

## **Arid Zone Journal of Basic and Applied Research**

Faculty of Science, Borno State University Maiduguri, Nigeria



Journal homepage: https://www.azjournalbar.com

## **Research Article**

## **Quantitative Risk Assessments of Bacteria and Heavy** Metals in Ossiomo River, Orhionmwon Local Government Area, Edo State, Nigeria

Augustine, B. Odigie<sup>1</sup>, Emmanuel E. Imarhiagbe<sup>2</sup> and Osaro F. Ekhaise<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria <sup>2</sup>Department of Environmental Management and Toxicology, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

\*Corresponding author: brian.van43@yahoo.com, doi.org/10.55639/607.050403

## **ARTICLE INFO:**

## ABSTRACT

Water contaminated with heavy metals causes human health risk after prolonged exposure. This study aimed to evaluate the quantitative risk of heavy metals and **Keyword:** bacterial diversity of Ossiomo River, Orhionmwon Local Government Area, Edo Antibiogram, State, Nigeria. Water samples were collected in triplicates from July 2019 to Heavy metals, December 2019, for physiochemical and bacteriological analysis. Heavy metals were determined using Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS). The concentrations Bacterial diversity, of metals calculated were chromium (0.003 mg/l), lead (0.009 mg/l and cadmium Ossiomo River, (0.005 mg/l) using the USEPA risk assessment guidance. Heterotrophic and coliform **Risk** assessments bacteria were isolated and enumerated using pour plate and most probable number techniques respectively. Antibiogram test was carried out using Kirby-Bauer antibiotic disc diffusion method. Non-carcinogenic risk (CR) of Pb for adult ranged from  $2.91 \times 10^{-5}$  -  $3.72 \times 10^{-5}$  mg/kg/day, Cd  $1.30 \times 10^{-6}$  -  $9.72 \times 10^{-8}$  mg/kg/day and Cr  $1.6 \times 10^{-6}$  -  $9.88 \times 10^{-6}$  mg/kg/day while Pb for children ranged from  $1.42 \times 10^{-5}$  -  $5.65 \times 10^{-5}$  mg/kg/day, Cd  $1.23 \times 10^{-1}$  -  $9.84 \times 10^{-8}$  mg/kg/day and Cr  $1.5 \times 10^{-6}$ - $3.76 \times 10^{-6}$  mg/kg/day and the average cancer risk were  $11.47 \times 10^{-6}$  mg/kg/day for children and  $11.30 \times 10^{-6}$  for the adults mg/kg/day. Total heterotrophic bacterial counts ranged between 2.4  $\pm$  1.1 and 17.8  $\pm$  4.9  $\times$  10<sup>3</sup> cfu/ml and mean coliform counts ranged from 23 to 201 MPN/100 ml. Four bacterial isolates were found and identified as Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Escherichia coli, Salmonella enterica and Klebsiella pnuemoniae. Escherichia coli 37.0 % was found to be the most frequent bacterial isolate while Pseudomonas aeruginosa 12.0 % was least. Ciprofloxacin 100 %, ceftriaxone 100 %, azithromycin 90 %, gentamycin 100 %, pefloxacin 95 %, oflaxacin 75 %, cefuroxime 70 % and ceftazidine 60 % were effective drugs against enterobacteriaceae infections whereas, augmentin 0 % and nitrofurantoin 0 % were ineffective. There is the need to improve awareness, monitoring and surveillance of coastal water bodies to curb outbreak of water borne diseases among the dependent communities

Corresponding author: Emmanuel E. Imarhiagbe, Email: brian.van43@yahoo.com Department of Environmental Management and Toxicology, University of Benin

ISSN: 2811-2881

### INTRODUCTION

The concentration of heavy metals, its severe toxic effects as well as their persistence in biotic and abiotic environment make it highly toxic for major inhabitants (Chai et al., 2010). The presences of these metallic chemical elements with relatively high density are poisonous at low concentration which could be linked with carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic human risks (Moho and Dhote, 2013). Carcinogenic risks associated with human health could be expressed as the probability that someone could develop cancerous cells after prolonged exposure to contaminated water source ladened with heavy metal deposits while in the noncarcinogenic risks, human could be able to manage exposure in a lifetime (Moraise et al., 2012). Some metals such as arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, nickel and zinc as well as other effluents from industries, urban and agricultural runoffs such as insect and disease control agents, among others are major contaminants of surface water (Moraise et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2015). These toxicants present in the river could flow into neighboring water source and become a potential health threat via ingestion, dermal contact and inhalation (Zhang et al., 2015). The health status of local inhabitants could be assessed and managed through sustainable development (Haque et al., 2018).

