 with a vortex mixer. The nutrient agar media was prepared by using an autoclave. The 97 media was poured into petridish and left to settle. Using nutritional agar media Petri 98 plates, the viable microbe count was assessed. An interscience easy spiral dilutes machine 99 with a dilution factor of 10-3 was used to execute step-by-step serial dilutions of water 100 samples. The serial dilution was done using the spread plate technique and NaCl saline 101 solution. The plates were then incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. After the incubation period, 102 the petridish was observed, and the colony produced was counted. 103

2.5. Questionnaire survey

A survey was carried out to gather information about the farms, in general. Close-105 ended questions were used to collect the initial half of the socio-demographic data. The 106 second segment included open-ended questions that allowed participants to elaborate on 107 their responses. The routine practices on the farm and farm waste, such as where waste is 108 disposed of and what disinfectant is used for cleaning, were also examined. 109

3. Results

3.1. Physico-chemical analysis

Table 1 summarizes the results of the analysis of physicochemical properties of tap 112 water and dairy wastewater samples from three dairy farms. The study's findings were 113 compared to a standard established by the Department of the Environment (DoE), Bang-114 ladesh. These are National Standards for Waste Discharge Quality for Bangladesh [8]. 115

	No of Farms						Standard
Parameter	Farm #1		Farm #2		Farm #3		
I afailleter	Tap water Wastewater		Tap wa-	Waste wa-	Tap wa-	Waste wa-	by DoE
	Tap water	wastewater	ter	ter	ter	ter	DOE
Color	Clear	Light	Clear	Light	Clear	Dark	
Color	brown			brown		brown	-
Odor	Odorless	Pungent	Odorless	Pungent	Odorless	Pungent	-
Temperature	28.3	28.3	28.3	28.3	28.4	28.1	40
(°C)	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.4	20.1	40
pН	7.20	7.30	7.14	7.51	7.11	7.77	6-9
TDS (mg/l)	116	451	109	2000	112	2000	2100
EC (mS/cm)	0.23	0.86	0.22	3.93	0.22	13.20	1.2
DO (mg/l)	6.25	1.86	5.73	1.46	4.21	0.98	4.5-8

Table 3. 1: Analysis of physicochemical properties of tap water and wastewater from dairy sector. 116

3.2. Survey analysis

Demographic data from the survey provides information about the farmers' age, ed-118 ucation, and occupation. The farm-related survey collects data about farms and how they 119 run, such as the number of cows, antibiotics and disinfectants used, and so on. 120 121

Based on the questionnaire survey, the collected data is presented in the table:

Table 3. 2. Farm related information from the questionnaire survey.

117

Farm No	Use of antibiotics	Waste disposal	Use of disinfectant
Farm #1	No	Throw it in pond	Bleaching powder (2 times in a day)
Farm #2	Yes	Throw it in pond	No use of disinfectant
Farm #3	No	Throw it in pond	No use of disinfectant

3.3. Analysis of microbial colony count

The tap water and wastewater were serially diluted. The diluted factor for both type 124 of water sample was 10⁻³ and the volume of the sample was 1 ml. 125

Table 3. 3. Summarizes the results of the microbial viable count of tap water and dairy wastewater. 126

Farm No	Sample	Count	Dilution	Volume (ml)	CFU/ml
Farm# 1	Tap water	261	10-3	1	2.6×10^{5}
	Wastewater	242	10-3	1	2.4×10^5
Farm #2	Tap water	149	10-3	1	1.5×10^{5}
	Wastewater	487	10-3	1	4.9×10^5
Farm #3	Tap water	115	10-3	1	1.2×10^{5}
	Wastewater	303	10-3	1	3.0×10^{5}

4. Discussion

Color and odor: Most of the wastewater samples were light brown or dark brown, 128 whereas the tap water samples were clear, and the wastewater samples had a strong or 129 weak odor, but the tap water samples had no odor, indicating the presence of undesired 130 pollutants. 131

pH: The large range in the pH value of effluent can have an impact on the rate of 132 biological processes, the survival of different microorganisms, and the soil's quality [9]. 133 According to the current investigation, the pH appears to be under the national guideline 134 for wastewater disposal (Table 1). The pH measurements ranges from 7.30 to 7.77 shows that the effluent from these farms is just slightly alkaline (Fig. 4.1). 136

Total Dissolved Solids (TDS): The variation of the total value of dissolved solids is 137 caused by the collision of these colloidal particles, and the total solid concentration in 138 waste effluent [9]. For the effluent samples used in this investigation, TDS ranged from 139 451 to 2000 mg/l (Fig. 4.2) which is within the permitted range (Table 1). 140

Electrical Conductivity (EC): Tap water EC values ranged from 0.22 to 0.23 mS/cm, 141 whereas wastewater EC levels ranged from 0.86 to 13.20 mS/cm (Fig. 4.3). According to 142 the DoE's water quality discharge limit of 1.2 mS/cm, the EC is not within the permissible 143 level for the samples taken (Table 1). Wastewater has a higher EC than the farm's tap water 144 indicating more chemicals dissolved in the water. 145

Dissolved Oxygen (DO): One of the key factors in determining the quality of water 146 is the amount of dissolved oxygen in the water, which is necessary to support a range of 147 aquatic life forms [9]. In the present study, the DO is not within the allowed threshold for 148the samples taken, according to the DoE's standard (Table 1). The wastewater on all of the 149 farms had a lower DO than the farm's tap water, indicating that more microorganisms in 150 the wastewater use more oxygen for respiration (Fig. 4.4). 151

127

123









Figure 4.3: Variation in the value of EC (mS/cm).



