International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering and Management (IJIREM)
ISSN: 2350-0557, Volume-9, Special Issue-6, June-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

Waterborne Diseases and Their Effects

Mr. Ashok Bhat
Assistant Professor,
Masters In Business Administration, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id:ashokbhat@presidencyuniversity.in

While aquatic bacteria cause a broad variety of illnesses, the most common consequence, and the one that most commonly goes undetected, is acute gastrointestinal infection AGI. Viruses, bacteria, or protozoa may all induce AGI. Also, chemical pollutants may create symptoms similar to AGI. The origins of the infectious agents Ave a significant impact on the genesis of waterborne illness. Shigella species, for example, are largely human diseases, and shigellosis epidemics are often linked with pollution from human waste. Zoonotic pathogens include E. coli, Campylobacter, Salmonella, and numerous protozoan and viral infections. In other words, they have a connection to cattle, wildlife, and wildfowl. As a consequence, faucal contamination of water from any of these sources may lead to a waterborne illness epidemic, which is why there is growing worry about high-density animal husbandry methods, especially in flood-prone regions [1], [2].

Viral Diseases

Viruses are increasingly being considered as significant causal factors of AGI. Viruses are thought to cause 80 percent of the 38.6 million cases of gastroenteritis reported in the United States each year Mead and colleagues, 1999. Caliciviruses and rotaviruses are the most usually diagnosed of the well over 100 identified viruses that might possibly be transmitted via drinking water. However, forms of Poliovirus, Coxsackievirus, Echovirus, Reovirus, Adenovirus, Hepatitis A, Astrovirus, Coronavirus, and Hepatitis E have been linked to waterborne outbreaks, and there may be many more unidentified virus families that might produce AGI and other illness symptoms. The challenges in both precise diagnosis and measuring the agents in drinking water and food have hampered scientific awareness of the involvement of viruses in waterborne diarrhoea. Caliciviruses, for example, are now regarded to be the leading causes of food and waterborne sickness globally, but study has been hampered by their inability to be grown. This intriguing family of viruses was discovered in 1972 when electron microscopists spotted minute spherical particles in samples from an AGI epidemic in Norwalk, Ohio, four years earlier, when half of the students and teachers at an elementary school were ill.

An examination of surveillance data from 1995 to 2000 in Europe revealed that this particular group of caliciviruses one of possibly four separate Calicivirus genera, now known as noroviruses, responsible for more than 85 percent of all nonbacterial gastroenteritis outbreaks Lopman and others, 2003. In the United States, Mead and colleagues 1999 estimated that noroviruses caused 23 million instances of gastroenteritis each year. A recent study discusses three separate types of pathogenic bacteria found in humans that have been discovered using molecular epidemiology methods Lopman, Brown, and Koopmans, 2002. This method amplifies and fingerprints genetic material in this example, RNA so that researchers may match suspected infection origins to clinical samples. Caliciviruses have been proven to be spread by drinking water, seafood, uncooked foods such as salads and fruits, food handling, environmental exposures bathing, contaminated surfaces, and so on, and person to person using these mechanisms. In fact, person-to-person transmission is considered to be the most common mode of infection, including infection through aerosol production induced by the projectile vomiting that characterizes these diseases. Animals have been proven to be infected by strains of Calicivirus that are extremely similar to the three human pathogen groups, therefore further developments in molecular epidemiology may indicate that they are a source of infection. Human caliciviruses have significant clinical and public health implications, especially since there seems to be no long-term immunity to such agents in humans [3]–[5].

Bacterial Infections. Campylobacteriosis is still the most frequent kind of bacterial dysentery, followed by pathogenic E. coli, salmonellosis, and shigellosis. It is difficult to quantify the worldwide prevalence of these disorders. Morris and Levin 1995 calculated that water causes 35,000 instances of shigellosis, 59,000 cases of salmonellosis, 150,000 cases of E. coli infection, and 320,000 cases of campylobacteriosis in the United States per year. Of course, these illnesses are ubiquitous around the globe, but many other bacterial pathogens that are largely under control in industrialised nations remain rampant in other countries. Cholera caused by Vibrio cholerae and typhoid produced by Salmonella typhi are two well-known instances of aquatic diseases that have previously caused worldwide pandemics. Typhoid tends to spread in epidemic proportions in less developed areas when sanitation is inadequate. This occurred in Chile during the 1980s and was ascribed, at least in part, to wastewater irrigation of vegetables, excessive rainfall, insufficient water treatment, and a weakening economy.

