



中国科学院大学
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

博士学位论文

焦化废水处理系统中挥发性和半挥发性污染物： 排放特征与健康风险

作者姓名 AYMAN NABIL SABER ABDELHAY

指导教师： 杨敏 研究员

中国科学院生态环境研究中心

学科类别： 工学博士

学科专业： 环境工程

研究单位： 中国科学院生态环境研究中心

2021年6月

**Volatile and semi-volatile pollutants in coking wastewater
treatment systems: emission characteristics and health risks**

**A Dissertation Submitted to
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
In partial fulfillment of the requirement
For the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in
Environmental Engineering**

**By
AYMAN NABIL SABER ABDELHAY**

Supervisor: Professor Min Yang

**Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences,
Chinese Academy of Sciences
June 2021**

Abstract

Coking wastewater is an important source of volatile and semi-Volatile organic compounds (VOCs and SVOCs), which poses an adverse effect to human health. However, few studies have been carried out on the fate and emissions of VOCs and SVOCs in the coking wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). In this thesis, the occurrence, fate, transformation, and emission characteristics of 60 VOCs and VOCs, including phenols, BTEX, Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and substituted Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (SPAHS), were studied in coking WWTP and succeeding central WWTP using GC-MS. At the same time, 130 unknown VOCs and SVOCs were identified by suspect and non-target screening with a two-dimensional gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC×GC-MS), and the potential health hazards and environmental effects were also evaluated. The main results are as follows:

First, a dynamic verification method of headspace solid-phase microextraction-gas chromatography-triple quadrupole mass spectrometry (HS-SPME-GC-MS/MS) was established for qualitative and quantitative analysis of 43 VOCs and SVOCs in wastewater from a coking plant in Hebei Province. The 43 VOCs and SVOCs were detected in the raw coking wastewater, and the concentration of total phenols was the highest ($178.67\text{mg}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$), of which 3-cresol was the main one ($42.9\text{mg}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$). Among 43 VOCs and SVOCs, 23 were identified in the biological effluent, including 11 PAHs, seven phenols, five benzenes, and anilines.

Secondly, the occurrence and distribution of 43 VOCs and SVOCs in the wastewater system of 5 coking plants and the succeeding central WWTP in Inner Mongolia were studied using GC-MS. Besides, the fate and emission characteristics of 43 VOCs and SVOCs have been determined in coking plant C and central WWTP. Though biological treatment removes most of the 43 VOCs and SVOCs, the emissions of BTEX and some other compounds in the atmosphere are still great attention. The total emissions of VOCs and SVOCs from Plant C and the central WWTP are 1640 and $784\text{ g}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$, respectively. The mass balance calculation results of

coking plant C show that biodegradation was the main removal pathway for all the target compounds (56.6-99.9%) except BTEX, chlorinated phenols, and high molecular weight (MW) of PAHs. The chlorinated phenols and HMW-PAHs were mainly removed through sorption on activated sludge (51.8-73.2% and 60.2-75.9%, respectively). The health risk assessment results shown that Benzene from the equalization basins of plant C and central WWTP exhibited the highest inhalation carcinogenic risks (LCR) (1.4×10^{-3} and 3.2×10^{-4} , respectively), which above the acceptable level for human health recommended by the U.S.EPA (1×10^{-6}). In contrast, Benzo (a) pyrene (BaP) exhibited the highest inhalation non-cancer risks with a hazard index (HI) as high ratio as 70 and 30, respectively. At the same time, the excess sludge generated during wastewater treatment should also be carefully handled since it adsorbs abundant PAHs and chlorinated phenols (58,000 and 3,500 $\mu\text{g/g}$; and 622 and 54 $\mu\text{g/g}$ at coking plant C and central WWTP, respectively).

Thirdly, the distribution, fate and transformation of substituted PAHs (SPAHS), including oxygenated-PAHs (OPAHS), methyl-PAHs (MPAHs), and nitrated-PAHs (NPAHS) in the wastewater treatment system of a coking plant E and central WWTP in Inner Mongolia were studied using GC-MS. Biodegradation is the main removal pathway for most LMW-MPAH, LMW-PAH, and part of LMW-OPAH and LMW-NPAH. The average concentrations of total SPAHS in the air above coking plant E ($8.1 \mu\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$) and central WWTP ($3.3 \mu\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$) were markedly higher than those in the ambient air of other urban and industrial areas. The mass balance calculation results of coking Plant E show that transformation was the major mechanism to remove LMW-MPAHs (59.9-77.3%), a large part of OPAHS, including anthraquinone, methylanthraquinone, and 9-fluorenone (46.7- 49.6%), and some NPAHS, including 2-nitrofluorene and 9-nitroanthracene (52.9-59.1%). While adsorption by activated sludge mainly accounted for removing HMW-SPAHS (59.6-71.01%). The relatively high concentration of SPAH in excess sludge ($15000 \mu\text{g} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$) and treated effluent ($104 \mu\text{g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$) are of great concern for their potential adverse environmental impacts. The estimated total LCR for different PAH and SPAH groups ranged between 3.2×10^{-4} and 1.7×10^{-1} in coking plant E and between 2.2×10^{-4} and 1.3×10^{-1} in central

