

Dismantling Microplastic Menace: Strategies for Detection, Removal, Toxicity Evaluation, and Containment in Ecosystems

Hong Zhao*

Department of Environmental Engineering, Tianjin University, China

Abstract

Over the past few decades, the accumulation and fragmentation of plastics on Earth's surface has resulted in a number of long-term climate and health risks. plastic-based materials, particularly microplastics (MPs); They have received a lot of attention from scientists all over the world because of their bioaccumulation, non-biodegradability, and ecotoxicological effects on living things. This study explains how microplastics are produced, transported, and disposed of in the environment on the basis of their physicochemical properties and sources. Additionally, the study investigates the impact of COVID-19 on global plastic waste production. MPs can be quantified and identified using physical and chemical techniques like SEM-EDX, PLM, FTIR, Raman, TG-DSC, and GC-MS. This paper discusses both established and cutting-edge methods for removing microplastics from aquatic systems. The findings of this review help us better understand the studies on the toxicity of microplastics to humans, aquatic life, and soil ecosystems. Additionally, in order to lessen the risk posed by MP waste in the future, it is necessary to investigate the global efforts and measures taken to combat it.

Keywords: Microplastics; Environmental pollution; Covid-19; Detection techniques; Toxicity assessment

Introduction

Plastic, which permeates virtually every aspect of human existence worldwide, is heavily used in today's world. Due to their exceptional properties of durability, flexibility, lightness, and mechanical and thermal stability, organic polymers, also known as plastics, are utilized extensively in a wide range of industries, including the construction sector, the food and packaging sector, pharmaceuticals, and others. Despite the plastic industry's annual growth, the demand for plastic does not appear to have decreased. There will be approximately 33 billion tons of plastic produced by 2050. The environmental impact of plastic has been a major source of concern for government agencies, the scientific community, and the general public despite its long-term industrial benefits. The rapid production and distribution of extremely durable plastics has a significant impact on the ecology and the environment. By 2010, land-produced plastic waste had polluted the marine environment by four to twelve million metric tons, according to reports [1]. It has become increasingly evident over the past few decades that plastic waste pollutes the environment. Synthetic microplastics with a diameter of less than 5 millimeters are currently causing public concern, despite the fact that plastic debris can be as small as a microscopic particle and as long as several meters. The first time the term "microplastics" (MPs) was used, it was to talk about various common household plastics, how they were made, how they were used, and what might go wrong with them. For instance, polypropylene is a common household plastic that will naturally degrade in about 30 years and may have an unidentified adverse effect on the biosphere. In addition, organic contaminants such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are carried by these microplastics (MPs) in biomedical and cosmetic products. MP pollution is now a global issue because of the increasing impact that microplastics have on the environment [2-5]. Effects of COVID-19 on the environmental release of MPs Throughout history, infectious diseases that have the potential to cause a pandemic have appeared and spread frequently. The Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) and other pandemics and epidemics have already had an impact on humanity. Since December 2019, there has been a global

pandemic of the novel coronavirus (SARSCoV- 2) that is believed to be the cause of COVID-19, a severe respiratory illness. In March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 to be a pandemic worldwide. Since then, efforts to stop its spread have been made. Biowaste and medical waste are abundant during the COVID-19 pandemic, indicating a sudden uptick in plastic pollution. This is because personal protective equipment (PPE), face masks, disposable utensils, food packaging plastics, and other items made of single-use plastic (SUP) are used a lot. Global demand for personal protective equipment significantly increased following the COVID-19 outbreak, with 65 and 129 billion pairs of gloves and masks consumed monthly, respectively. According to Benson and co., since the pandemic began, global plastic waste has increased by 1.6 million tonnes [6]. Approximately 3.4 billion disposable face shields and masks are discarded each day. In addition, According to a report, as of August 23, 2021, the amount of plastic waste that was produced by 193 nations during the pandemic reached over eight million tons and washed into the ocean in more than 25,000 tons worldwide. About 1.5% of the total amount of plastic that was dumped into the water comes from this. To confirm that face masks made of polypropylene (PP) release MPs into water, environmental waste processing, common sources, and the fate of MPs produced by COVID-19 are tested. To imitate the circular waves and motions of ocean water, they degraded three-layered surgical masks in water using a rotating blender. Under weathering conditions, the experiment demonstrated that a single mask can release a significant amount of microplastics. The release of MPs from disposable masks, according to

*Corresponding author: Hong Zhao, Department of Environmental Engineering, Tianjin University, China, E-mail: hongzhao@gmail.com

Received: 01-May-2024, Manuscript No: jety-24-136513, **Editor assigned:** 04-May-2024, Pre-QC No: jety-24-136513 (PQ), **Reviewed:** 18-May -2024, QC No: jety-24-136513, **Revised:** 25-May-2024, Manuscript No: jety-24-136513(R), **Published:** 31-May-2024, DOI: 10.4172/jety.1000218

Citation: Hong Z (2024) Dismantling Microplastic Menace: Strategies for Detection, Removal, Toxicity Evaluation, and Containment in Ecosystems. J Ecol Toxicol, 8: 218.

Copyright: © 2024 Hong Z. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

them, was also influenced by exposure time and shear intensity [7].