Global morbidity and death due to E. Nowadays, E. coli infections are common. They are thought to outnumber those of cholera and other known aquatic diseases. The . Enterotoxigenic E. coli strains ETEC may also manufacture enterotoxin. enteropathogenic or providing this information, as in the case of Notorius E. O157-H7 coli Walkerton outbreak Box 18.1. Estimates of cholera morbidity and mortality Each year, tens of thousands of people are killed. ETEC, on the other hand, is expected to cause around 400 million diarrheal episodes, with 700,000 fatalities among children. each year for children under the age of five reported in Chakraborty and others, 2001. Several opportunistic infections may also be spread through water. These Aeromonas, Pseudomonas, Klebsiella, and other bacteria are included. Estimating the contributions of these agents on morbidity and death is exceedingly challenging. by ingestion of drinking water. They are undeniably a significant source of hospital-acquired infections, with substantial fatality rates. Legionella, nontuberculous mycobacteria, and Helicobacter pylori are among the other opportunistic pathogens of importance. Legionella and nontuberculous mycobacteria inhabit a distinct niche.

Its propensity to multiply in hot-water systems, as well as their environmental Its prevalence, as well as their resistance to disinfection. When it comes to Legionella, the globe The illness burden is estimated to outnumber reported numbers by a large margin. It is estimated that Legionella causes at least one death each year in the United States. Every year, 13,000 people have bacterial pneumonia Breiman and Butler, 1998. Water is a crucial vector for diffusion, according to researchers. Helicobacter pylori is a kind of bacteria. Cholera is still an epidemic and a pandemic affecting numerous nations as a result of due in part to its capacity to live and reproduce in an environment populated by plankton and other aquatic creatures Colwell, 1996. Since 1817, there have been seven cholera pandemics, the most recent of which reached South America in 2010.

By 1994, it had allegedly caused over a million illnesses and 10,000 fatalities. 1995 Pan American Health Organization. There are various probable explanations. explanation for the introduction of cholera in South America, including transportation in a ships bilge water associated with plankton, diseased persons, or imported foods. It might also have been endemic, persisting in the environment. They only emerged with tainted sanitation after the continent had been cleared of For more than a century, there has been an outbreak of cholera. The truth may never be revealed. Cholera may arise when sanitary methods fail, although aquatic organism blooms have also been linked to cholera epidemics in Bangladesh Colwell and Huq, 2004. 1994. The ecological connections are intriguing, and the reader is inspired to investigate the burgeoning research on the subject [6]–[8].

Cholera is of special importance since there are signs that it is changing. V. cholerae, serogroup O1, has been the causal agent of the last seven pandemics. V. cholerae serogroup O139 developed in epidemic form in India in the early 1990s, marking the first time that a non-O1 serogroup of V. cholerae was found to produce epidemic cholera. O139 strains were produced from O1 strains by genetic change, according to molecular evidence Faruque, Albert, and Mekalanos, 1998. It is critical to discover more about the circumstances that led to the creation of the toxigenic O139 serogroups, since this might lead to the emergence of many other, perhaps more environmentally resistant, serogroups of this virus. The formation of epidemic strains might be caused by mutations in existing strains or by gene transfer. This diagrammatically. While V. cholerae is used as an example, the approach described might apply to other pathogens as well, such as toxigenic E. coli. Virulence factors might be transmitted across species by gene transfer. Througho6ut the drinking-water distribution system, where organisms are expected to be exposed to a range of stressors such as chlorine and metal ions, both mutation and gene transfer seem to be conceivable.