Ossiomo River is a tributary of Benin River, Southern Nigeria, with a supplier from Ikpoba, Okhuiahe and Akhaianwan Rivers. Ossiomon River drains into the Benin River at Koko, Delta State and empties itself into the Atlantic Ocean (Tawari-Fufeyin et al., 2008). The water source is important for its role in fishery, domestic use, washing, bathing and recreational activities. The rapid development and change of lifestyle in the past few decades such as increased rates of construction (bridge), development of industrial layouts, increased transportation and human population, intensive fertilizer and insecticide application as well as the use of other chemical substances by communities including Ologbo community have inevitably altered the quality of surface water bodies of valleys including Ossiomo River, now poses health risks to consumers (Tawari-Fufeyin et al., 2008), hence, this study evaluates the quantitative risks of heavy metals and bacterial diversity of Ossiomo River, Edo State, Nigeria.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS Study Area

This study was carried out in Ossiomo River (Latitudes 6°30'- 6°32'0''N; Longitudes 5°39'-5°40'30''E), a tributary of Benin River located in Abudu community, Orhionmwon Local Government Area, Edo State, Southern Nigeria. Ossiomo River (Fig. 1) stretches over a distance of 250 km within Edo and Delta States, Nigeria



Figure 1: Map of Orhionmwon L.G.A., showing the locations of the sampling sites along Ossiomo River stretch.

#### Sampling

Water samples were collected in triplicates monthly for a period of Six (6) months from July 2019 – Dec. 2019. The sampling locations were identified for as station 1 (Upstream), (Midstream) and station 2 station 3 (Downstream), samples were collected in sterile 1 L screw cap glass bottle and transported to the laboratory for physicochemical and bacteriological analyses.

#### **Physicochemical parameters**

Physicochemical parameters such as Dissolve Oxygen (DO), Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) were estimated using Winkler's methods. While nitrate, sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium, chloride, phosphorus and sulphate were determined using UV-Spectrophotometer following the methods (APHA, 2005). Temperature, electrical conductivity, pH and total dissolved solids were measured using an ExTech multimeter (EC 400, ExTech instruments, Nashua, NH, USA.

**Heavy metals analysis:** Heavy metals such as iron, lead, zinc, cadmium, copper, and chromium were analyzed using Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (900H, Perkin Elmer, Akron, OH, USA) according the methods APHA(2005).

# Quantitative risk assessment analysis of heavy metals

The human exposure risk to trace metals could be classified into three main routes including inhalation, ingestion and dermal adsorption exposure (USEPA, 1989). However, the most common exposure routes to water are direct ingestion and dermal adsorption (Asare – Donkor *et al.*, 2016). The estimated human risk index through ingestion pathway was calculated for adults and children showing  $\text{Exp}_{ing}$ ,  $\text{HQ}_{ing}$ , HI and  $\text{CR}_{ing}$ . The data from midstream were human activities were mostly observed were used to determine the potential carcinogenic risks (CR<sub>ing</sub>) for lead, chromium and cadmium across the sampling periods. In this study, direct ingestion was adopted for the estimation of quantitative risk assessment of heavy metals ( $Exp_{ing}$ ) for adults (70years) and children (6 years), using the equations and some constant values. Average concentration (Cw) mg/l, Ingestion Rate (IR) 3L/day (adult), 1.5

$$Exp_{ing} = \frac{C_{water} \times IR \times EF \times ED}{BW \times AT} -$$

Where Exp<sub>ing</sub>: exposure through ingestion of water (mg/kg/day).

Potential non-carcinogenic risks due to exposure to heavy metals were determined by comparing the calculated contaminant exposure with the

$$HQ_{ing} = \frac{Exp_{ing}}{RFD_{ing}} - - -$$

Where  $RFD_{ing}$  is ingestion toxicity reference dose (mg/kg/day) and the value for the selected metals were derived from the literature (USEPA, 1989; WHO, 2011; Hasan *et al.*, 2021).

