Comparative Study On Filtration Techniques For Pond Water Treatment

Mrs.G.Hemalatha[1], Mr.T.Sathieshkumar[2], Mrs.S.Sharmila[3], Mrs.R.Jeevika[4]
[1]Dept of Civil Engineering
[2, 3, 4]Assistant Professor, Dept of Civil Engineering
[1, 2] Gnanamani College of Technology,Pachal,Namakkal - 637 018
[3, 4] Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan Engineering College(A), Perambalur,621212.

Abstract- *Untreated pond water frequently has significant levels of turbidity, hardness, nitrates, and chlorides, rendering it unfit for drinking and other uses. Contaminants such as suspended particles, germs, and dissolved salts can endanger human health and impair water quality. This study compares the efficacy of four filtration technologies for improving pond water quality: microfiltration (MF), ultrafiltration (UF), nanofiltration (NF), and reverse osmosis (RO). The findings indicate that MF and UF successfully reduce turbidity and suspended solids, but NF provides moderate purification by reducing pollutants to tolerable levels. RO produces the highest quality water by considerably eliminating all contaminants, making it suitable for drinking and other delicate uses. The study emphasizes the necessity of choosing the right filtration system based on water quality requirements, cost, and efficiency.*

Keywords- Pond water treatment, Filtration techniques, Microfiltration, Ultrafiltration, Nanofiltration, Reverse Osmosis, Water quality improvement

I. INTRODUCTION

Water is vital for survival and is integral to agriculture, industry, and ecosystems; nevertheless, population increase, industrialization, and climate change are intensifying the strain on freshwater resources. Ponds, prevalent in rural and semi-urban regions, function as essential water supplies for irrigation, domestic purposes, aquaculture, and livestock; yet, they frequently become contaminated with contaminants, including pathogens, heavy metals, pesticides, and excess nutrients, so posing threats to human health and the environment. Efficient water treatment is essential for guaranteeing safe and sustainable utilization. Conventional pond water treatment techniques, such as sedimentation, filtration, coagulation, and chlorination, mitigate turbidity and microbial contamination; however, they frequently prove inadequate in eliminating dissolved organic matter and heavy metals (Schulz & Okun, 1984). Slow sand filtration improves pathogen elimination through the biological layer that develops on the sand surface, whereas sedimentation is economical but lacks thorough purification (Elliott, 1991). Activated carbon filtering efficiently eliminates odors, tastes, and dissolved organic carbon (Yin et al., 2016); nevertheless, conventional methods frequently depend on chemical additives and produce sludge, hence requiring more sophisticated and sustainable alternatives.

Effective pond water treatment guarantees safe utilization, diminishes reliance on bottled water, and promotes environmental sustainability by enhancing the accessibility of local water supplies (Kochkodan et al., 2008). Multiple purification methods, including physical processes like sedimentation and filtering, eliminate suspended particles; nonetheless, these procedures may not achieve comprehensive purification (Elliott, 1991). Chemical treatments such as coagulation and flocculation effectively diminish turbidity, eliminate organic matter, and eradicate microbes (Sillanpaa et al., 2018), whereas disinfection techniques like chlorination and ozonation focus on pathogens, with ozone treatment necessitating specialized equipment and incurring higher costs (von Gunten, 2003). Biological techniques, such as built wetlands, employ microbial decomposition, plant uptake, and adsorption to eliminate pollutants in an environmentally sustainable manner (Vymazal, 2010). The growing demand for sophisticated and sustainable filtration methods is essential for enhancing pond water quality and guaranteeing its safe utilization in diverse applications.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Materials

The research included the collecting and examination of pond water samples from designated sites. The utilized components comprised pH indicators, coagulants including alum and ferric chloride, and filtration medium such as activated carbon and sand. All reagents were of analytical grade to provide accurate and dependable findings.

2.2 Collection of Pond Water Samples

Pond Water samples from local ponds were obtained utilizing clean and sanitized containers. Water samples were obtained in sanitized plastic bottles in accordance with IS 3025 (Part 1):1987 standards for water sampling and preservation. The bottles were meticulously washed prior to sample collection to prevent contamination. The samples were preserved at 4°C to inhibit microbial proliferation and guarantee precision in later analyses.Figure 1 depicts the source of the pond water used in the investigation. The image depicts the natural water body where the sample was obtained for testing.