Protozoal Infections. Protozoa have received a lot of media attention recently because of the scale of recent outbreaks, which are caused in part by low infectious dosages and great resilience to water treatment. The greatest attention has been paid to Cryptosporidium parvum, which has surpassed Giardia lamblia as the most prevalent cause of waterborne illness outbreaks in the United Kingdom and the second most common cause in the United States. Because to misdiagnosis, the worldwide spread of Cryptosporidium is far larger than previously documented. For example, in Russia, where pathogen monitoring has only recently been implemented, recent seroprevalence studies studies that examine the presence of antibodies to a specific pathogen in blood samples indicate that nearly 90 percent of the population sampled had been exposed to Cryptosporidium infection Egorov and others, 2004. The same authors discovered Cryptosporidium oocysts in the majority of source waters analysed and in the stool samples of around 7% of diarrhoea patients Egorov and others, 2002. Cyclospora and Toxoplasma are two more protozoa of current attention, albeit a watery mode of infection has yet to be proved. Microsporidia, a third type of protozoans, are smaller than other protozoans and are increasingly recognised as causal agents of both human and animal illnesses. They are also more likely than bigger protozoa to pass through filtering systems, therefore it is fair to infer a watery route of exposure.

Fungal Infections. Fungal species such as Aspergillus, Cladosporium, Epicoccum, Penicillium, and Trichoderma have been identified from treated drinking water in recent investigations Arvanitidou, Kanellou, Constantinides, and Katsouyannopoulos, 1999. Candida yeasts are also isolated from drinking water on occasion and seem to correlate with the indicator organisms, total and faecal coliforms. A variety of fungus and yeasts identified from water supply are either potential pathogens or may create harmful compounds that quickly degrade food.

To far, there is really no direct proof of viral transmission through water. Viroids, which are single-stranded RNA, are considered to solely cause plant illnesses. These pathogens, like related infectious agents known as satellite RNAs, which rely on a helper virus for reproduction, are unlikely to pose a substantial hazard to human health through drinking water. In fact, the lack of knowledge linking these chemicals to human illness does not rule out the possibility of future links. The Hepatitis Delta agent, for example, is simply a viroid wrapped in a hepatitis B coat. Prions, an infectious proteinaceous substance, have come to prominence in the aftermath of the severe economic impact and perceived public health concern posed by the bovine spongiform encephalopathy BSE epidemic in the United Kingdom The BSE Inquiry, 2000. While prions have not been isolated from drinking water, it is acceptable to consider the dangers of contamination from rendering wastes, abattoirs, and landfills, for example.

Safe Drinking Water

Protection of drinking water sources from contamination, water treatment to remove pollutants, and protection of water from recontamination during transmission all contribute to ensuring the safety of drinking water.

Source Protection

The availability of high-quality source water is perhaps the most critical concern for human health protection in regard to drinkable water sources. Watershed preservation is crucial to this process, although it often clashes with development and recreation of watersheds. Development in many urban areas has far outpaced the supply of high-quality source water. Naturally, many communities now rely on surface waterways that may absorb both treated and untreated wastewaters. The protection of source waters entails preserving large buffers, restricting recreational access, and prohibiting agricultural and industrial usage. Many would argue that all animals and wildfowl should be barred from accessing source water, regardless of how impracticable this is. As explained, New York City has gone to remarkable lengths to preserve upstate source water. This method proved to be less expensive than treating water from hazardous sources.

The development of this water supply by New York may have an impact on the three downstream consumers. The watersheds of the Croton, Catskill, and Delaware rivers have great recreational and agricultural grounds. Moreover, the numerous upstream settlements that have grown in these watersheds resent the fact that they are unable to fully use these resources, which must be conserved in order to service a population 100 miles below. The laws for New York, as well as other large cities in the United States without filtration including Boston, Portland, and Seattle, altered in 1989. The EPA issued the Surface Water Treatment Regulation this year as part of the Safe Drinking Water Act SWTR. The SWTR mandates filtration of all public water supply systems fed by unfiltered surface water unless a set of requirements known as the filtration avoidance criteria are fulfilled. New York City has made these criteria available on their website New York City Department of Environmental Protection, 2004.