An HQ < 1 is assumed to be safe and accepted as significant non – carcinogenic but when HQ>1 may be a major concern for potential health risk in association with over exposure of humans to the contaminants. (children), Exposure Frequency (EF) 365 day/year, Exposure Duration (70 years) adult, (6 years children), Average Body weight (BW, kg) 60.7 (adult), 20 (children), Average Time (AT) (365×70) adult (365×6) children USEPA (1989).

- - - - (1)

reference dose (RFD) (USEPA, 1989; Bironke *et al.*, 2018).

Equation 2 was used to estimate the hazard quotient (HQ) toxicity in order to determine the non– carcinogenic potential risks of an individual through the ingestion route.

- - - - (2)

To access the overall potential for non – carcinogenic effects posed by more than one metal through the pathway, the sum of the computed HQ across metal, is expressed as a hazard index (H1) using equation 3 below (USEPA, 1989).

H1>1 showed that regular exposure to the surface water could have a potential adverse impact on human health (Li *et al.*, 2010; Ullah *et al.*, 2014).

Carcinogenic risk (CR) via ingestion route was estimated using equation

Where  $CR_{ing}$  is the Carcinogenic risk via ingestion route and  $SF_{ing}$  is the Carcinogenic slope factor for Pb is 8.5 x10, Cd is 6.1 x 10<sup>3</sup> and 5.0 x 10<sup>2</sup> mg/kg/day (Ibironke *et al.*, 2021; Ullah *et al*; 2014). The CR<sub>ing</sub> values for other metals were not calculated due to unavailability of the SF<sub>ing</sub> values.

#### Bacteriological analyses of sampled water

Isolation and enumeration of total heterotrophic bacterial isolates were cultured using nutrient agar, MacConkey agar using pour plate methods while eosin methylene blue agar as suitable media for isolation of total fecal and total coliforms were determined using Most Probable Number (MPN) according to Cheesebrough (2000). Plates were incubated at  $37^{\circ}$  C for 24 hours and discrete colonies were further subcultured onto Nutrient agar to obtain pure isolates. Pure culture isolates were stored in Nutrient agar slant at  $4^{\circ}$  C according to Cheesebrough (2006).

# Phenotypic and biochemical identification of isolates

Phenotypic identification of bacterial isolates was carried out with focus on Gram staining and biochemical reactions using standard bacteriological techniques outlined in Cheesebrough (2000). Suspected colonies were subjected to oxidase, indole, urease, citrate, fructose, galactose, lactose, maltose, mannitol, mannose, nitrate reduction, triple sugar iron (TSI) and sucrose.

# Antibiotic susceptibility test of bacterial isolates

The antibiotic susceptibility test for each isolate was performed on freshly prepared, dry surfaced Mueller - Hinton agar (Oxoid) using the agardisk diffusion method according to Clinical Laboratory Standard Institute (CLSI, 2008). A total of Eleven (11) tested antibiotics disc (Oxiom) where employed and they were augmentin (30 µg), ceftriaxone (30 µg), nitrofurantoin (300 µg), ofloxacin (5 µg), azithromycin (15 µg), cefuroxime (30 µg), gentamicin (10 µg), ciprofloxacin (5 µg), levofloxacin (5 µg), pefloxacin (5 µg) and ceftazidime (30  $\mu$ g). The ranges of the diameter were measured in millimeter (mm) of each antibiotic disc which is interpretive for intermediate susceptibility. or resistant compared with the performance standards of CLSI (2008).

## **Bacterial DNA extraction**

Bacterial DNA was extracted according to the lysozyme-based cell lysis and DNA precipitation procedure for bacteria. The DNA obtained was spectophotometrically quantified using the NanoDrop ® Technologies (USA) at 260nm and the purity level of DNA samples was determined at a ratio of absorbance (A260/A280). The purity ratio ranging from 1.8 and 2.2 was used as DNA template for Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) (Lee *et al.*, 2003; Fietto *et al.*, 2004).