Figure1 Source of pond water

Diverse materials were employed for water purification. Coagulating substances such as alum ($Al_2(SO_4)_3 \cdot 18H_2O$) and ferric chloride ($FeCl_3$) facilitated particle removal. Filtration medium, including sand and activated carbon, were employed to capture suspended particles and organic contaminants. Disinfectants such as sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) and ozone (O_3) effectively eradicate germs and viruses. Membrane filters, such as ultrafiltration (UF) and reverse osmosis (RO), were employed to eliminate dissolved contaminants.

2.3 Filtration Procedure

Subsequent to coagulation, the water traversed a multi-stage filtering system. Initially, sand filtering eliminated bigger particulates. Subsequently, activated carbon filtering facilitated the elimination of organic contaminants, undesirable aromas, and unpleasant flavors. The efficacy of this method was evaluated by quantifying the decrease in turbidity and organic matter.

2.4 Membrane Filtration

Ultrafiltration (UF) and reverse osmosis (RO) membranes were employed to enhance the purification of the water. These membranes facilitated the elimination of tiny particulates, dissolved salts, and organic contaminants. The efficacy of both approaches was evaluated by assessing water flow rate, contaminant elimination, and membrane obstruction. Sodium hypochlorite (chlorine) or ozone was introduced to the filtered water to eliminate detrimental microbes. The efficacy of disinfection was assessed by evaluating bacterial decrease and quantifying residual chlorine levels. Ozone treatment was evaluated for its efficacy in degrading organic contaminants.

2.5 Post-Treatment Evaluation

Subsequent to the comprehensive treatment, the water samples were re-evaluated for turbidity, total dissolved solids (TDS), microbiological contamination, and chemical contaminants. The results were juxtaposed with the initial values to assess the enhancement in water quality. The procedure was reiterated several times to guarantee uniform and dependable outcomes.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Water Quality Parameters

The water quality parameters before and after each treatment phase demonstrate a notable enhancement in water purity. The pH remains consistent during the process, exhibiting a minor reduction from 7.2 to 7.0 following Reverse Osmosis (RO). Dissolved oxygen (DO) rises from 3.0 mg/L prior to treatment to 7.0 mg/L during reverse osmosis, indicating improved oxygenation resulting from contaminant elimination. Nitrate concentrations, initially surpassing the permissible threshold of 50 mg/L, gradually diminish to a safe level of 10 mg/L following reverse osmosis. Chloride concentration diminishes from 300 mg/L in raw water to 50 mg/L following reverse osmosis, ensuring safe consumption.

A considerable reduction in turbidity is evident, decreasing from 10 NTU to 0.1 NTU, hence producing clearer water. The water temperature remains stable at 28°C, signifying that filtering operations do not affect the temperature. The hardness, initially quantified at 250 mg/L, progressively diminishes, with reverse osmosis attaining the most substantial reduction to 50 mg/L, rendering the water softer and more appropriate for ingestion. The data underscores the efficacy of the treatment methods, with Microfiltration (MF) and Ultrafiltration (UF) offering initial purification, but Nanofiltration (NF) and Reverse Osmosis (RO) are essential for producing high-quality water that complies with safe drinking standards.Table 1 compares water quality measurements before and after treatment, demonstrating improvements. Table 2 compares membrane filtration technologies in terms of efficiency and application.

Table 1 Water quality parameters before and after each treatment process

Parameter	**Acceptable Range (IS Code)**	**Before treatment**	**After MF**	**After UF**	**After NF**	**After RO**
pH	6.5 - 8.5	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.0
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	> 5 mg/L	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0
Nitrate (mg/L)	< 45 mg/L	50	45	40	30	10
Chloride (mg/L)	< 250 mg/L	300	280	250	200	50
Turbidity (NTU)	< 1 NTU	10	5	2	1	0.1
Water Temperature (°C)	23-25	28	28	28	28	28
Hardness (mg/L as CaCO3)	< 200 mg/L	250	240	220	180	50

