

Impact of Municipal Dumpsite on Neighbouring Boreholes in Igbogo Community of Rivers State, Nigeria

Ugwoha, Ejikeme ^a, Udeh, Ngozi U. ^{a*}
and Kpaniku, Doreen ^a

^a *Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Port Harcourt, P.M.B. 5323, Nigeria.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/97486>

Original Research Article

Received: 25/10/2022

Accepted: 29/12/2022

Published: 10/01/2023

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to assess the impact of Igbogo Road municipal dumpsite on the quality of nearby boreholes. The dumpsite waste was characterized to ascertain the individual components. Leachate sample was taken from the bottom of the dumpsite and analysed for relevant physicochemical parameters. Water samples were collected from seven selected boreholes and analysed for relevant water quality parameters. Water quality index (WQI) was calculated for the monitored boreholes to reveal the quality status of the water. The result of the characterization of dumpsite waste revealed the following: plastic (40%), food waste (14%), tin/can (5%), rubber (4%), textile (4%), yard waste (10%), paper (11%), ash/dirt (2%), leather (0.5%), glass (5%) and wood (4.5%). The leachate analysis gave the following results: pH (9.7), ammonia (3.07mg/L), alkalinity (674.3mg/L), DO (3.9mg/L), total hardness (235.8mg/L), iron (9.08001mg/L), zinc (4.28947mg/L) and BOD₅ (7.2mg/L) that were above WHO and NSDWQ permissible limits, indicating potential for groundwater contamination. Computed WQI for the borehole water samples

*Corresponding author: Email: goziu@yahoo.com;

(with values ranging from 105.17 to 603.58) indicated that the groundwater around the dumpsite is extremely poor and unsuitable for drinking. The developed multiple linear regression model for WQI has an excellent fit to the measured data. The one-way multivariate ANOVA carried out showed no significant variation in water quality with increasing distance from the dumpsite. Therefore, it is concluded that leachate from the municipal dumpsite impacted on the water quality of the underlying neighbouring groundwater.

Keywords: Municipal dumpsite; borehole; groundwater; contamination; leachate; water quality index.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Water of good drinking quality is of basic importance to human physiology, and man’s continued existence depends very much on its availability. An average man (of 53kg – 63kg body weight) requires about three litres of water in liquid and food daily to keep healthy” [1]. “This fact accounts for why water is regarded as one of the most indispensable substances in life” [2]. “Increase in human population has exerted an enormous pressure on the provision of safe drinking water, especially in developing countries” [3]. “Unsafe drinking water is a global public health threat, placing persons at risk for a host of diarrheal and other diseases as well as chemical intoxication” [4]. “Most of the fresh water bodies all over the world are getting polluted, thus decreasing the portability of water” [5]. Therefore, the analysis of groundwater quality is very important to preserve the natural ecosystem and protect human health.

“Groundwater is one of the major sources of domestic, agricultural and industrial water” supply [6]. “In the last few decades, there has been a tremendous increase in the demand for fresh water due to rapid growth of population and the accelerated pace of industrialization” [7,8]. According to WHO, about 80% of all the diseases in humans are caused by poor quality water. Groundwater, which is in aquifers beneath the earth surface, is considered the most important natural resource to mankind. “In the past few decades, due to population growth, rapid urbanization and industrialization, groundwater quality has witnessed deterioration, especially in developing countries” [9]. “As groundwater is an important part of the hydrological cycle, it is more prone to various sources of contamination” [10]. In general, the quality of groundwater varies with the location, geology, type, and quantity of dissolved ions present in it. According to Fatta et al. [11], dumpsites have been identified as one of the major threats of groundwater resources, thus,

groundwater located near a dumpsite is likely to be polluted due to the leachate produced from it.