## Amplification of the 16S rRNA genes

The 16S rRNA gene from total bacterial isolates and genomic DNR respectively were amplified by Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) using bacteria primers universal (27F-AGAGTTGATCCTGGCTCAG 1492Rand GGTTACCTTGTTACGACTT). The PCR amplification was carried out in a Techne TC-412 Thermal Cycler (Model FTC41H2D, Bibby Scientific Ltd, UK) in a 50 µl reactions containing 25  $\mu$ l of 2  $\times$  PCR Master Mix (Norgen Biotek, Canada), 1.5 µl of template DNA (0.5  $\mu$ g), 1  $\mu$ l of both forward and reverse primers (2.5µM of each) and 21.5µl of nuclease free water in a PCR tube added in that order. PCR was carried out at an initial denaturation step at 94 °C for 2 min, followed by 30 cycles at 94 °C for 30 sec, 52 °C for 30 sec and 72 °C for 2 min, and a final extension step at 72 °C for 5 min. PCR products (amplicons) were separated by electrophoresis on a 1% agarose TAE gel containing ethidium bromide and visualized by UV trans illumination (Foto/UV 15, Model3-3017, Fotodyne, USA) according to methods Klindworth, et al., (2013).

### Statistical analysis

Data generated were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using F-test and T-test to determine the significance differences in group results. SPSS version 21 and graph prims version 6.0 was used as statistical tools Ogbeibu (2005).

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The results of Hazard Quotient (HQ) presented in Table 1 ranged from  $1.28 \times 10^{-2} - 9.88 \times 10^{-1}$ (adult) and  $2.1 \times 10^{-1} - 8.62 \times 10^{-2}$  (children). According to Liang *et al.* (2011), heavy metals pollution have been known to cause severe health impacts when the HQ and Hazard Index (HI) values of a metal is higher than 1 (HQ>1 and HI>1). In this study, the average (HQ) and (HI) for adults were  $9.26 \times 10^{-1}$  and  $9.53 \times 10^{-1}$ ,

locations of the river. The results in Table 3

and  $10.09 \times 10^{-1}$  and  $8.48 \times 10^{-1}$  (children) were less than 1 (HQ<1 and HI<1) in all sampling locations and periods. This finding proved that there were no indications for non-carcinogeous risk linked with heavy metals such as lead, chromium and cadmium in Ossiomo River. Similar findings were reported by Madilonga *et al.* (2021) in Mutangwi River, South Africa and Ibironke *et al.* (2018) in Ndawuse River, Abuja, Nigeria.

The carcinogenic risk (CRing) associated with lead, chromium and cadmium via ingestion route as estimated for both adults and children revealed the average values of  $11.45 \times 10^{-6}$ (children) and  $11.30 \times 10^{-6}$  (adults) are shown in Table 1. The above results suggest higher cancer risk for children than adults through ingestion pathway after a long period of exposure. The calculated cancer risk due to exposure to chromium, lead and cadmium, and the average cancer risk values recorded in this study were above the acceptable cancer health risk limit of  $1.00 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $1.00 \times 10^{-4}$  (i.e, 1 case of cancer per every 1,000,000 to 1 case of cancer per every 10,000). Pawelczyk (2003) asserted that a risk of  $1.00 \times 10^{-3}$  level will require protective measure of the river. Results from this study revealed that a lifetime exposure to these heavy metals concentration can pose cancer risk for both children and adults. These findings were similar to the report of Madilonga et al. (2021) and Ibironke et al. (2018).