Figure 4.2: Variation in the value of TDS (mg/l).

Figure 4.4: Variation in the value of DO (mg/l).

154 155

152

153

Microbial viable count: As seen in the Figure, microbial colonies form more fre-156 quently in tap water than in wastewater. 157



Figure 4.5: Microbial colony count (F 1). Figure 4.6: Microbial colony count (F 2). Figure 4.7: Microbial colony count (F 3).

> According to the survey, the Farm #1 uses bleaching powder twice daily, which is 160 why the wastewater has a smaller microbial colony than tap water. 161

> Environmental Impact: Compared to other toxic solid and gaseous waste, the or-162 ganic wastewater emitted by the dairy sector is highly detrimental to the ecosystem. Fresh 163 water sources are harmed in every way by the organic garbage dumped into them [2]. 164Low amounts of dissolved oxygen influence fish survival by raising their susceptibility to 165 disease, slowing down their growth, and long-term reductions can modify the species' 166 makeup. Water bodies that receive wastewater effluent may also undergo physical 167 changes. Many direct and indirect environmental consequences can result from the dis-168 charge of suspended solids into receiving waters, including reduced sunlight penetration, 169

physical injury to fish, and toxic effects from toxins linked to suspended particles. The 170 phenomenon of bioaccumulation and biomagnifications is one of the potential health ef-171 fects of untreated wastewater effluent on the environment [3]. 172

5. Conclusions

In the current study, the wastewater samples taken from the study area are light 174 brown and slightly alkaline. All water samples' pH and TDS levels are within the accepta-175 ble range. The Farm #1 is within the acceptable limit regarding electrical conductivity, but 176 the EC values of the other two farms are not. DO levels in the tests conducted on any of 177 the farms were found to be higher than the allowable limit. For two farms, the microbio-178 logical quality of all the water samples in this study was poor. In Farms #2 and #3, 179 wastewater contains more microbes than that of tap water. Because this farm discharges 180enormous volumes of wastewater effluents into the adjacent pond and soil regularly, the 181 soil, surface water, and groundwater might be contaminated. As a result, remediation and 182 mitigation of these effluents' overall consequences on receiving water bodies and soil are 183 required. Wastewater should be treated before release to avoid contamination of soil and 184 water bodies. Planning, monitoring, management, treatment, and legislation are recom-185 mended for maintaining the water quality. 186

Author Contributions: FR: Sample collection, methodology, data analysis, original draft preparation, review and editing; HA: Data analysis, original draft preparation, review and editing; MAS: Investigation, conceptualization, review and editing, supervision; MMR: Investigation, conceptualization, review and editing, supervision.

Acknowledgments: The authors are thankful to Water Research Center, Department of Environmental Sciences, Jahangirnagar University, and Animal Health Laboratory, BLRI, for providing laboratory facilities. FR is grateful to Md. Samun Sarker and Ms. Ayesha Ahmed, Animal Health Laboratory, BLRI, for supplying necessary reagents and helping out in the laboratory analysis.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1]G. Edwards and A. . Shamsuddoha, "Dairy Industry in Bangladesh : Problems and Prospects," " Dairy Ind. Bangladesh Probl. Prospect. ", 1-26, 2000. 201
- [2]G. J. Joshiba, P. S. Kumar, C. C. Femina, E. Jayashree, R. Racchana, and S. Sivanesan, "Critical review on biological treatment 202 strategies of dairy wastewater," Desalin. Water Treat., 160, 94-109, 2019, doi: 10.5004/dwt.2019.24194. 203
- [3]O. B. Akpor and M. Muchie, "Environmental and public health implications of wastewater quality," African J. Biotechnol., 10(13), 204 2379-2387, 2011. 205
- [4]A. Tikariha and O. Sahu, "Study of Characteristics and Treatments of Dairy Industry Waste Water," J. Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 2(1), 16–22, 2014, doi: 10.12691/jaem-2-1-4.
- [5]N. P. Shete, Bharati & Shinkar, "Dairy Industry Wastewater Sources, Characteristics & its Effects on Environment," Int. J. Curr. Eng. Technol. ISSN 2277-4106, 3(5), 1611–1615, 2013, [Online]. Available: http://inpressco.com/category/ijcet.
- [6]R. S. Al-Wasify, M. N. Ali, and S. R. Hamed, "Biodegradation of dairy wastewater using bacterial and fungal local isolates," Water Sci. Technol., 76(11), 3094-3100, 2017, doi: 10.2166/wst.2017.481.
- [7]J. A. McGarvey, W. G. Miller, S. Sanchez, C. J. Silva, and L. C. Whitehand, "Comparison of bacterial populations and chemical composition of dairy wastewater held in circulated and stagnant lagoons," J. Appl. Microbiol., 99(4), 867-877, 2005, doi: 213 10.1111/j.1365-2672.2005.02662.x. 214
- [8]Department of Environment "Guide for Assessment of Effluent Treatment Plants," Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate 215 Change., Government of People's Republic of Bangladesh, 2008. 216
- [9]A. Verma and A. Singh, "Physico-Chemical Analysis of Dairy Industrial Effluent," Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci., vol. 6, no. 7, 217 pp. 1769-1775, 2017, doi: 10.20546/ijcmas.2017.607.213. 218

173

199 200

187

188

189

190

191 192

193

194

195

196 197

198

219 220

206

207