Heavy Metal Contamination in Wastewater and Analytical Techniques for Its Determination

Dr. Lokesh Mathur[1], Gaurav Vaishnav[2], Dr. Mohd.Raees[3]
[1,2]*Department of Chemistry, Lachoo Memorial College, Jodhpur, Rajasthan*
[3]*Department of Chemistry,Maulana Azad University Jodhpur.*

***Abstract*—Water pollution caused by industrial effluents has become one of the most serious environmental concerns because wastewater frequently carries toxic inorganic contaminants that persist in natural systems and threaten human health. Among these contaminants, heavy metals are particularly important because they are non-biodegradable, chemically stable, and capable of bioaccumulating through food chains. Their presence in aquatic environments is associated with industrial activities such as electroplating, mining, fertilizer production, leather treatment, battery manufacturing, pigments, and pharmaceutical processing. The uploaded article identifies heavy metals such as arsenic, cadmium, chromium, nickel, copper, lead, mercury, zinc, and manganese as major pollutants of concern in wastewater systems. This review discusses the environmental significance of heavy metal contamination, summarizes their major sources and toxic effects, and presents conventional instrumental techniques used for their determination in aqueous matrices, including atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS), inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS), inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (ICP-OES), X-ray fluorescence spectrometry (XRF), and atomic force microscopy (AFM). In addition, the paper evaluates the comparative utility of these methods with respect to sensitivity, selectivity, speed, sample preparation, instrumentation complexity, and economic feasibility. The discussion highlights that no single analytical platform is universally ideal, and method selection must depend on the concentration range of analytes, sample composition, number of elements to be determined, and intended environmental application.**

***Index Terms*—heavy metals; wastewater; toxicity; analytical techniques; environmental pollution.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Freshwater quality is under continuous stress due to industrialization, urban growth, rising population, and unsystematic disposal of wastes into natural water bodies. Wastewater contaminated with heavy metals is especially problematic because these elements are not easily degraded and may remain in environmental compartments for prolonged periods. Once released into water, soil, or sediment, heavy metals may undergo transport, adsorption, dissolution, precipitation, and biological uptake, thereby creating long-term ecological and toxicological risks.

The source article explains that heavy metal contamination is common in developing and industrializing regions where sectors such as metal finishing, mining, fertilizer industries, leather processing, batteries, and pharmaceuticals generate significant metal-bearing effluents. Although some metals are essential micronutrients at very low levels, their excessive concentration produces harmful biochemical, physiological, and pathological effects in living systems. Metals such as Pb, Hg, Cd, and as are described as highly toxic because of their strong association with organ damage, carcinogenicity, neurological disorders, and chronic poisoning.

The public-health importance of this topic is evident from the establishment of drinking-water guideline limits by regulatory agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). When these limits are exceeded, prolonged exposure through drinking water, food-chain transfer, or occupational contact can create severe risks for humans and ecosystems. Therefore, accurate quantification of heavy metals in wastewater is not only an analytical problem but also a central requirement for pollution assessment, regulatory compliance, treatment design, and environmental protection.

This review-style research paper expands the material in the attached article into a fuller academic format by discussing the chemistry of heavy metal contamination, the toxicological significance of specific metals, and the working principles, strengths, and limitations of widely applied detection techniques. The expanded discussion is intended to make the manuscript read more like a substantial journal paper suitable for refinement under Rasayan Journal formatting requirements.

II. HEAVY METAL CONTAMINATION IN WASTEWATER

Heavy metal ions enter wastewater from both natural and anthropogenic sources, but industrial discharge remains the dominant concern in polluted systems. Important contributors include electroplating units, mining and smelting operations, metal-refining industries, textile and dyeing units, leather tanning plants, battery manufacturing, paint and pigment industries, and fertilizer-associated activities. Because many of these processes use metal salts, catalysts, coatings, or metallic raw materials, untreated or poorly treated wastewater may contain hazardous concentrations of dissolved and suspended metal species.