Table 2 showed results of total heterotrophic bacterial counts ranging from  $2.4 \pm 1.1$  to  $17.8 \pm 4.9 \times 10^3$  cfu/ml across the sampling locations and periods. Midstream samples had the highest bacterial counts of  $15.9 \pm 7.0 - 17.8 \pm 4.9 \times 10^3$ cfu/ml followed by downstream samples  $8.2 \pm 6.3 - 13.6 \pm 2.4 \times 10^3$  cfu/ml, while the least counts of  $7.4 \pm 1.0 \times 10^3$  cfu/ml was recorded in upstream samples. The significant difference (P<0.05) in bacterial load observed in the studied locations could be attributed to the levels of contamination resulting from unhygienic human activities in the different sampling revealed the total coliform counts ranged from 23 to 201 MPN/100ml. Upstream samples had the lowest count of 126 MPN/100ml followed downstream 152 MPN/100ml, bv while midstream samples 201 MPN/100ml recorded the highest bacterial count. The highest bacterial load recorded in this study could be linked to increased anthropogenic activities and the presence of other forms of contaminants in and around the water body, specifically in the various sampling locations. These findings were in accordance with the report of Adieze et al. (2016) who reported that high bacterial load is attributable to the presence of organic matters in the water bodies. Table 4 shows the cultural, morphological, biochemical and physiological characteristics of bacterial isolates. Phenotypically, Four (4) bacterial isolates were isolated and they include Klebsiella sp., Pseudomonas sp., Escherichia sp. and Salmonella sp. Molecular characterization revealed the presence of Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Escherichia coli and Salmonella enterica as shown in Plate 1. The results shown in Table 5 revealed the percentage occurrence of bacterial isolates. Escherichia coli (37.0 %) was reported to be the most prevalent bacteria isolate while Pseudomonas aeruginosa (12.0 %) had the least frequency of occurrence.

Table 6 showed the results of antibiogram assay of bacteria isolates. Escherichia coli exhibited high level of susceptibility to gentamicin (100 %) and ciprofloxacin (100 %), followed by ceftriaxone (75 %), ofloxacin (75 %) and levofloxacin (75 %) while azithromycin (50 %) and ceftazidine (50 %) were found to be resistant. But augmentin (0 %) and nitrofurantoin (0 %) showed no effect on the isolate. Pseudomonas aeruginosa showed high susceptibility to ceftriaxone (100 %) and ciprofloxacin (100 %), followed by pefloxacin (95 %), cefuroxime (65 %, ofloxacin (62 %) and levofloxacin (57 %) while azithromycin (50 %)

and ceftazidine (50 %) were found to be ineffective. Augmentin (0 %) and nitofurantoin (0%) showed no resistance. cefuroxime (70%), levofloxacin (68 %), pefloxacin (67 %), ceftazidine (62 %), ciprofloxacin (61 %) and ofloxacin (60 %) were effective against Klebsiella pneumonia while azithromycin (50 %) ceftriaxon (0 %), gentamicin (0 %), augmentin (0 %) and nitrofurantoin (0 %) were ineffective. Salmonella enterica was sensitive to ceftriaxon (100 %), ciprofloxacin (100 %), cefuroxime (94 %), levofloxacin (87 %), azithromycin (80 %), ofloxacin (76 %) and ceftaxidine (60 %) while pefloxacin (50 %), gentamicin (0 %), augmentin (0 %) and nitrofurantoin (0%) were resistant.

#### CONCLUSION

Recently, more concern is raised on the impacts of heavy metals in environmental studies especially in water bodies. Drinking water which contains a significant amount of heavy metal might cause adverse health impacts on human and could results in severs cancer disease. In this study, the Hazard Quotient (HQ) values of selected heavy metals contents in Ossiomo River were less than 1 which indicates no health risk effects. However, precaution needs to be taken due to human activities and potential cancinogenic exposure risk (CRing) over a period of time especially for young children using this water. Ossiomo River contaminated with E. coli and other Enterobacteriaceae is not suitable for irrigation, recreation and domestic use, hence, water treatment is recommended before consumption.