“Dumpsite is a widespread land disposal area generally known for its common features of being exposed directly to the atmosphere or covered improperly with soil layer and without proper bottom liner support. These features could significantly contribute to pollution and contamination of the total environment. Dumpsite could adversely affect the general condition of our atmosphere, exosphere and hydrosphere. Interestingly, an open dumpsite attracts flies and other insects that would cause diseases and considerably affect people’s health. Individuals who stay in close proximity to the dumpsite, especially the scavengers who often come in contact with dumped waste, are prone to develop health disorders. Dumpsites receive a growing mixture of municipal, commercial and mixed industrial wastes due to increase in population and the rising demand for food and other essentials” [12]. “Studies on the effects of unlined waste dumps on the host soil and underlying shallow aquifers have shown that soil and groundwater system can be polluted due to poorly designed waste disposal facilities” [13].

“Waste disposal management remains one of the major challenges in the developing countries” [14,15]. “Wastes, if not properly disposed of, could lead to contamination of surface water and groundwater in its immediate environment” [12]. The most important issue today is groundwater contamination [16], and among the wide diversity of contaminants affecting water resources, heavy metals are of particular concern, considering their high toxicity even at low concentration [17]. “In recent times, the impact of leachates on groundwater and other water resources has attracted a lot of attention because of its overwhelming environmental importance” [18,19,20,21]. “Groundwater is the most economic source of potable water for urban, semi-urban and rural areas in Nigeria because of its known advantages over surface water” [16]. The progressive degradation of groundwater

quality via human activities particularly from waste dumpsites [22], if unchecked, will greatly affect its usability. Therefore, this study was designed to determine the significant impact of dumpsite on selected boreholes within the vicinity of a dumpsite in order to determine the quality of the groundwater in the area.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Area

The study area was Igbogo Road situated between latitude $4^{\circ}53'37.272''$ N and longitude $6^{\circ}54'46.236''$ E along Port Harcourt East West Road in Obio-Akpor Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria (Fig. 1). Due to the presence of the federal university in the surrounding area, the population of Igbogo is gradually increasing and this has resulted in high demand for sundry uses of water. Boreholes are preferred to surface water by the people and this has led to uncontrolled abstraction of groundwater resources in the area. Consequently, the large population and industrialization has resulted in increased waste generation. The official dumpsite for commuters in this area is a piece of bare land off the

highway at the entrance of the road. This piece of land has served this purpose of dumpsite for some years now.

2.2 Dumpsite Waste Characterization

Samples of municipal solid wastes from the waste stream at Igbogo Road dumpsite was manually and randomly collected, identified, sorted, characterized and weighed. For the classification of waste, eleven waste components were considered. These are food, paper, tin/can, glass, rubber, plastic, textiles, yard waste, ash/dirt, leather and wood. Sorting and weighing of collected waste was done at the dumpsite. The materials and resources used at the dumpsite for data generation were sorting platform, an electronic scale for weighing the waste, bins for all sorted categories, gloves, and a calculator. The determination of the individual component of the solid waste in the dumpsite was carried out by Quartering method. The method involved the unloading of a given quantity of waste into a controlled area of the dumpsite, that is isolated from wind and other operations, and dividing the waste into four sections (hence quartering) until a sample size of 100 kg was obtained.




Fig. 1. Map of Igbogo Road dumpsite showing sample points

2.3 Dumpsite Leachate Analysis

Leachate sample was obtained from the bottom of the dumpsite. Plastic bottle of polyethylene (200 mL) was used for sampling. Before the collection of the sample, the plastic bottle was washed with acid water in order to sterilize it, and thereafter thoroughly rinsed with distilled water. The collected sample was tightly closed and well labelled. The sample was preserved at 4°C and thereafter taken to the laboratory for analysis. It was analyzed for relevant physicochemical parameters following the internationally accepted procedures and standard methods of American Public Health Association (APHA) and American Standard Testing Method (ASTM). The leachate sample was also analyzed for total coliform.

2.4 Collection of Borehole Water Samples

Groundwater samples were obtained from existing surrounding boreholes close to and far away from the dumpsite. The samples were taken north, south, east and west of the dumpsite. A total of seven borehole water samples were collected. Plastic containers of 200ml were used to collect the groundwater samples. Before the collection of the samples, the containers were washed with acid water in order to sterilize them, and thereafter thoroughly rinsed with distilled water. The collected samples were tightly closed and well labelled. The samples were preserved at 4°C and thereafter taken to the laboratory for analysis. Table 1 presents the coordinates of the borehole water sampling points.