A major environmental challenge with heavy metals is that they do not decompose into harmless end products under ordinary environmental conditions. Instead, they may persist in sediments, adsorb onto particulate matter, or cycle repeatedly between dissolved and solid phases. Their toxic effect is often amplified by bioaccumulation and biomagnification, through which repeated exposure results in concentration of metals in plant tissues, aquatic organisms, animals, and ultimately humans.

The environmental behavior of a heavy metal also depends on its oxidation state, solubility, ligand interactions, and affinity for organic or inorganic matter. This is why the same metal may show very different mobility and toxicity under different wastewater conditions. For example, chromium in the hexavalent form is significantly more hazardous than trivalent chromium, illustrating the importance of chemical speciation in environmental monitoring.

III. MAJOR HEAVY METALS AND TOXICOLOGICAL EFFECTS

The attached article summarizes several heavy metals that are frequently encountered in wastewater and emphasizes both their industrial origins and harmful health consequences. A review-style paper benefits from discussing these metals individually because their toxic pathways and environmental significance are not identical.

Arsenic

Arsenic contamination is linked to fossil-fuel combustion, mining activities, and pesticide-related applications. The source document associates arsenic exposure with vascular disease and visceral cancers, highlighting its significance as a carcinogenic contaminant in water systems. Even when present at low levels, chronic arsenic exposure is a matter of concern because it can persist in contaminated groundwater and enter food pathways.

Cadmium

Cadmium is introduced through mining, welding, refining, fertilizers, smelting, plastic-associated industries, and electrochemical applications. The article notes that cadmium compounds are highly toxic even at low concentrations and may cause kidney and lung damage as well as liver toxicity. Because cadmium can accumulate in the ecosystem and in biological tissues, its long-term monitoring is essential in industrial wastewater surveillance.

Chromium

Chromium is heavily associated with tanning, electroplating, textile operations, steel processing, and leather industries. The manuscript points out that chromium may exist as Cr (III) and Cr (VI), with hexavalent chromium being substantially more toxic than trivalent chromium. Cr (VI) is linked to irritation, respiratory effects, cancer risk, and food-chain accumulation, whereas Cr (III) has some metabolic importance in lower concentrations.

Nickel

Nickel in wastewater may arise from storage batteries, electroplating, porcelain enameling, and paint-related industries. According to the uploaded article, nickel exposure is associated with dermatitis, nausea, chronic asthma, coughing, and carcinogenic outcomes. This makes nickel particularly important in occupational as well as environmental exposure assessment.

Copper

Copper is released from mining, electroplating, batteries, pesticides, and copper-containing vessels or equipment. Although copper is a biologically relevant trace element, excess intake or exposure can produce liver damage and related physiological disturbances such as insomnia, as noted in the source article. Monitoring copper is therefore necessary in wastewater streams where industrial usage is high.

Lead

Lead remains one of the most widely recognized toxic metals because of its severe effects on multiple organ systems. The source document identifies batteries, mining, pigments, paint, explosives, and electroplating among major sources and states that lead can damage the nervous system, kidneys, reproductive system, brain function, and basic cellular processes. Clinical manifestations such as headache, dizziness, irritability, hallucinations, muscular weakness, and renal impairment further underline its toxicological significance.

Mercury

Mercury is described in the article as a potent neurotoxin with the capacity to damage the central nervous system. Its sources include batteries, mining, and paper and paint industries, while higher exposure levels may also affect kidney and lung function. The reference to Minamata Bay in the uploaded article illustrates the historic and continuing relevance of mercury pollution in aquatic environments.

Zinc and Manganese

Zinc and manganese occupy a more complex position appropriate physiological conditions, yet excessive exposure remains harmful. Excess zinc may produce nausea, vomiting, anemia, skin irritation, and stomach cramping, whereas manganese exposure is associated with neurological and psychological symptoms. Their inclusion in wastewater monitoring programs is still necessary because concentration determines whether their role is beneficial or toxic.