		bA	nlt		Children					
Metals	<b>RfD</b> <sub>ing</sub>	Exp <sub>ing</sub>	HQ	HI (mg/kg/day)	CR <sub>ing</sub>	Exping	HQ	HI (mg/kg/day)	CR <sub>ing</sub>	
July										
Pb	1.4	$2.74 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.77 \times 10^{2}$	$1.06 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.91 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.75 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.68 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-1}$	$4.41 \times 10^{-5}$	
Cd	0.5	$2.97 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.94 \times 10^{1}$	$3.56 \times 10^{1}$	4.86×10 <sup>-7</sup>	$4.5 \times 10^{-2}$	9×10 <sup>-1</sup>	5.4×10 <sup>-2</sup>	7.28×10 <sup>-8</sup>	
Cr	3	4.94×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$1.65 \times 10^{1}$	$9.88 \times 10^{-1}$	9.88×10 <sup>-6</sup>	$7.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.5 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-6}$	
Aug										
Pb	1.4	2.65×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$1.89 \times 10^{-2}$	1.13×10 <sup>-1</sup>	3.12×10 <sup>-5</sup>	$4.05 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.89 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.74 \times 10^{-1}$	4.7×10 <sup>-5</sup>	
Cd	0.5	$3.79 \times 10^{-4}$	$7.58 \times 10^{-1}$	4.55×10 <sup>-3</sup>	4.46×10 <sup>-6</sup>	$6 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-2}$	$7.2 \times 10^{-2}$	9.84×10 <sup>-8</sup>	
Cr	3	$6.43 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.14 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.29 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.29 \times 10^{-6}$	$9.75 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.25 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.95 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.95 \times 10^{-6}$	
Sep										
Pb	1.4	2.67×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$1.91 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.14 \times 10^{-1}$	3.14×10 <sup>-4</sup>	4.05×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$2.89 \times 10^{-2}$	1.73×10 <sup>-1</sup>	4.76×10 <sup>-5</sup>	
Cd	0.5	$4.94 \times 10^{-4}$	9.88×10 <sup>-1</sup>	5.93×10 <sup>-2</sup>	8.1×10 <sup>-7</sup>	$7.05 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-1}$	9×10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.23×10 <sup>-1</sup>	
Cr	3	$6.92 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-1}$	1.38×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$1.38 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-3}$	3.5×10 <sup>-1</sup>	2.10×10 <sup>-2</sup>	$2.1 \times 10^{-6}$	
Oct										
Pb	1.4	$2.77 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.98 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-1}$	3.25×10 <sup>-5</sup>	4.2×10 <sup>-3</sup>	3×10 <sup>-2</sup>	$1.8 \times 10^{-2}$	4.94×10 <sup>-5</sup>	
Cd	0.5	5.93×10 <sup>-4</sup>	$1.19 \times 10^{-2}$	7.12×10 <sup>-2</sup>	9.72×10 <sup>-8</sup>	9.0×10 <sup>-4</sup>	$1.8 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.08 \times 10^{-1}$	1.48×10 <sup>-6</sup>	
Cr	3	8.40×10 <sup>-4</sup>	$2.8 \times 10^{-1}$	1.68×10 <sup>-2</sup>	$1.68 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.28 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.25 \times 10^{-1}$	2.52×10 <sup>-2</sup>	2.55×10 <sup>-6</sup>	
Nov										
Pb	1.4	2.94×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$2.1 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.26 \times 10^{-1}$	3.46×10 <sup>-6</sup>	4.50×10 <sup>-3</sup>	3.21×10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.93×10 <sup>-1</sup>	5.29×10 <sup>-5</sup>	
Cd	0.5	$7.91 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.58 \times 10^{-1}$	9.48×10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.30×10 <sup>-6</sup>	$1.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.44 \times 10^{-1}$	2.40×10 <sup>-6</sup>	
Cr	3	9.39×10 <sup>-4</sup>	3.13×10 <sup>-1</sup>	$1.88 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.88 \times 10^{-6}$	1.43×10 <sup>-3</sup>	$4.75 \times 10^{-1}$	$2.85 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.88 \times 10^{-6}$	
Dec										
Pb	1.4	3.11×10 <sup>-3</sup>	2.22×10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.33×10 <sup>-1</sup>	3.66×10 <sup>-5</sup>	4.73×10 <sup>-3</sup>	3.38×10 <sup>-2</sup>	2.03×10 <sup>-1</sup>	5.56×10 <sup>-5</sup>	
Cd	0.5	9.39×10 <sup>-4</sup>	$1.88 \times 10^{-1}$	1.13×10 <sup>-1</sup>	$1.54 \times 10^{-7}$	1.43×10 <sup>-3</sup>	2.85×10 <sup>-2</sup>	$1.71 \times 10^{-1}$	2.34×10 <sup>-7</sup>	
Cr	3	$1.09 \times 10^{-3}$	3.62×10 <sup>-1</sup>	$2.17 \times 10^{-1}$	2.18×10 <sup>-6</sup>	$1.65 \times 10^{-3}$	5.5×10 <sup>-1</sup>	3.3×10 <sup>-1</sup>	3.30×10 <sup>-6</sup>	
Average					∑ <b>11.30</b> ×10 <sup>-6</sup>				∑ <b>11.41</b> ×10 <sup>-6</sup>	
USEPĂ Limi	t				—			1.0>	<10 <sup>-4</sup> - 1.0×10 <sup>-6</sup>	
V LICED	A TT 1/ 1		· 1 D · · ·	· · · D	1 1 1 0 1 0	1	· 11			