WWTP. The LCR values of all target compounds except 3-NFlu and 7-Nitrobenzo[a]anthracene in the two coking WWTPs exceeded the cancer risk level recommended by the US EPA ($>10^{-6}$). Therefore, the cancer risk estimated by the current study is obviously unacceptable, and measures should be taken to control the pollution of PAHs and SPAHs in the ambient air.

Finally, we successfully established a screening method based on a GC×GC-MS to identify source-specific and previously unknown VOC and SVOC pollutants in coking plant E and central WWTP in Inner Mongolia, China. A total of 188 VOCs and SVOCs, including 130 unknown pollutants, were identified. Most of the identified unknown VOCs and SVOCs are MPAHs (32 compounds), Benzene series (26 compounds), PAHs (25 compounds), and Phenols (including phenols, Nitro, and chlorinated phenols; 22 compounds). Other high groups mainly included NPAHs (12 compounds), OPAHs (11 compounds), alkanes (11 compounds), Polychloroethylenes (9 compounds), alkenes (8 compounds), and Polychloroethanes (8 compounds). There are 13 volatile compounds identified in the air of coking WWTPs without any previous knowledge of their existence in the wastewater or environment, some of which such as 1,2-benzenediamine, 2,4,6-trimethylbenzaldehyde, 2-formylphenoxyacetic acid, and 4-Bromo-1H-pyrazole, may pose immunomodulatory effects and might cause respiratory irritation, severe skin burns, and eye damage. Among 188 detected VOC and SVOC, 58 compounds were selected for quantitative analysis. The highest VOC and SVOC contents were found in the equalization basins of plant E and central WWTP (880.5 and $199.4\ \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$, respectively). In this study, the average values of total ozone formation potential (OFP) of coking plant E and central WWTP (716.3 and $191.7\ \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$, respectively) was higher than the recommended value ($100\ \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$). The result demonstrates that the coking WWTPs are a significant source of atmospheric VOCs and SVOCs.

Keywords: Coking wastewater, VOCs and SVOCs, Emission rate, Removal mechanism, Health risks.

Table Contents

摘要.....	I
Abstract.....	III
Table Contents.....	VII
List of Figures.....	XI
List of Tables.....	XIII
Acronyms	XV
Chapter One	1
Research Background and Relevance	1
1.1. Overview	1
1.2. Introduction	1
1.3. Characteristics of coking wastewater	3
1.4. Characteristics and toxicities of VOCs.....	5
1.4.1. BTEX.....	8
1.4.2. Phenols.....	11
1.4.3. PAHs	13
1.4.4. Substituted PAHs.....	17
1.4.5. Other VOCs	20
1.5. Fates of VOCs in WWTPs	21
1.5.1. Volatilization	21
1.5.2. Sorption	23
1.5.3. Biological transformation	24
1.5.4. Coagulation, flocculation, and sedimentation.....	25
1.6. Analysis of VOCs.....	27
1.7. Literature review conclusions	28
1.8. Research objectives	29
1.9. General research framework and chapter arrangement.....	30
Chapter Two	31

Optimization of HS-SPME-GC-MS/MS method for simultaneous determination of VOCs and SVOCs in coking WWTPs.....	31
2.1. Introduction	31
2.2. Material and Methods.....	32
2.3.1. Chemicals and Materials	32
2.2.2. Standards preparation	34
2.2.3. Optimization of HS-SPME parameters.....	34
2.2.4. GC-MS/MS analysis.....	35
2.2.5. Method Validation and Sampling	35
2.2.6. Statistical analysis	36
2.3. Results and Discussion	36
2.3.1. Choosing optimal SPME fiber coating	36
2.3.2. Optimization conditions of HS-SPME.....	37
2.3.3. Method Validation	41
2.3.4. Application to coking wastewater samples	45
2.4. Conclusion.....	47
Chapter Three	49
VOCs and SVOCs in coking wastewater treatment systems: distribution profile, emission characteristics, and health risks.....	49
3.1. Introduction	49
3.2. Materials and Methods	50
3.2.1. Chemicals	50
3.2.2. Study site description	50
3.2.3. Sample collection and pre-treatment.....	51
3.2.4. Quality control and quality assurance.....	54
3.2.5. Mass loading calculation.....	56
3.2.6. Human health risk assessment	58
3.2.7. Statistical analysis	59
3.3. Results and Discussion	60
3.3.1. Distribution of VOCs and SVOCs in wastewater.....	60