Regulatory Importance of Concentration Limits

The article includes guideline values for several heavy metals in drinking water according to WHO and USEPA. These limits are crucial because they convert toxicological knowledge into measurable regulatory thresholds that can guide monitoring and treatment decisions. For arsenic, cadmium, chromium, nickel, copper, lead, mercury, zinc, and manganese, the permitted concentrations vary, but in each case the limit is intended to reduce long-term exposure and protect public health.

In wastewater management, such limits have practical value beyond drinking-water compliance. They support risk assessment, determine whether wastewater requires advanced treatment, and help prioritize analytical sensitivity when choosing detection methods. Metals with very low permissible limits, such as mercury and cadmium, demand methods capable of reliable trace or ultra-trace quantification.

IV. DETECTION TECHNIQUES FOR HEAVY METALS

Sensitive and reliable analytical techniques are required because heavy metals often occur at low concentrations and in complex wastewater matrices. The source article focuses on five major instrumental approaches and explains their principles and practical relevance.

Atomic Absorption Spectrometry (AAS)

AAS is one of the most established methods for metal analysis and has been widely used for quantitative determination of more than 70 elements in either solution or solid form. Its analytical basis lies in atomizing the sample and measuring the absorption of radiation at element-specific wavelengths, after which concentration is calculated by calibration with known standards. Flame atomization and electrothermal atomization are commonly employed depending on the required sensitivity and sample characteristics.

A major strength of AAS is its specificity and reliability for elemental analysis. The uploaded article presents AAS as a respected and dependable method for heavy metal determination despite the emergence of newer plasma-based techniques. In practical terms, AAS is especially useful where the number of analytes is limited and the laboratory seeks well-established methodology with acceptable cost and good accuracy.

V. INDUCTIVELY COUPLED PLASMA MASS SPECTROMETRY (ICP-MS)

ICP-MS is a powerful multi-element technique in which the sample is introduced into a plasma, atomized and ionized, and then analyzed by a mass spectrometer according to mass-to-charge ratio. The source text emphasizes its excellent detection limits and describes it as suitable for ultrasensitive detection of metalloids and trace metal species. Its ability to identify multiple elements rapidly makes it highly attractive in environmental and industrial laboratories. Another important feature of ICP-MS is its usefulness in speciation-related contexts where trace elements may be distributed among different chemical forms. The article also notes that it can analyze all components within a very short time, though method development and operation require high technical expertise. Thus, ICP-MS offers exceptional analytical performance but may involve greater capital cost and operational complexity than simpler methods.

VI. INDUCTIVELY COUPLED PLASMA OPTICAL EMISSION SPECTROMETRY (ICP-OES)

ICP-OES is another multi-element plasma-based technique and determines concentration by measuring light emitted from excited atoms in the plasma. Because the intensity of emitted radiation correlates with analyte concentration, the method can quantify multiple trace elements rapidly and over a broad linear range. The article highlights its capability for simultaneous determination at nanogram-per-milliliter levels and notes its usefulness for limited biological samples and refractory elements.

The heating efficiency of the plasma source, reported in the article as reaching approximately 10,000 degrees Celsius, ensures efficient atomization of many analytes. Compared with single-element methods, ICP-OES provides greater throughput where many metals must be screened in one run. This makes it particularly suitable for routine monitoring laboratories dealing with diverse wastewater samples.

VII. X-RAY FLUORESCENCE SPECTROMETRY (XRF)

XRF relies on the interaction between incident high-energy radiation and atoms within the sample. When inner-shell electrons are displaced, outer-shell electrons fill the vacancies and emit characteristic X-ray fluorescence that can be measured to identify elemental composition. According to the uploaded manuscript, XRF is highly useful for heavy metal analysis and offers several operational advantages over some conventional methods.