The City of New York confronts billions of dollars in expenditures to adopt drinking water filtration, therefore it has gone to extraordinary lengths to demonstrate that it can fulfil these standards. In addition to initiatives to acquire property in watersheds, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection produced Final Rules and Regulations for the Preservation of the New York City Water Supply and Its Sources from Contamination, Degradation, and Pollution 1997. This 122-page document establishes a regulatory framework for the following potential watershed contaminants: hazardous substances and hazardous wastes, radioactive isotopes, petroleum products, human excreta, wastewater treatment plants, sewerage systems, service connections and discharges to sewerage systems, subsurface sewerage treatment systems, storm water pollution prevention plans and impervious surfaces, miscellaneous point sources, solid waste, agricultural act, miscellaneous point sources, solid waste, agricultural act, miscellaneous point sources, solid.

Water Treatment

Since that many source waters are of low quality, and even high-quality source waters may get polluted, some amount of water treatment is deemed necessary. Water transmission from the source to the facility is arguably where the sewage treatment train starts. Contamination prevention during conveyance, which in some situations might be hundreds of kilometres of pipeline, aqueduct, or even open ditches, is obviously critical. Water treatment consists of a series of stages. To remove plants, debris, dead animals, and other big particles, water entering the treatment facility may go through coarse filtration. Chemicals may be added for particular objectives, such as oxidising soluble iron and manganese to make them simpler to remove. When present, these metals discolour water and stain garments and plumbing fixtures. Coagulation and precipitation are the following steps. This phase involves the addition of a chemical, such as aluminium sulphate, as well as lime and sodium bicarbonate, which causes suspended sediments, bacteria, and other particles to cluster together form floc. After that, the floc is allowed to settle, eliminating these elements from the water. After filtration, a disinfection phase, like as ozonation, is performed in certain plants to lower microbial counts and avoid excessive microbial development on filter materials. Depending on the resources available and the number of the population serviced, filtration methods vary from basic, time-b.

Postfiltration disinfection is the last stage. Chlorination has been the most extensively utilised type of disinfection since the early twentieth century. Through denaturing enzymes, chlorine and chlorine compounds are supposed to serve as disinfectants. Chlorine has the benefit of producing a leftover in water as it passes from the treatment plant to taps through the distribution systems pipes. This aids in the prevention of bacterial regrowth in the distribution system however biofilms inhibit this purpose. With growing concern about the possible toxicity of chlorination byproducts, other disinfection methods including as ozonation and pulsed UV have gained popularity.

Resistant against infection. One motivation for looking for alternatives to chlorination is the emerging understanding that a variety of microorganisms seem to be capable of thriving at the safe chlorination levels often seen in drinking water. Survival mechanisms range from a moderately tough cell wall to intracellular survival. The previously stated protozoan Cryptosporidium parvum is one of the most hardy germs. C. parvum produces exceptionally environmentally resistant oocysts, allowing the organism to withstand chlorine concentrations that are significantly higher than normal.

Disinfection By-Product Toxicity

Since residual disinfection is required in distributed water, some chlorine or chloramines must be supplied posttreatment. Chlorine compounds, on the other hand, react with naturally existing organic matter to create disinfection by-products DBPs. Trihalomethanes such as chloroform and boric acid are the most well-known DBPs. Yet, considering the variety of chemical precursors that might present in source water, the spectrum of disinfection by-products is extensive. Recently, there has been considerable interest in a chlorinated furanone known as mutagen X, 3- chloro-4-dichloromethyl-5-hydroxy-25H-furanone. A Finnish laboratory calculated that this chemical is more than 100 times more mutagenic than chloroform. It is, however, found at far lower amounts than chloroform Boorman and others, 1999. Several of these chlorinated organic chemicals are carcinogenic, according to mounting research. The majority of this information comes from animal research that used high-dose exposures. Human exposures through drinkable water are often orders of magnitude lower, and quantifying the degree of harm to people has been problematic. Moreover, whereas toxicological data for trihalomethanes and haloacetates are available, less is known about other DBPs. As a result, there is considerable ambiguity regarding the overall danger of DBPs. According to one estimate, DBPs cause 4,200 instances of bladder cancer and 6,500 cases of rectal cancer in the United States per year Morris and colleagues, 1992, while DBPs are responsible for around three more cancer deaths per 10,000 people in Taiwan.