3.3.2. Emission rate of VOCs and SVOCs and their atmospheric concentrations	63
3.3.3. Fates of VOCs and SVOCs	66
3.3.4. Assessment of human health risks	69
3.4. Conclusion	73
Chapter Four	75
Substituted polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in coking wastewater treatment systems: distribution profile, emission characteristics and health risks	75
4.1. Introduction	75
4.2. Materials and Methods	77
4.2.1. Chemicals	77
4.2.2. Description of WWTPs and sampling	78
4.2.3. Analytical procedure and quality control	81
4.2.4. Breakthrough of target compounds on PUFs	83
4.2.5. Calculation of Mass loading	83
4.2.6. Health risk assessment	85
4.3. Results and Discussion	86
4.3.1. Distribution of SPAHs and PAHs in each stage of WWTPs	86
4.3.2. Atmospheric concentrations of SPAHs and PAHs	89
4.3.3. Dewatered sludge concentrations of SPAHs and PAHs	91
4.3.4. Fates of SPAHs and PAHs	93
4.3.5. Health risk assessment	96
4.4. Conclusion	100
Chapter Five	101
Identification of unknown VOCs and SVOCs in coking wastewater using GC×GC-MS	101
5.1. Introduction	101
5.2. Materials and Methods	102
5.2.1. Chemicals	102
5.2.2. Sampling site	104

5.2.3.	Sample collection and analytical methods	104
5.2.4.	Instrumental analysis	106
5.2.5.	Quality assurance and quality control.....	107
5.2.6.	Calculation of air concentrations	108
5.3.	Results and Discussion	109
5.3.1.	Suspect screening of VOCs and SVOCs	109
5.3.2.	Non-target screening	118
5.3.3.	Target screening and spatial distribution of VOCs and SVOCs	120
5.3.4.	Evaluation of ozone formation potential (OFPs).....	123
5.4.	Conclusion.....	129
	Chapter Six	131
	Conclusions and recommendations/Future research perspectives	131
6.1.	Conclusions	131
6.2.	Novelty statement	132
6.3.	Recommendations/ Future research perspectives	132
	References	133
	DEDICATION.....	161
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	162
	Resume	163

List of Figures

Figure1.1. Global available water resources	2
Figure 1.2. The principle removal pathways of micro-pollutants in WWTPs.	21
Figure 1.3. Adsorption of volatile pollutant onto sludge, dissolved and colloidal matter.....	23
Figure 1.4. Biotransformation of organic pollutants by (a) metabolic or (b) co-metabolic processes.	25
Figure 1.5. Research framework and chapter arrangement.....	30
Figure 2.1. Comparison of the performance of SPME extraction using the two fibers.	37
Figure2.2. Temperature effects on extraction effectiveness for the low MW VOCs (a) and High MW VOCs (b).	38
Figure2.3. Extraction time effect	39
Figure2.4. Sample volume effect on the extraction effectiveness.....	40
Figure 2.5. NaCl concentration effect on the extraction efficiency	40
Figure 2.6. Desorption time for the extraction performance.....	41
Figure3.1. Procedural flow chart of plant C and central WWTP with sampling sites	51
Figure 3.2. Flow chart and sampling of studied coking WWTPs.Error! Bookmark not defined.	52
Figure3.3. Distributions and variation profiles of various target groups along various treatment units in the plant C (a) and central WWTP (b).	61
Figure 3.4. The estimated rate (a) and flux (b) of emission of target compounds in the both WWTP.....	64
Figure 3.5. Concentration levels of studied compounds in the gas samples at the plant C (a) and central WWTP (b)..	65
Figure 3.6. Fates of studied chemicals in the plant C.	66
Figure 3.7. Adsorption quantities of studied VOCs and SVOCs in the dewatered sludge of plant C (a) and central WWTP (b).	68
Figure 3.8. Fates of studied chemicals in the central WWTP.	69

