A Comparative Study on Electronic Waste (E- waste) Management Using BiologicalSystems: -

Keka Bhattacharjee
Department of Microbiology
Assistant Professor
Kingston College Of Science
Barasat, India
Email: keka.mymail@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Electronic waste is the utilized electronic items that require reusing or other legitimate types of removal. The removal of e- squander is a locale across the globe and is of concern mainly because of the harmfulness and cancer-causing nature of the portion of the substance if not handled appropriately.

1. Introduction

The word “Waste” means substances which are no longer in use by the user. Hazardous waste from electronic product is e-waste. E-waste components can be divided in two categories 1) organic part contains thermo and thermos setting plastic, 2) inorganic parts consists of metallic and nonmetallic components. With the presence of lethal synthetic compounds and harmful substance inthe electronic devices, removal of e-waste is turning into a natural and wellbeing nightmare. U.S inhabitants produce around 7 kilograms / individual/ year, while Europeans produce roughly 20 kilogram / year/ individual. The complete separated and outdated e- squander created in India figured to be around 1, 46,000 tons yearly. E-waste comprises of more than 1000 unique substances, which are risky or non-hazardous. Comprehensively, it comprises of metals like copper, aluminium and valuable metals like silver, gold platinum and palladium and so forth. The presence of components like lead, mercury, arsenic, cadmium, selenium and hexavalent chromium and fire retardants impact on living creatures and climate.The removal of e- waster is a specific issue looked in numerous districts across the globe and is of concern principally because of the poisonous nature and cancer causing nature of a portion of the substances if not handled appropriately.

2. Methodology:

1 Micro remediation

Micro remediation is characterized as the utilization of the microorganisms to dispose of, contain or change the foreign substance to non- perilous or less unsafe structure in the climate through the digestion system of microorganism (Mulligan et al. , 2001). There are six significant systems in micro remediation of harmful metals which are

- Bioleaching; (2) Biosorption; (3) Bioaccumulations; (4) Biotransformation; (5) Biomineralization; and microbially upgraded chemisorptions of metals.

A. Bioleaching

Bioleaching makes use of a herbal cap potential of the microorganisms to convert metals present within side the waste in a strong shape in dissolved form. There are two types of bioleaching:

Direct draining and Circuitous filtering.

Direct Draining utilizes the natural acid delivered the organism, to oxidize insoluble harmful metal turning them into ions which they grow to be soluble.

In indirect leaching steel oxidizing microorganisms are used that oxidize steel surrounding the microbe in maximum cases anion of the steel compound is oxidized , giving out loose steel ions in aqueous medium (Tichy et al ., 1998).

Table.1

Few organisms identified for bioleaching of toxic metals are		
The organism used	*Type*	*Name of toxic metal removed*
Acidithiobacillusthiooxidans	*Bacteria*	*Arsenic, Lead.*
Micrococcusroseus	*Bacteria*	*Cadmium.*
Thiobacillusferrooxidans	*Bacteria*	*Arsenic, Lead.*
Aspergillusfumigatus	*Fungus*	*Arsenic.*
Aspergillusniger	*Fungus*	*Cadmium , Lead.*

(Source: Stephan & Macnaughtont,1999; Ren et al., 2009)

2. Biosorption

Biosorption alludes to the concentrating and restricting of dissolvable impurities to the surface of the cell structure, it doesn’t require dynamic digestion, for this situation the dissolvable impurities are ionized poisonous metals (Volesky, and Holan, 1995).

The release of weighty metals into amphibians’ biological systems has turned into an issue worry in India in the course of the most recent couple of many years. These contaminations are brought into the amphibian frameworks altogether because of different modern tasks. Industrialization in India acquired an energy with inception of long term formative arrangement in the mid 50's. The toxins of concern incorporate lead, chromium, mercury, uranium, selenium, zinc, arsenic, cadmium, gold, silver, copper and nickel. These harmful materials might be gotten from mining tasks, refining minerals, muck removal, fly debris from incinerators, the handling of radioactive materials, metal plating, or the assembling of electrical gear, paints, composites, batteries, pesticides or additives. Weighty metals, for example, zinc, lead and chromium have various applications in fundamental designing works, paper and mash ventures, calfskin tanning, organ chemicals, petrochemicals fertilizers, and so on Significant lead contamination is through cars and battery producers. For zinc and chromium the significant application is in fertilizer and calfskin tanning individually (Trivedi, 1989). Over the years and years, a few strategies have been contrived for the treatment and expulsion of weighty metals.