The dangers connected with DBPs are concerning, although they are far lower than the risks associated with polluted water, particularly in impoverished countries. In Africa, infant death rates from unsafe and insufficient water range between 2 and 5% each year Taylor, 1993. In 1990, several million instances of diarrheal illness were recorded in Latin America, with an estimated 300,000 fatalities de Macedo, 1993. In addition, 5,000 fatalities in the United States are linked to foodborne disease each year Mead and others, 1999, with a part of these deaths most likely owing to food preparation with contaminated water. In many cases, the danger of microbiological water pollution outweighs the risk of DBPs. Many water specialists agree that the microbiological purity of drinking water should never be jeopardised in the name of ill-defined health hazards from DBPs. Nonetheless, once tap water is shown to be pathogen-free, it is appropriate to investigate measures to limit the potential toxicity of DBPs. This has included research on alternate ways of disinfection in the United States and other wealthy countries Clark and Boutin, 2001. Unfortunately, for many nations, economic realities make these technologies and their ongoing maintenance unfeasible, and chlorine remains the most practical and effective method of reducing waterborne illness.

Water Distribution

Water distribution is a vital phase, and its failure has been linked to several occurrences of drinking water pollution and outbreaks of waterborne illness. Water with a disinfectant residue may be transported through hundreds of miles of pipeline throughout a big metropolis. Water runs via building pipes in addition to large distribution lines. All of these pipelines are possible cross-contamination locations due to a number of procedures. Metal pipes are prone to corrosion and may develop holes over time, allowing external sources of water to enter the pipes during times of low pressure. This occurs, for example, when hydrants are widely utilised in firefighting. Back siphonage from pipes or tubing left hanging in sinks or other water or waste storage may also be caused by low pressure in the drinking water system.

This is especially problematic in high-rise structures, because distribution system pressure may be inadequate to keep top floors supplied 24 hours a day. When this occurs, inhabitants have a propensity to fill bathtubs and other containers as a reserve. Regrowth of bacteria in distribution lines is a very significant concern in the lack of outside contamination. This is especially true at dead ends like fire hydrants. In these locations, water stays virtually stagnant, and any leftover chlorine in the system quickly combines with organic matter, allowing microorganisms to flourish and multiply.

Point-of-Use Treatment and Bottled Water

A point-of-use treatment device or bottled water are two alternatives to direct tap water drinking that customers are increasingly considering for their potable water supply. These are undoubtedly feasible approaches, but careful maintenance of a point-of-use device is required to prevent compounding water quality issues by producing a biofilm reactor that fosters microbial growth. Since bottled water is not yet as strictly regulated as municipal water, the customer is at the discretion of the producer. Moreover, there is a strong case to be made that if the money people are prepared to spend for point-of-use filters and bottled water were spent in city treatment and distribution, many present health dangers both genuine and perceived might be reduced.

Regulatory Framework

Water quality monitoring laws for a wide range of chemicals are well established, owing largely to the more sensitive technology that can be employed to measure low amounts of pollutants. Sadly, this is not the case with microbiological pollutants. Notwithstanding the fact that many pathogens persist for lengthy periods in drinking water in the absence of these signs, the indicator approach remains the predominant way for evaluating microbiological quality of drinking water. Moreover, even in the absence of any pollution source, a variety of environmental pathogens mabe present in drinking water.

The Safe Drinking Water Act

The United States Congress obliged the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate pollutants in drinking water that might endanger human health under the Safe Drinking Water Act SDWA EPA, 2005, which was enacted in 1974 and revised in 1986 and 1996. This complicated piece of law has a lot of significant clauses. The SDWAs core approach is to establish allowable limits of pollutants in drinking water delivered by public drinking-water utilities. The EPA develops two sets of benchmarks: one based on ideal health objectives and the other on practicality. In the first set, known as Maximum Contaminant Level Goals MCLGs, a goal is defined as the level of a contaminant in drinking water below which there is no known or projected danger to health after seventy years of consuming two litres of water per day. These levels are designed with a margin of safety in mind. MCLGs are set to zero for several pollutants, including carcinogens, lead, and certain infections. MCLGs are public health objectives, not legally binding standards. Maximum Contaminant Levels MCLs on the other hand, are legal limitations. They are as near to MCLGs as feasible, taking both technical feasibility and cost into mind.