**Table 1:** Potential carcinogenic risk assessments values (CR<sub>ing</sub>) of Pb, Cd and Cr for adult and children in consuming Ossiomo River source through injection pathways between July 2019 and December 2019

Key: USEPA- United States Environmental Protection Agency, Pb-lead, Cd-Cadmium, Cr-Chromium

Sampling stations	July Aug 2019		Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec 2019					
(x10 <sup>3</sup> ±SD Cfu/ml)											
Upstream	7.4±1.7	10.7±1.0	9.1±1.7	2.4±1.1	3.2±0.2	4.5±3.1					
Midstream	15.9±7.0	17.8±4.9	16.0±1.8	9.2±6.7	5.4±2.1	4.7±2.4					
Downstream	8.2±6.3	13.6±2.4	12.4±2.6	6.8±4.3	3.6±1.2	4.7±2.8					

Table 2: Total Heterotrophic Bacterial Counts Isolated from July, 2019 to Dec., 2019

Values expressed as mean triplicates, World Health Organization Permissible Limits for portable water = 0, World Health Organization (2011).

<b>Table 3:</b> Total Coliform Counts Isolated from July to December, 2019 (MPN/100 ml)	

Sampling Locations	July 2019	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec 2019
Upstream	53	75	126	65	23	27
Midstream	83	201	189	121	76	79
Downstream	65	97	152	78	34	35

Values expressed as mean triplicates, World Health Organization permissible limits for portable water =0, World Health Organization (2011).

Characteristics	B1 B2		<b>B3</b>	<b>B4</b>	
Cell morphology	Rod	Rod	Rod	Rod	
Cell	Cluster	Single	Single	Single	
arrangement					
Gram reaction	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	
Motility	+	+	-	+	
Test for enzymes					
Catalase	-	+	+	+	
production					
Spore formation	+	-	-	-	
Oxidase	-	+	-	-	
Coagulase	-	-	-	+	
Citrate utilization	-	+	+	+	
Indole	+	-	-	-	
Nitrate reduction	+	-	-	+	
Urease	-	-	+	-	
Acid test	-	-	+	+	
Sugar					
fermentation					
Lactose	+	+	+	-	
Glucose	+	-	+	+	
Galatose	+	-	+	+	
Maltose	+	+	+	+	
Mannitol	_	-	+	+	
Probable	Escherichia	Pseudomonas	<i>Klebsiella</i> sp	Samonella	
Identity	sp	sp		sp	

Table 4: Cultural, morphological, biochemical and physiological characteristics of bacterial isolates

**Key:** + Positive, - Negative



**Plate 1:** Agarose gel electrophoresis of bacterial isolates and ail-specific amplification by PCR. Lane M- molecular marker (0.300-bp ladder): lane 1-*Klebsiella pneumoniae*, lane 2-*Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, lane 3- *Escherichia coli*, lane 4-*Salmonella enterica* 

**Table 5:** Percentage frequency of occurrence of bacterial isolates of water samples at different sampling locations in Ossiomo River from July to December, 2019

<b>Bacterial Isolates</b>	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Mean
Klebsiella pneumoniae	12(24)	20(22)	17(22)	14(32)	7(22)	6(16)	13(25)
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	10(20)	16(18)	12(16)	7(16)	6(19)	17(45)	6(12)
Escherichia coli	15(29)	32(36)	37(48)	14(32)	7(22)	6(16)	19(37)
Salmonella enterica	14(27)	21(24)	11(14)	9(20)	15(47)	9(24)	13(25)
Total	51	89	77	44	32	38	51