Table.2

The organism used	Type	Name of Toxic metal removed
Bacillussphaericus	Bacteria	Chromium
Myxococcusxanthus	Bacteria	Uranium
Pseudomonasaeruginosa	Bacteria	Cadmium,Uranium
Streptoverticillium cinnamoneum	Bacteria	Lead
Rhizopusarrhizus	Fungus	Uranium
Saccharomycescerevisiae	Fungus	Cadmium

(Source: Hu et al., 1996; Atkinson et al ., 1998; Ahalya et al., 2003)

3.Bioaccumalation

It is defined as the absorption of contaminants within the organism which are moved into biomass cell inside the cell structure and thought there, this process requires dynamic digestion (Prakash et al . , 2012) . For natural pollutants, there are now and again synthetic responses in the cell cytoplasm to change them over to other compounds; in any case the metal entering the cell cytoplasm won’t go through any response yet sequestered all things considered (Hou et al . , 2006).

The Spartina Schreb. Variety is made out of C4 enduring grasses in the family Poaceae. They are local to the banks of the Atlantic Ocean in western and southern Europe, north-west and southern Africa, the Americas and the southern Atlantic Ocean islands.

Most species are salt open minded and colonize beach front or inland salt marshes. The accessible writing on weighty metal bioaccumulation by Spartina sp. was arranged and looked at. Spartina alterniflora Loisel. Furthermore Spartina maritima (Curtis) Fernald were the most generally investigated types of the sort, though numerous species were not addressed by any stretch of the imagination. Conversely, Cu and Zn are the most seriously explored weighty metals. The couple of studies managing the physiological effects of weighty metals or the components of metal aggregation, which include extracellular and intracellular metal chelation, precipitation, compartmentalisation and movement in the vascular framework, were recorded. Bioaccumulation of metals in roots and turners of certain types of the Spartina sort (for example S. maritima and Spartina densiflora Brongn.) has been portrayed as an achievable strategy for remediating waters and soils defiled with weighty metals. One such model is Spartina argentinensis Parodi, which has been viewed asa Cr-hyper accumulator; it can pack chromium in its tissues to levels far surpassing those present in the dirt.(Redondo-Gómez Susana (2013) Bioaccumulation of heavy metals in Spartina. Functional Plant Biology 40, 913-921.)

Few organisms identified for bioaccumulation of toxic metal:

Table.3

The organism used	Type	Name of toxic metal removed
Bacilluscirculans	Bacteria	Chromium
Bacillusmegaterium	Bacteria	Chromium
Deinococcus radiodurans	Bacteria	Uranium
Micrococcusluteus	Bacteria	Uranium
Aspergillusniger	Fungus	Chromium, Lead

(Source: Demirbas, 2001; Srinath et al 2002; Malik, 2004; Juwarkar and Yadav, 2010).

4. Biotransformation

Biotransformation alludes to the cycle in which a substance is changed from one synthetic structure to one more substance structure by compound responses ; on account of harmful metals, the oxidation state is changed by expansion or expulsion of electrons, accordingly their compound properties and additionally changed (Prakash et al ., 2012).

There are two different ways of biotransformation process.

1. Direct enzymatic decrease, in which multivalent poisonous metal particles are diminished by tolerating electrons from the compound in the outside of the cell .

2. Backhanded decrease , can be utilized to lessen and immobilize multivalent poisonous metals in particles in sedimentary and subsurface climate by activities of metal- diminishing or sulfate lessening microbes (Tabak et al , . 2005) .