The EPAs National Primary Drinking Water Rules NPDWR are based on these criteria. These restrictions presently cover 53 organic substances, 16 inorganic compounds, four radionuclide classes, four kinds of disinfection by-products, and three disinfectants. Cryptosporidium, Giardia lamblia, Legionella, and viruses are controlled as microbiological pollutants, but solely in terms of % eradication or inactivation by treatment. Heterotrophic plate counts a measure of microbial load, turbidity, and total coliform levels including faecal coliforms and E. coli are similarly controlled and may be tested directly, however as previously noted, these signs are imprecise indications of pathogen presence. The EPA also issues National Secondary Drinking Water Rules NSDWR, which are non-binding standards for pollutants that create cosmetic or aesthetic issues in drinking water.

Total Coliform Rule

The Total Coliform Regulation was finalised by the EPA in 1989. This guideline is presently the driving force behind drinking water safety and is typically used as the first signal of probable contamination other than turbidity. A water system must create a regular coliform sampling strategy, including sample locations that appropriately reflect water quality across the distribution system, according to the regulation. Each sample that tests positive for total coliforms must be repeated and tested for faecal coliforms or E. coli. Specific requirements vary depending on the population served; however, for a large municipality, having more than 5% of samples test positive for total coliforms in a month constitutes a monthly Maximum Contaminant Level violation, which must be reported to the municipalitys respective state by the end of the next business day and the public notified within thirty days. Every repeat faecal coliform or E. coli positive sample, or any routine faecal coliform or E. coli positive sample followed by a repeat total coliform sample, results in an acute MCL violation.

If an acute violation occurs, the state must be informed by the end of the following working day, and the public must be notified within twenty-four hours. The Sanitary Survey is an extra component of the Total Coliform Regulation that is intended to safeguard smaller public water systems. Any system that collects less than five samples a month is obliged to conduct Sanitary Surveys on a regular basis, generally every five years. This study is intended to assess the complete water system, including its operations and maintenance, in order to maintain public health. The EPAs Web site has a wealth of tools for completing Sanitary Surveys

Consumer Confidence Reports

Reports on Consumer Confidence

The obligation for utilities to issue Consumer Confidence Reports was a significant effect of the SDWA Amendment of 1996. The mandate, which was adopted in 1998, is intended to empower Citizens to make practical, informed choices about their health and the environment. In addition to providing timely warning when coliform levels are high, water utilities are mandated to notify customers yearly at the very least

Risk Characterization for Water Contaminant

Risk assessment is the process of prioritising actions and reducing human exposure to natural sources of chemicals and diseases. Nevertheless, assessing microbiological risk raises some additional problems. They include exposure evaluation, variability, and complexity.Spot samples are normally obtained from finished water at the treatment plant, and sometimes from readily accessible places in the distribution system, to detect microbiological risks. Yet, pathogen distribution in drinking water is exceedingly variable. Most consumers will not eat an infectious dosage of a disease, and water sample values will typically be zero.

Yet, a small number of people may eat a big number of infectious germs. Moreover, as previously noted, the presence of the commonly monitored coliform group does not reliably indicate the presence of most infections. Utilities anticipate that turbidity spikes will detect severe pollution events in a watershed; however, this doesnt always turn out to be the case. Turbidity increases were not high during the Milwaukee pollution incident in 1993. Mac Kenzie and others, 1994. A much smaller incident may not cause high turbidity, or modest increases may be undetected. While it is an uncommon occurrence, a plug of infectious oocysts, cysts, or viruses might infiltrate the distribution system and be easily overlooked by a spot sample method, but contain sufficient numbers to almost assure infection. As a result, assessing exposure remains a barrier in microbiological risk assessment. As a result, assessing microbiological risk remains difficult. Consequently, variability is a significant problem. Individuals differ in the pathogen dosages they sustain, which is connected to both heterogeneity in the drinking-water system and diversity in individual water intake. Individual susceptibility age, health, and other characteristics, past exposure immunity, and the pathogens virulence all influence how people react to a certain infectious dosage affected by numerous environmental factors.

It may be polluted by both chemicals and bacteria, and these two types of pollutants interact with one another. Some of the compounds of concern include bacterial, yeast, or algal toxins. Some kinds of organisms may manufacture some inside the distribution system pipeline; sulfate-reducing bacteria produce sulphides and other sulfur-containing chemicals, while nitrifying bacteria produce nitrites and nitrates from ammonia molecules either in source water or from chloramination. Yet other chemicalsdisinfection byproductsare produced as a consequence of water treatment methods to reduce microbial contamination.