The main strengths of XRF include minimal sample preparation for solids, faster overall analysis, low operating cost, reduced hazardous waste, and portability. These features make it attractive for screening applications, field use, and comparative elemental analysis in environmental matrices. However, because environmental samples are often heterogeneous and analytically complex, calibration, matrix effects, and sensitivity requirements must still be considered carefully.

VIII. ATOMIC FORCE MICROSCOPY (AFM)

AFM differs from the other techniques because it is primarily a surface-analysis and nanoscale characterization tool rather than a conventional elemental quantification method. The article describes AFM as part of scanning probe microscopy and notes its major functions as imaging, manipulation, and force measurement. By measuring probe-sample interactions through a cantilever-based system, AFM can generate high-resolution three-dimensional surface images and enable controlled surface modification.

Within a broader heavy-metal research context, AFM may support characterization of adsorbents, coatings, nanosurfaces, or material interfaces relevant to detection and remediation. Although it is more complex and specialized than routine chemical quantification methods, its flexibility makes it valuable in advanced analytical and materials-oriented studies.

IX. COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION OF ANALYTICAL METHODS

Each of the reviewed techniques occupies a distinct analytical niche. AAS is highly specific and reliable for routine metal analysis, especially when a relatively small number of elements must be quantified. ICP-MS offers the best trace-level sensitivity and excellent multi-element performance, whereas ICP-OES balances multi-element capability with fast throughput and a broad working range.

XRF is particularly attractive when portability, speed, and low sample preparation are important. AFM, by contrast, is best understood as a complementary high-resolution technique for structural and surface investigation rather than a direct replacement for elemental quantification platforms. These distinctions show that analytical performance must always be interpreted in relation to the practical monitoring objective.

Method selection in wastewater analysis should therefore be based on several criteria: expected analyte concentration, number of metals to be detected, sample throughput, matrix complexity, instrument availability, operator expertise, environmental safety, and cost. A laboratory focused on routine compliance testing may choose differently from a research laboratory concerned with ultra-trace speciation or nanoscale surface characterization. This contextual approach is one of the central analytical insights supported by the uploaded article.

X. FUTURE SCOPE

The conclusion of the source article emphasizes that heavy metal pollution in wastewater will remain a major concern for present and future environmental protection efforts. Building on that point, expanded academic discussion suggests that future work should focus on improving analytical sensitivity, simplifying field deployment, reducing cost, and enhancing performance in real wastewater matrices rather than ideal laboratory samples. There is also clear value in integrating detection systems with rapid treatment decision-making for industries that generate metal-rich effluents.

Another important future direction is the development of methods that combine low detection limits with portability and simpler sample preparation. As regulatory standards become stricter and wastewater compositions become more complex, analytical systems must also become more selective, faster, and more practical for continuous monitoring. The source material supports the view that the future of heavy metal analysis lies not merely in higher sensitivity, but in balanced performance across analytical, operational, and economic dimensions.

XI. CONCLUSION

Heavy metal contamination of wastewater is a serious environmental issue because these pollutants are persistent, toxic, and capable of accumulating in living systems. Industrial sectors such as electroplating, mining, leather processing, battery production, pigments, and fertilizer-related manufacturing are major contributors to metal-laden effluents. Metals including arsenic, cadmium, chromium, nickel, copper, lead, mercury, zinc, and manganese differ in their sources and toxicological effects, but each can become hazardous when present above safe limits.

The source article demonstrates that reliable detection is essential for pollution assessment, health-risk reduction, and wastewater treatment planning. AAS, ICP-MS, ICP-OES, XRF, and AFM each contribute valuable capabilities, yet their usefulness depends on analytical sensitivity, sample type, throughput, matrix complexity, and economic feasibility. Consequently, selection of an appropriate detection method should be based on a realistic understanding of the monitoring objective rather than on analytical sensitivity alone. The expanded paper therefore positions heavy metal detection as a multidisciplinary challenge linking chemistry, instrumentation, toxicology, regulation, and environmental management.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Rajoria, M. Vashishtha, and V. K. Sangal, "Treatment of electroplating industry wastewater: A review on the various techniques," *Environmental Engineering Research*, 2022.