Biotransformation of actinide natural complex

The natural mixtures in squanders comprise of defiled cellulosic material sparkle liquids, squander oils, decontamination specialists, and mixtures utilized in extricating and isolating radionuclides. Biodegradation of chosen

chelating specialists has been explored, yet little is known of the rate and degree of biodegradation of other natural accumulates. Chelating specialists are available in squanders because they are broadly utilized for disinfecting atomic reactors and hardware in tidy up tasks, and in isolating radionuclides The kinds of natural complexing specialists utilized are carboxylic acids, for example, citrus, hydroxy-acetic,oxalic, and tartaric acids,and amino-carboxylic acids, for example, ethylenediaminetetraacetic corrosive (EDTA), diethylenetriaminepentaacetic corrosive(DTPA),nitrilotriaceticacid(NTA), and N-hydroxyethylenediaminetriacetic acid (HEDTA). A considerable lot of these metal chelates either are ineffectively biodegraded vigorously, or go through minimal anaerobicbiodegradation; their biodegradation should cause the precipitation of delivered particles as water-insoluble hydroxides oxides, or salts, accordingly hindering their movement. The general request of corruption of a few chelates in surface soil was NTA.EDTA¯DTPA, and in subsurface dregs NTA.DTPA.EDTA. Albeit the biodegradation of engineered chelating specialists complexed with harmful metals has been explored, little is known about the biotransformation of actinides complexed with regular natural mixtures and chelating specialists (Agnihotri, V.K. 2011: "E waste in India". Francis, A. J. 1998. Biotransformation of uranium and other actinides in radioactive wastes. Journal of Alloys and Compounds. 271, 78-84).

Few microorganisms identified for biotransformation of toxic metals:

Table.4

The organism used	*Type*	*Name of toxic metal removed*
Anaeromyxobactersp.	*Bacteria*	*Uranium*
Clostridiumsphenoides	*Bacteria*	*Uranium*
Halomonassp.	*Bacteria*	*Uranium*
Serratiasp.	*Bacteria*	*Chromium*
Fusariumoxysporum	*Fungus*	*Cadmium*
Rhizopusoryzae	*Fungus*	*Chromium*

(Source : Lovely and Coates, 1997; Francis, 1998; Malik, 2004)

5. Biomineralization

Biomineralization potrays the interaction in which poisonous metal particles join with anions or ligands created by the microorganisms to form precipitation (Ronald and Don , 2005). The effect of science in the field of biomineralization can generally be isolated into three unique regions : (1) the potrayal of crystallography, arrangement and natural chemistry of the organic materials; (2) the plan of in vitro model frameworks to respond to inquiries from science, for example, testing speculations with respect to the communications between the natural network and the precious stones and the job of biomacromolecules in controlling nucleation and development of gems; and (3) the improvement of new manufactured strategies, which depend on the organic frameworks, for controlling gem morphology, polymorph, and materials properties, prompting new classes of organic−inorganic composites (Lara A. Estroff ChemicalReviews2008).

Few microorganisms identified for biomineralization of toxic metals

Table.5

The organism used	Type	Name of toxic metalremoved
Bacillusfusiform	Bacteria	Lead
Cupriavidusmetallidurans	Bacteria	Cadmium
Desulfotomaculum auripigmentum	Bacteria	Arsenic
Sporosarcinaginsengisoli	Bacteria	Arsenic
Aspergillusflavus	Fungus	Lead

Source: (Tabak et al., 2005 ; Benzerara et al., 2011; Achal et al., 2012; Govarthanan et al., 2012)

6.Microbially – enhanced Chemisorption of metals:

Chemisorption is like adsorption but there is a synthetic response between the surface and the adsorbate (Volesky and Holan, 1995).