Figure 3.9. Non-carcinogenic risks assessment via Inhalation (a&b), and dermal (c&d) exposure at two coking WWTPs	72
Figure 4.1. Schematic diagram showing the treatment in the two coking WWTPs and sampling points	79
Figure4.2. Distribution of different PAH and SPAH groups in wastewater along the treatment train in both coking WWTPs	87
Figure4.3. Re-estimated elimination contribution of individually unit in the biological process at coking plant E (a) and Central WWTP (b). With complete removal of studied substances presumed to be 100%, the removal contribution of each unit was determined.....	89
Figure 4.4. Distribution of different PAH and SPAH groups in the ambient air along the treatment train in coking plant E (a, b) and central WWTPs (c, d).....	90
Figure 4.5. Profiles of different PAH and SPAH groups in dewatered at both coking WWTPs.....	92
Figure 4.6. Fates of PAHs and SPAHs in coking plant E(a) and central WWTP(b)....	94
Figure 4.7. Cumulative LCR from PAH and SPAH exposure in both coking WWTPs.	100
Figure5.1 Two Coking wastewater treatment processes and sampling sites	105
Figure 5.2 Overview of the air samples analysis workflow	106
Figure 5.3 Classification of the identified 175 VOCs.....	110
Figure 5.4. Distributions profile and percent contributions of VOCs and SVOCs in air phase of the coking plant E (a) and central WWTP (b).	121
Figure5.5. Top six compounds with highest concentration at coking plant E (a) and central WWTP (b)	123
Figure5.6. Assessment of OFP from major compounds at coking plant E (a) and central WWTP (b).....	124

List of Tables

Table 1.1. Physiochemical information of frequently detected VOCs and SVOCs....	6
Table 2.1. Quality parameters for proposed method	33
Table 2.2a. Recoveries (Intra-day) \pm RSDr,% of target compounds at varying fortifying levels ($\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$).	42
Table 2.2b. Recoveries (Inter-day) \pm RSDR,% of target compounds at varying fortifying levels ($\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$).	43
Table 2.3. Comparison between proposed technique with other methods reported in earlier studies	45
Table 2.4. Analysis results of real samples	47
Table 3.1. Operational information for the coking WWTP.	53
Table 3.2. LOQ for target analytes in wastewater, sludge, and air samples.....	55
Table 3.3. The Parameters of carcinogenic risk evaluation are considered as random variables.	59
Table 3.4. Concentrations ($\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$) of studied volatile pollutants in the influent wastewater, equalization basin effluent, and final effluent of four WWTPs.	62
Table 3.5. Carcinogenic risk of inhalation and dermal contact for labors exposed to studied chemicals.....	69
Table 3.6. The calculated concentrations of TEQ _{BaP} and lung cancer risks estimate from exposure to PAH compound through inhalation exposure to PAH in the coking WWTPs.....	71
Table 4.1. List of parent and substituted PAHs (and their Physical-chemical properties) measured in this study.....	77
Table 4.2. The coking WWTP operational parameters.....	80
Table 4.3. Recoveries of SPAHs and PAHs in spiking samples (mean (%) \pm RSD (%), n=3), and MQLs of wastewater, sludge, and air samples.	82
Table 4.4a. Emission rates ($\text{g}\cdot\text{day}^{-1}$) of PAHs and SPAHs at each unit in the coking plant E	83
Table 4.4b. Emission rates ($\text{g}\cdot\text{day}^{-1}$) of PAHs and SPAHs at each unit in the central WWTP	84
Table 4.5. SPAHs concentration in the influent of other municipal WWTPs.	86

Table 4.6. The concentrations of PAHs and SPAHs in a dewatered sludge sample from the coking WWTP ($\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}$).....	92
Table 4.7a. Ratios of SPAHs to their corresponding PAHs in wastewater, Air, and dewatered sludge in coking plant E.	95
Table 4.7b. Ratios of SPAHs to their corresponding PAHs in wastewater, Air, and dewatered sludge in central WWTP.	96
Table 4.8a. The LCR estimated from exposure to target compounds in the coking WWTPs.....	97
Table 4.8b. The LCR estimated from exposure to target compounds in the coking WWTPs.....	98
Table 5.1. List of quantified compounds measured in this study.	103
Table 5.2. Suspect analysis of VOCs and SVOCs in the emissions from the coking WWTP.....	113
Table 5.3. Non-target analysis of new emerging VOCs and SVOCs in air of coking WWTPs.....	119
Table 5.4a. The MIR values and OFPs of VOCs in a coking plant E.	125
Table 5.4b. The MIR values and OFPs of VOCs in a central WWTP.....	127