Table 2 Comparative Analysis of Membrane Filtration Methods

Parameter	**Microfiltration (MF)**	**Ultrafiltration (UF)**	**Nanofiltration (NF)**	**Reverse Osmosis (RO)**
Removal Efficiency	Particulates, bacteria	Bacteria, viruses, some organic molecules	Salts, heavy metals, organic compounds	Dissolved salts, organic/inorganic pollutants
Turbidity Removal	Moderate	High	Very High	Near Complete
Hardness Reduction	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
Nitrate Reduction	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
Chloride Reduction	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
Bacteria & Virus Removal	60 - 90%	90 - 99%	99%	99.9%
Energy Consumption	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
Chemical Requirement	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Application Areas	Pretreatment, Drinking water	Industrial & Domestic Water Treatment	Brackish Water, Softening	Desalination, Purification of Wastewater
Cost Factor	Low	Moderate	High	Very High

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated various filtration techniques—Microfiltration (MF), Ultrafiltration (UF), Nanofiltration (NF), and Reverse Osmosis (RO)—to enhance pond water quality. The findings indicate that each approach exhibits differing degrees of efficacy in diminishing hardness, turbidity, nitrate, and chloride concentrations.The hardness of the pond water was initially elevated at 250 mg/L. MF and UF exerted minimal influence, whereas NF decreased it to 180 mg/L. Reverse osmosis (RO) proved to be the most efficacious method, reducing the concentration to 50 mg/L. The turbidity commenced at 10 NTU. Microfiltration (MF), ultrafiltration (UF), and nanofiltration (NF) progressively decreased the turbidity to 5, 2, and 1 NTU, respectively, whilst reverse osmosis (RO) attained the highest clarity at 0.1 NTU. Nitrate concentrations were elevated at 50 mg/L. MF and UF achieved minor enhancements, NF reduced it to 30 mg/L, and RO decreased it to a secure 10 mg/L.

The chloride concentration was 300 mg/L. Microfiltration (MF) and ultrafiltration (UF) exhibited little effects, whereas nanofiltration (NF) decreased it to 200 mg/L, and reverse osmosis (RO) substantially reduced it to 50 mg/L. In summary, microfiltration (MF) and ultrafiltration (UF) are proficient in eliminating turbidity and suspended particles, although they have a restricted influence on dissolved contaminants. NF offers moderate purification, rendering the water appropriate for agricultural applications. Reverse osmosis is the optimal method for obtaining high-quality water, rendering it safe for consumption and other delicate uses.

REFERENCES

[1] Achilli, A., Cath, T. Y., Childress, A. E., & Elimelech, M. (2009). Power generation with pressure retarded osmosis: An experimental and theoretical investigation. *Journal of Membrane Science, 343*(1-2), 42-52.

[2] Anderson, D. M., Glibert, P. M., & Burkholder, J. M. (2010). Harmful algal blooms and eutrophication: Nutrient sources, composition, and consequences. *Estuaries and Coasts, 25*(4), 704-726.

[3] Baker, R. W. (2012). *Membrane technology and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.

[4] Barredo-Damas, S., &Alcaina-Miranda, M. I. (2013). Advanced membrane technology and applications in the pulp and paper industry. *Water Research, 47*(14), 5037-5048.

[5] Bratby, J. (2006). *Coagulation and flocculation in water and wastewater treatment*. IWA Publishing.

[6] Cheryan, M., & Rajagopalan, N. (1998). Membrane processing of oily streams: Wastewater treatment and waste reduction. *Journal of Membrane Science, 151*(1), 13-28.

[7] Crittenden, J. C., Trussell, R. R., Hand, D. W., Howe, K. J., &Tchobanoglous, G. (2012). *MWH's water treatment: Principles and design*. John Wiley & Sons.

[8] Elliott, A. H. (1991). Sedimentation tanks: Design and operation. *Water Research, 25*(12), 1469-1475.

[9] Fane, A. G., & Wang, R. (2006). Membrane technology for water: Microfiltration, ultrafiltration, nanofiltration, and reverse osmosis. In *Environmental engineering: Prevention and remediation of environmental problems from nanotechnology* (pp. 337-375). CRC Press.

[10] Fletcher, T. D., Shuster, W., Hunt, W. F., Ashley, R., Butler, D., Arthur, S., & Muthukrishnan, S. (2015). SUDS, LID, BMPs, WSUD and more–The evolution and application of terminology surrounding urban drainage. *Urban Water Journal, 12*(7), 525-542.

[11] Goh, P. S., Lau, W. J., Othman, M. H. D., & Ismail, A. F. (2013). Membrane fouling in desalination and its mitigation strategies. *Desalination, 336*, 105-116.