Sorption

Bio-sorption of uranium is the cycle where the uranium is immobilized on the external layer or extra polymeric substance of the organism. This can follow a redox occasion, however can likewise be redox free. It can similarly now and again depend on charge, however can likewise be because of electrostatics since uranium is "tacky." Sorption is one of the more ordinarily referred to bio-changes in the writing since it is a potential remediation system. A few cells can absorb uranium up to almost a large portion of their phone weight (Friis, N. and Myers –Keith, P (1986) Biosorption of Uranium and Lead by Streptomyces Longwoodensis.Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 28, 21-28) (Bengtsson, L., Johansson, B., Hackett, T.J., McHale, A.P (1995). Studies on the Biosorption of Uranium by Talaromyces emersonii CBS 814.70 biomass. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology,42,807-811), however this gives off an impression of being an aloof, non-enzymatically determined cycle. Examples of microbes doing biosorption incorporate the growth Talaromycesemersonii.At pH 5, the growth had a biosorption limit of 280 mg U for every gram of dry cell weight (Bengtsson, L., Johansson, B., Hackett, T.J., McHale, A.P (1995). Studies on the Biosorptionof Uranium by Talaromyces emersonii CBS 814.70 biomass. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology,42,807-811). With maximal biosorption of 0.44 g U per gram of dry cell weight at pH 4.6, the Actinomycetes bacterium Streptomyces longwoodensis productively eliminates uranium from fluid samples (Friis, N. and Myers –Keith, P (1986) Biosorption of Uranium and Lead by Streptomyces Longwoodensis.Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 28, 21-28) . The sum was subjected to a few elements including cell phosphorous content, pH, uranium concentration, and cell-cycle stage (Friis, N. and Myers –Keith, P (1986) Biosorption of Uranium and Lead by Streptomyces Longwoodensis.Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 28, 21-28) . Bacillus disengages from Saxony had the option to take up uranium proficiently in the 10 - 200 mM range and the metal was viewed as adsorbed to the S-layer proteins and cell surface .In a surprising finding, Thorgensen and collaborators distinguished a S-layer protein complex in Pelosinus sp. Strain UFO1 that binds U(VI), however doesn't dimish it (Thorgersen, M.P., et al. (2017) A Highly Expressed High-Molecular-Weight S-Layer Complex of Pelosinus sp. Strain UFO1 Binds Uranium. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 83, e03044) . Different living beings such as At. ferrooxidans and Acidovorax facilis are likewise answered to adsorb uranium (Romero- Gonzalez, M., Nwaobi, B., Hufton, J.M. and Gilmour, D.J. (2016) Ex Situ Bioremediation of U(VI) from Contaminated Mine Water Using Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans Strains. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 4) (Gerber, U., et al. (2016) Combined Use of Flow Cytometry and Microscopy to Study the Interactions between the Gram-Negative betaproteobacterium Acidovorax facilis and Uranium (VI). Journal of Hazardous Materials, 317, 127-134) . Indeed even non-uranium-reducers or organisms not found in uranium contaminated environments, such as Saccharomycescerevisiaeand Staphylococcus aureus LZ-01, can adsorb uranium efficiently (Wang, T., Zheng, X., Wang, X., Lu, X. and Shen, Y. (2017) Different Biosorption Mechanisms of Uranium(VI) by Live and Heat-Killed Saccharomyces cerevisiae under Environmentally Relevant Conditions. Journal of Environmental Radioactivity, 167, 92-99) (Zou, L., Chen, Z., Zhang, X., Liu, P. and Li, X. (2014) Phosphate Promotes Uranium (VI) Adsorption in Staphylococcus aureus LZ-01. Letters in Applied Microbiology, 59, 528-534). The compound types of the adsorbed uranium fluctuate and mirror the condition of uranium in the climate. Uranium is often tightly bound, complexing to phosphoryl, carbonate or occasionally nitryl ligands and side chains. Subsequently biosorption can be an alluring technique for bio-remediation (Volesky and Holan, 1995). In microbially improved chemisorptions of metals a progression of compound responses in which organisms first accelerate a bio – mineral of a non target metal known as priming deposits, the priming deposits act as nucleation center for the resulting testimony of the target metal (Tabak et al. , 2005) .

Phytoremediation for Electronic waste

The demonstration of eliminating harmful metals from the climate by the utilization of metal aggregating plants is named phytoremediation (Vinita, 2007). Phytoremediation takes advantage of plant's natural organic instruments for human advantage. Four subsets of this innovation as pertinent to harmful metal remediation from soil and water are: (i)

Phytoextraction – the utilization of metal – aggregating plants to eliminate harmful metals from soil, (ii) Phytovolatilization – dissipation of specific metals from airborne pieces of the plant, (iii) Phytostabilitzation the utilization of plants to dispose of the bioavailability of harmful metals in soils and (iv) Rhizofiltration – the utilization of plant roots to eliminate harmful metals from dirtied waters (Vinita, 2007).