Because of thes6e factors, the health hazards connected with drinking water have yet to be thoroughly characterised and quantified. The World Health Organization provides globally accepted drinking water quality standards. In certain circumstances, such as the current WHO arsenic standard, these requirements are stricter compared to the US EPA. Those without predisposing variables are likely to have minor health risks; persons with predisposing factors in industrialised countries include the very old, the elderly, pregnant women, and those with weakened immune function. On a global scale, however, sensitive people may be as prevalent as nonsusceptible ones. Susceptibility is increased by malnutrition, stress, concurrent illnesses, and socioeconomic disadvantage. The worldwide danger posed by tainted water might be immense.

Despite this danger, persons living in polluted regions may be protected by immunity arising from repeated earlier exposures. All of the parameters described above indicate that these people are very vulnerable, although immunisation results in a lower than predicted prevalence of many waterborne infections. This resilience must come at a cost to the person, but there is no reliable method for estimating the disease burden from numerous infectious agents exposure and toxins. Its intricacy, like the complexity of water itself, continues to make microbial risk assessment studies difficult [9]–[11].

The Phenomenon of New Disease

A variety of variables may contribute to the actual or perceived appearance of a new illness. Novel ecological niches, such as hot-water systems that favour Legionella development, may contribute. Even in industrialised nations, factors such as population density and a rising number of vulnerable people the very young, the elderly, pregnant women, and the immunocompromised might create a large human reservoir for opportunistic infections and induce changes in virulence patterns. Increasing adaptation to the human host may be to blame for higher infection rates in populations that do not have any underlying sensitivity for example, mycobacterial diseases.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Zerbo, R. C. Delgado, and P. A. Gonzalez, Conceptual frameworks regarding waterborne diseases in sub-Saharan Africa and the need of for a new approach to urban exposomes, *Epidemiol. Health*, 2021, doi: 10.4178/epih.e2021079.

[2] J. K. Griffiths, Waterborne Diseases, in *International Encyclopedia of Public Health*, 2016. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-803678-5.00490-2.

[3] L. Mari, R. Casagrandi, E. Bertuzzo, A. Rinaldo, and M. Gatto, Conditions for transient epidemics of waterborne disease in spatially explicit systems, *R. Soc. Open Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1098/rsos.181517.

[4] E. Funari, M. Manganelli, and L. Sinisi, Impact of climate change on waterborne diseases, *Ann. Ist. Super. Sanita*, 2012, doi: 10.4415/ANN_12_04_13.

[5] V. R. N. Cruvinel, T. R. Zolnikov, M. Bashash, C. P. Marques, and J. A. Scott, Waterborne diseases in waste pickers of Estrutural, Brazil, the second largest open-air dumpsite in world, *Waste Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.wasman.2019.08.035.

[6] S. A. Collier *et al.*, Estimate of burden and direct healthcare cost of infectious waterborne disease in the United States, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, 2021, doi: 10.3201/eid2701.190676.

[7] F. Capone, M. F. Carfora, R. De Luca, and I. Torcicollo, Analysis of a model for waterborne

diseases with allee effect on bacteria, *Nonlinear Anal. Model. Control*, 2020, doi: 10.15388/namc.2020.25.20563.

[8] A. Hennebique, S. Boisset, and M. Maurin, Tularemia as a waterborne disease: a review, *Emerging Microbes and Infections*. 2019. doi: 10.1080/22221751.2019.1638734.

[9] M. Cesa, G. Fongaro, and C. R. M. Barardi, Waterborne diseases classification and relationship with social-environmental factors in Florianópolis city - Southern Brazil, *J. Water Health*, 2016, doi: 10.2166/wh.2015.266.

[10] L. Bonadonna and G. La Rosa, A review and update on waterborne viral diseases associated with swimming pools, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16020166.

[11] K. Ravindra, S. Mor, and V. L. Pinnaka, Water uses, treatment, and sanitation practices in rural areas of Chandigarh and its relation with waterborne diseases, *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11356-019-04964-y.