[12] Goh, P. S., Ismail, A. F., & Ng, B. C. (2019). Energy consumption in reverse osmosis (RO) desalination plants: A review on the influence of feedwater temperature. *Desalination, 451*, 75-86.

[13] Kadlec, R. H., & Wallace, S. D. (2008). *Treatment wetlands*. CRC Press.

[14] Kim, J., Lee, S., & Kim, S. (2021). Review of membrane technologies in water and wastewater treatment processes: Applications, challenges, and future prospects. *Environmental Research, 202*, 111646.

[15] Kucera, J. (2015). *Reverse osmosis: Industrial applications and processes*. John Wiley & Sons.

[16] Li, Z., Dong, B., & Dong, Y. (2018). Recent advances in microfiltration membranes: Design, fabrication, and applications in industry. *Chemical Engineering Journal, 337*, 438-451.

[17] Mulder, M. (2012). *Basic principles of membrane technology*. Springer Science & Business Media.

[18] Richardson, S. D., Plewa, M. J., Wagner, E. D., Schoeny, R., & Demarini, D. M. (2007). Occurrence, genotoxicity, and carcinogenicity of regulated and emerging disinfection by-products in drinking water: A review and roadmap for research. *Mutation Research/Reviews in Mutation Research, 636*(1-3), 178-242.

[19] Rusten, B., Eikebrokk, B., Ulgenes, Y., &Lygren, E. (2000). Design and operations of the Kaldnes moving bed biofilm reactors. *Aquacultural Engineering, 34*(3), 351-366.

[20] Schulz, C. R., & Okun, D. A. (1984). *Surface water treatment for communities in developing countries*. Wiley.

[21] Sillanpää, M., Ncibi, M. C., Matilainen, A., & Vepsäläinen, M. (2018). Removal of natural organic matter in drinking water treatment by coagulation: A comprehensive review. *Chemosphere, 190*, 54-71.

[22] Su, J., Zhang, Y., & Tian, J. (2016). A review on membrane technology in seawater desalination application. *Desalination, 386*, 115-125.

[23] Tang, C. Y., Chong, T. H., & Fane, A. G. (2017). Colloidal and fouling phenomena in membrane filtration of wastewater. *Journal of Membrane Science, 243*(1-2), 1-10.

[24] Tchobanoglous, G., Burton, F. L., & Stensel, H. D. (2003). *Wastewater engineering: Treatment and reuse*. McGraw-Hill.

[25] Van der Bruggen, B., & Vandecasteele, C. (2003). Removal of pollutants from surface water and groundwater by nanofiltration: Overview of possible applications in the drinking water industry. *Environmental Pollution, 122*(3), 435-445.

[26] von Gunten, U. (2003). Ozonation of drinking water: Part I. Oxidation kinetics and product formation. *Water Research, 37*(7), 1443-1467.

[27] Vymazal, J. (2005). Horizontal sub-surface flow and hybrid constructed wetlands systems for wastewater treatment. *Ecological Engineering, 25*(5), 478-490.

[28] Vymazal, J. (2010). Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment. *Water, 2*(3), 530-549.

[29] Wang, L., Dong, B., & Su, Y. (2020). Recent progress in fouling-resistant strategies for microfiltration membranes: A review. *Journal of Membrane Science, 601*, 117924.

[30] Wiesner, M. R., & Chellam, S. (1999). The promise of membrane technology. *Environmental Science & Technology, 33*(17), 360A-366A.

[31] Wu, S., Kuschk, P., Brix, H., Vymazal, J., & Dong, R. (2014). Development of constructed wetlands in performance intensifications for wastewater treatment: A nitrogen and organic matter targeted review. *Water Research, 57*, 40-55.

[32] Yang, X., Wang, R., & Zhao, J. (2015). Review on treatment technologies of rural domestic sewage. *Journal of Environmental Engineering and Landscape Management*, *23*(1), 64-71.

[33] Yin, K., Wang, Q., &Lv, M. (2016). Adsorption of pollutants from water by functionalized carbon nanotubes. *Chemosphere, 146*, 376-383.

[34] Zhang, Y., Su, J., & Xue, B. (2019). Ultrafiltration membrane technology for drinking water treatment: A review. *Journal of Water Process Engineering*, *32*, 100916.

[35] Zularisam, A. W., Ismail, A. F., & Salim, R. (2012). Reverse osmosis technology for water treatment: State of the art review. *Desalination, 287*, 1-8.