Bacterial Isolates	No. of Isolates	LEV	PEF	CRO	GEN	CIP	СХМ	AZM	OFL	CAZ	AUG	NIT
E. coli	2	2 (73)	1 (50)	2 (75)	2(100)	2(100)	1(50)	1(50)	2 (75)	1(50)	0(0)	0(0)
P. aeruginosa	2	1(57)	2 (95)	2(100)	2(100)	1(100)	1(65)	1(50)	2 (62)	1(50)	0(0)	0(0)
K. pneumoniae	2	2 (68)	1(67)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (61)	2(70)	1 (50)	2 (60)	1(62)	0(0)	0(0)
S. enterica	1	2(87)	1(50)	2(50)	0(0)	2(100)	1(94)	1(80)	2(76)	1(60)	0(0)	0(0)

**Table 6:** Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of bacterial isolates from Ossiomo River

Key: Salmonella enterica, Escherichia coli, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Klebsiella pneumoniae. LEV=Levofloxacin, PEF=Pefloxacin, CRO=Ceftriaxon, GEN=Gentamicin, CIP=Ciprofloxacin, CXM=Cefuroxime, OFL=Ofloxacin, CAZ=Ceftazidine, AUG=Augmentin,NIT=Nitrofurantoin and AZM= Azythromycin. Susceptibilty= 91-100 %, Intermediate=51-90 %, Resistance=1-50 %.

#### REFERENCES

- Adieze, I.E., Nwosu, C.I., Adieze, N.C. and Nwabueze., R. N (2016). Effects of untreated sewage effluent on the water quality of Otamiri River in Owerri, Nigeria. *Journal of Microbiology* **30**: 3241-3245.
- American Public Health Association (APHA) (2005). *Standards Method for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 21<sup>st</sup> Edition.American Public Health Association, Washington DC.308 pp.
- Asarr-Donkor, N.K., Boadu, T.A. and Adimado, A.A. (2016).Evaluation of groundwater and surfacewater quality and human risk assessment for treatment of human settelementa around the Bosomtive Crater Lake in Ghana. *Springer Plus* **5:**18-25
- Cheesbrough, M. (2000). *Medical Laboratory Mannual for Tropical Countries. Volume 11, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.*,University Press, Cambridge, Great Britain. 377 pp.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institutes (CLSI). (2008). Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. Eighteenth Informational Supplement (Document M100-S18). Vol. 4., The Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA, USA. 354 pp.
- Ibironke, T. E., Ambimbola, M. E., Odiyo, O. and Muhammed, M.A. (2018). Human health risk assessment of trace metals in surface water due to leachate form the municipal dumpsite by pollution ondex: A case study from Ndawuse River , Abuja, Nigeria. *Journal of Open Chemistry* 16: 214 – 229.
- Li, S. and Zhang, Q. (2010). Spatial characterization of dissolved trace

elements and heavy metals in the Upper Han River (China) using multivariate Statistical techniques. *Journal of Hazard Matter* **176:** 579 – 588.

- Madilonga, R., Edokpayi, J. N., Volenzo, E. T., Durowoju, O. S. and Odiyo, J.O. (2021). Water quality assessemnet and evaluation of human health risk in Mutaangwi River, Limpopo Province, South Africa. *International Journal of Environmental research and public health* 18: 1-16.
- Ogbeibu, A. E. (2005). *Biostatistics; A Practical Approach to Research and Data Handling*. Mindex Press Limited, Benin City, Nigeria.262 pp.
- Tawarin-Fufeyin, P., Imoobe, T.O.T. and Awana, B.B. (2008).The impacts of bridge construction on Crustacean and Zooplankton of Ossiomo River, Niger Delta, Nigeria. Africa Scientists 9:117 – 122.
- Ullah, N., Hashmi, M.Z., Yu, C., Shen, H. and Duan, D. (2015). Concentration of human health risk assessment of selected heavy metals in surface water of the siling reservoir watershed in Zhejiang Province, China. Polish Journal of Environmental Studies 23(3): 801 – 811.
- United States Environmental Protection (USEPA). (1989). *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfound, Vol. 1.Human Health Evaluation Mannual* (*Part A*), Washington DC.540 pp.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2011). Guidelines for drinking water quality 4<sup>h</sup> edition, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. 155 pp.