[2] F. Fu and Q. Wang, "Removal of heavy metal ions from wastewaters: A review," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 92, no. 3, pp. 407–418, 2011.

[3] S. Bajpai, A. Dey, M. K. Jha, S. K. Gupta, and A. Gupta, "Removal of hazardous hexavalent chromium from aqueous solution using divinylbenzene copolymer resin," *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 2014.

[4] R. Sasidharan and A. Kumar, "Magnetic adsorbent developed with alkali-thermal pretreated biogas slurry solids for the removal of heavy metals: Optimization, kinetic, and equilibrium study," *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 2021.

[5] M. A. Barakat, "New trends in removing heavy metals from industrial wastewater," *Arabian Journal of Chemistry*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 361–377, 2011.

[6] B. J. Alloway, "Heavy metals in soils: A review," *Environmental Pollution*, 2013.

[7] Azimi, A. Azari, M. Rezakazemi, and M. Ansarpour, “Removal of heavy metals from industrial wastewaters: A review,” *ChemBioEng Reviews*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 37–59, 2017.

[8] Z. Al-Qodah and M. Al-Shannag, “Heavy metal ions removal from wastewater using electrocoagulation processes: A comprehensive review,” *Separation Science and Technology*, vol. 52, no. 17, pp. 2649–2676, 2017.

[9] S. Rajoria, M. Vashishtha, and V. K. Sangal, “Review on the treatment of electroplating industry wastewater by electrochemical methods,” *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2021.

[10] R. Shrestha, S. Devkota, S. Sharma, R. Joshi, A. P. Tiwari, H. Y. Kim, *et al*., “Technological trends in heavy metals removal from industrial wastewater: A review,” *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, 2021.

[11] R. Vidu, E. Matei, A. M. Predescu, B. Alhalaili, C. Pantilimon, C. Tarcea, *et al*., “Removal of heavy metals from wastewaters: A challenge from current treatment methods to nanotechnology applications,” *Toxics*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 112, 2020.

[12] S. Sawan, R. Maalouf, A. Errachid, and N. Jaffrezic-Renault, “Metal and metal oxide nanoparticles in the voltammetric detection of heavy metals: A review,” *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, vol. 131, Art. no. 116014, 2020.

[13] C. F. Carolin, P. S. Kumar, A. Saravanan, G. J. Joshiba, and M. Naushad, “Efficient techniques for the removal of toxic heavy metals from aquatic environment: A review,” *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 2782–2799, 2017.

[14] T. Z. Sadyrbaeva, “Removal of chromium (VI) from aqueous solutions using a novel hybrid liquid membrane-electrodialysis process,” *Chemical Engineering and Processing*, 2016.

[15] P. Malaviya and A. Singh, “Physicochemical technologies for remediation of chromium-containing waters and wastewaters,” *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, vol. 41, no. 12, pp. 1111–1172, 2011.

[16] K. H. Vardhan, P. S. Kumar, and R. C. Panda, “A review on heavy metal pollution, toxicity and remedial measures: Current trends and future perspectives,” *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, vol. 290, Art. no. 111197, 2019.

[17] R. K. Soodan, Y. B. Pakade, A. Nagpal, and J. K. Katnoria, “Analytical techniques for estimation of heavy metals in soil ecosystem: A tabulated review,” *Talanta*, vol. 125, pp. 405–410, 2014.

[18] J. Q. McComb, C. Rogers, F. X. Han, and P. B. Tchounwou, “Rapid screening of heavy metals and trace elements in environmental samples using portable X-ray fluorescence spectrometer: A comparative study,” *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*, 2014.

[19] L. A. Malik, A. Bashir, A. Qureashi, and A. H. Pandith, “Detection and removal of heavy metal ions: A review,” *Environmental Chemistry Letters*, vol. 17, pp. 1495–1521, 2019.