- Phytoextraction

Metal phytoextraction depends on metal-amassing plants to ship and focus contaminating metals from soil into the harvestable over the ground shoots (Salt et al., 1998; Vassil et al., 1998). The plant material can consequently be utilized for nonfood purposes (for e.g. wood, cardboard) or ashed, trailed by removal in a landfill or, in the case of valuable metals, the gathered component can be reused. The latter is termed phytomining (Chaney et al., 2000). Well known species for phytoextraction are Indian mustard and sunflower because of their quick development, high biomass, and high tolerance and accumulation of metals and other inorganics (Blaylock and Huang, 2000; Salt et al., 1995b).

Restrictions of the innovation incorporate the potential for bringing the toxin into pecking order, long tidy up occasions required, bioavailability of foreign substance and harmfulness experienced in setting up and keeping up with vegetation at squander locales. The utilization of phytoremediation is likewise restricted by the climatic and geologic states of the site to be cleaned, the temperature, soil type furthermore the availability for horticulture gear (Salt and Kramer, 2000; Schmoger et al., 2000). Besides, instruments of a large portion of the natural cycles hidden phytoremediation, for example, plant metal take-up, movement, aggregation and/or corruption and plant microorganism communications, are inadequately perceived also need further examination.

Some plant species for phytoextraction of toxic metals

Table.6

Plant species	Name of toxic metal removed
Thlaspicaerulescens	Cadmium, Strontium
Amaranthusretroflexus	Arsenic, Strontium
Chenopodiumalbum	Cadmium, Lead
Brassicajuncea	Cadmium, Chromium
Helianthusannuus	Arsenic, Lead

(Source: Lasat, 2002; McGrath, 2006; Rajiv et al., 2009) .

- Phytovolatilization

Phytovolatilization is the arrival of toxins from the plant to the climate as a gas. In spite of the fact that it functions admirably for organics, this can be utilized for a couple inorganics that can exist in volatIle form for example Se, Hg and As (Hansen et al., 1998; Rugh et al., 1996). Individuals from the Brassica class and some microorganisms are especially great volatilizers of Se (Terry et

al., 1992). Among the sea-going species, rice, hare foot grass, Azolla and pickle weed are the best Se volatilizers (Hansen et al., 1998; Lin et al., 2000; Pilon-Smits et al., 1999; Zayad et al., 2000). Volatilization of Se includes absorption of inorganic Se into the natural selenoaminoacids selenocysteine (SeCys) and

Selenomethionine (SeMet). The last option can be methylated to shape dimethylselenide (DMSe), which is unstable (Terry et al., 2000).Volatilization of As and Hg has been exhibited for microorganisms, however these components don't seem, byall accounts, to be volatilized to critical levels by nontransgenic plants (Rugh et al., 1996). In Hg-sullied soils and dregs, microbial movement changes over the profoundly poisonous Hg (II) into organomercurials what's more, under ideal conditions, natural Hg (which is undeniably less harmful) enters the worldwide biogeochemical cycle upon volatilization (Bizily et al., 2000). Since volatilization totally eliminates the contamination from the site as a gas, without need for plant collecting and removal, this is an alluring innovation. A danger evaluation study for unstable Se and Hg detailed that the contamination was scattered and weakened so much that it didn't represent a

danger (Lin et al., 2000; Meagher et al., 2000). Despite the fact that phytovolatilization is a latent interaction, it very well might be augmented by utilizing plant species with high happening rates, by overexpression of proteins, for example, cystathionine-V-synthase that intercedes S/Se volatilization (Van Huysen et al., 2003) and by moving quality for Se volatilization from hyper accumulators to nonaccumulators (Le Duc et al., 2004).

Some plant species for phytovolatalization of toxic metals.