Identification of MPs and their detection

MPs with a wide range of characteristics are produced as a result of the worldwide excessive use of commodity plastics. It is necessary to identify and evaluate MPs in order to effectively eliminate them from aquatic systems. A wide range of physical and chemical methods are used to quantify MPs because a single identification method may miss some types. Physical detection is frequently used to quickly, cheaply, and easily identify MPs based on their size, color, and appearance [8]. Physical detection can be used to identify colored and larger MPs (>500 nm), but smaller MPs cannot be effectively removed. As a result, chemical methods are used to determine the MPs' structure and composition. Examples include non-destructive techniques like SEM-EDX, PLM, FTIR, Raman spectroscopy, and GC-MS.

Morphological identification

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) is frequently used to morphologically analyze MPs because it provides information about MPs' surface texture and deformities that help distinguish them from other wastewater materials. This is because SEM takes high-resolution pictures of the MP's surface. This method is frequently utilized in conjunction with the Energy Dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) method for the purpose of analyzing the MPs' components. Due to its high cost, low efficiency, and inability to detect colored MPs, SEM-EDX is not suitable for use in the detection of MPs. In order to improve SEM-EDX's capability of detecting MPs, fluorescent dyes such as Safranin T, Nile Red, and fluorescein isophosphate are frequently stained on MPs at high temperatures to reduce error probability [9]. With the help of PLM and other cutting-edge microscopy techniques, the type of MP can now be precisely identified. Using the polymer's anisotropic property, the PLM method involves passing unpolarized light through MP particles placed between cross-polarizers. The polarized light produced by the polarizers shows the crystallinity of MPs, making it simpler to identify the type of MP polymer. It is possible to use it with opaque and thick samples, but it is not a reliable method. A variety of destructive and non-destructive methods are utilized to further improve MP identification and chemical composition determination. By irradiating the samples with infrared light and observing changes in the dipole moments of the sample's structural chemical bonds, FTIR can be used to identify IR-active MPs. The MPs' composition can be determined by comparing the sample spectrum to the reference spectrum. The use of FTIR for detecting larger particles is constrained by the sample's size, the difficulty of sample preparation, and the time and labor required. FTIR, on the other hand, is a good way to find agglomerates and smaller particles. Because it gives the MP particles a wider spectrum, the FPA-FTIR (Focal Plane Array-Fourier Transform Infrared spectroscopy) method is used to improve detection efficiency. Techniques for separation and illumination: MPs are separated from contaminated water using these techniques, which make use of physical barriers like membranes and filter mechanisms. By allowing only liquids to pass through, these physical barriers separate microplastics from aqueous media. However, microplastics with higher viscosities

in waste sludge are frequently not removed by these techniques. To separate micro- and nano-sized microplastics, which are only present in trace amounts, filtration methods also require a lot of manpower and water movement. Only the quantity of separated microplastics can be quantified using these methods; They provide no details about the microplastic pollutants' nature or structure [10]. We will need to employ additional characterisation strategies in order to obtain complete information regarding the MP's structure and type. Growth and surface adhesion methods: Surfactants, oxidants, coagulants, and disinfectants, as well as MPs, are captured and adhered to the surface of the additional materials.

Conclusion

Microplastic pollution may rise as a result of the anticipated rise in global plastic production and use in the coming years. In addition to their physicochemical properties—size, crystallinity, shape, density, and so on—microplastics are influenced by a wide variety of natural conditions, as this study demonstrates. In the formation, development, and transport of their bodies. To ensure that microplastics are effectively removed, it is necessary to quantify and identify them. However, there are some drawbacks to using visual analysis and spectroscopic methods together to locate microplastics in aquatic systems. Given the enormous amount of MP waste produced worldwide, better methods for MP detection and identification must be developed to reduce misidentification.

References

1. Caqueo-Urizar A, Alessandrini M, Zendjidian X, Urzúa A, Boyer L, et al. (2016) Religion involvement and quality of life in caregivers of patients with schizophrenia in Latin-America. *Psychiatry Res* 246: 769-75.
2. Özen G, Atagündüz P (2023) Living With Schizophrenia. *Information & Support*.
3. Davuluri triveni, sandeep, Gover subho chakrabarti (2014) Religiosity among patients with schizophrenia: An exploratory study.
4. Mohr S, Gillieron C, Borrás L, Brandt PY, Huguelet P (2007) The assessment of spirituality and religiousness in schizophrenia. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 195: 247-53.
5. Zafar SN, Gowani SA, Waqar S, Zubair A, Yousaf W, et al. (2008) Perceptions about the cause of schizophrenia and the subsequent help seeking behavior in a Pakistani population-Results of a cross-sectional survey. *BMC Psychiatry* 17: 8.
6. Duñó R, Oliva JC, Tobefía A, Palao D, Labad J (2020) Religiosity and Psychotic Ideation in Stable Schizophrenia: A Role for Empathic Perspective-Taking. *Behavioral Sciences* 10.
7. (1990) Criteria for diagnosis of Behçet's disease International Study Group for Behçet's Disease. *Lancet* 335: 1078-80.
8. Mumcu G, Alibaz-Öner F, Öner SY, Özen G, Atagündüz P, et al. (2017) Oral ulcer activity in Behçet's disease: Poor medication adherence is an underestimated risk factor. *Eur J Rheumatol* 4: 109-12.
9. Tappuni AR, Kovacevic T, Shirlaw PJ, Challacombe SJ (2013) Clinical assessment of disease severity in recurrent aphthous stomatitis. *J Oral Pathol Med* 42: 635-41.
10. Bhakta BB, Brennan P, James TE, Chamberlain MA, Noble BA, et al. (1999) Behçet's disease: evaluation of a new instrument to measure clinical activity. *Rheumatology* 38: 728-33.