Table.7

Plant species	***Name of toxic metals removed***
Nicotianatabacum	***Mercury***
Arabidopsisthaliana	***Mercury***
Triticumaestivum	***Mercury***
Bacopamonnieri	***Mercury***
TrifoliumrepensL.	***Mercury***
Pterisvittata	***Arsenic***

Crinumamericanum	Selenium

- ### Phytostabilization

The term signifies the utilization of plants to settle toxins in soil (Berti and Cunningham, 2000). Phytostabilization of metals may utilize plants to lessen filtering, spillover, and disintegration through adjustment of soil by plant roots or root exudates might cause metals to hasten, changing them over to less bioavailable structure (Berti and Cunningham, 2000; Burken et al., 2000; Kramer and Chardonnens, 2001). For phytostabilization of metals a blend of trees and grasses work best. Quick happening trees for example, 'Poplar' keep a vertical stream to forestall descending draining, while grasses forestall wind disintegration and sidelong spillover with meager thick root framework. Further, grasses don't aggregate as much metals in their shoots as dicot species, limiting openness of untamed life to poisonous components (Pilon Smits, 2005).

Table.8 (Source :David et al,1997; Wilde et al., 2005 ; John, 2007).

Plant species	Name of toxic metals removed
Alnusglutinosa	Uranium
PopulusCanadensis	Cadmium,Lead.
Atriplexlentiformis	Uranium
Chrysopogonzizanioides	Arsenic, lead
MediterraneanL.albus	Arsenic, cadmium
Populusalba	Cadmium, Lead.

4.Vermiremediation

Earthworms have been accounted for to bio-gather synthetic impurities in their tissues and either biodegrade or biotransform them into innocuous items with the guide of compounds examined that earthworms can bio-gather high groupings of substantial metals like cadmium (Cd), mercury (Hg), lead (Pb) copper (Cu), manganese (Mn), calcium (Ca), iron (Fe) and zinc (Zn) in their tissues.

Some earthworm species identified for removing toxic metal

Table.9

(Source: John,2007; Rajiv et al., 2009; Olguin and Sanchez – galvan, 2012)

Earthworm species	*Name toxic metals removed*
Aporrectodeatuberculata	*Cadmium, Lead.*
Eiseniafetida	*Cadmium, Mercury.*
Lumbricusterrestris	*Cadmium, Chromium, Lead.*
Dendrobaenarubida	*Arsenic, Lead.*
Eiseniellatetraedra	*Chromium, Lead.*

Result and discussion

Squander the broad alludes to all actions taken to ensure human and ecological from the risk of constituents of electronic and different squanders. It is by and large attempted to lessen their impacts on wellbeing. E-squander reusing is essential yet it ought to be directed in a protected and normalized house. The OK danger edges for perilous, optional e- squander substances ought not to be distinctive for creating and created nations. Be that as it may, the adequate limits ought to be distinctive for kids and grown-ups given the actual contrasts and articulated weaknesses of kids. Working on word related conditions for all e-squander labourers and making progress toward the destruction of youngster work is non- debatable.

References

1.Mulligan, C. N., Yong, R. N., and Gibbs, B. F. 2001. Remediation technologies for metal-contaminated soils and groundwater: an evaluation. Engineering Geology. 60(1): 193- 207.

2.Tichy, R.,Rulkens, W.H., Grotenhuis, J.T.C., Nydl , V., Cuypers, C., and Fajtl , J .

1998. 3.Stephen, J.R and Macnaughtont, S.J. 1999; Ren et al., 2009.

4.Volesky and Holan, Z.R. 1995. Biosorption of heavy metals. Biotechnology progress. 11(3) : 235-250.

5.Ahalya , N., Ramachandra, T.V., and Kanamadi, R.D 2003. Biosorption of heavy metals.

6.Atkinson, B.W., Bux, F., and Kasan, H. C. 1998.Considerations for application of biosorptiontechnology tailings.

7.Hu, M.Z.C., Norman, J. M ., Faison, B. D., and Reeves, M.E. 1996. Biosorption of Uranium

8.Redondo-Gómez Susana (2013) Bioaccumulation of heavy metals in Spartina. Functional Plant Biology 40, 913-921.

David, E.S., Ilya R., and Robert D.S.1997. 2005 ; John, 2007.