2.5 Analysis of Borehole Water Samples

Seven borehole water samples were collected and analyzed for relevant water quality parameters following the internationally accepted procedures and standard methods of APHA and ASTM. The monitored water quality parameters were pH, turbidity, dissolved oxygen (DO),

alkalinity, ammonia, zinc and iron. The parameters selected were based on the leachate analysis; the highest leachate constituents were used.

2.6 Calculation of Water Quality Index (WQI)

Seven important parameters were chosen for the calculation of WQI (See Table 2). The WQI was calculated using standards of drinking water quality recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Nigerian Standard for Drinking Water Quality (NSDWQ). The weighted Arithmetic index method was used for the calculation of WQI. Further, quality rating or sub-index was calculated using Equation (1).

$$q_n = \frac{100[V_n - V_{io}]}{[S_n - V_{io}]} \quad (1)$$

where q_n is the quality rating for the n^{th} water quality parameter, V_n is the estimated value of the n^{th} parameter at a given water sampling station, V_{io} is the ideal value of n^{th} parameter in pure water (i.e., 0 for other parameters except for pH and DO having 7.0 and 14.6mg/l, respectively), and S_n is the standard permissible value of the n^{th} parameter. The unit weight was calculated by a value inversely proportional to the recommended standard value of S_n of the corresponding parameter, using Equation (2).

$$W_n = k/S_n \quad (2)$$

where W_n is the unit weight for the n^{th} parameter, k is the proportionality constant, and S_n is the standard permissible value for n^{th} parameter. The overall WQI was calculated using Equation (3):

$$WQI = \frac{\sum q_n W_n}{\sum W_n} \quad (3)$$

where q_n and W_n were as described previously.

Table 1. Borehole water sampling points

Sample	Location	Latitude	Longitude	Distance from dumpsite
BH1	North of dumpsite	4°53'34.54462'' N	6°54'45.63054'' E	77metres
BH2	East of dumpsite	4°53'39.12198'' N	6°54'47.64258'' E	77metres
BH3	South of dumpsite	4°53'38.56956'' N	6°54'48.62074'' E	86metres
BH4	North of dumpsite	4°53'36.5028'' N	6°54'43.24331'' E	96metres
BH5	North of dumpsite	4°53'33.50317'' N	6°54'43.63045'' E	140metres
BH6	West of dumpsite	4°53'36.47054'' N	6°54'51.36926'' E	160metres
BH7	West of dumpsite	4°53'36.13351'' N	6°54'52.3197'' E	190metres

2.7 Model Development

A multiple linear regression model was used to develop a mathematical equation describing the impact of pH, turbidity and iron on the quality of groundwater (using WQI). The general form of the multiple regression is represented by Equation (4)

$$y = a_0 + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) was used to derive normal equations (Equation (5)) to estimate the values of a_0 , a_1 , a_2 and a_3 .

$$\left. \begin{aligned} a_0n + a_1\sum x_1 + a_2\sum x_2 + a_3\sum x_3 &= \sum y \\ a_0\sum x_1 + a_1\sum x_1^2 + a_2\sum x_2x_1 + a_3\sum x_3x_1 &= \sum yx_1 \\ a_0\sum x_2 + a_1\sum x_1x_2 + a_2\sum x_2^2 + a_3\sum x_3x_2 &= \sum yx_2 \\ a_0\sum x_3 + a_1\sum x_1x_3 + a_2\sum x_2x_3 + a_3\sum x_3^2 &= \sum yx_3 \end{aligned} \right\} (5)$$

where y is the estimated dependent variable (WQI), x_1 , x_2 and x_3 are the independent variables (pH, turbidity and iron respectively), and a_0 , a_1 , a_2 and a_3 are the constants of regression. Equation (5) was solved using matrix triangulation to obtain the constants. Substituting the independent variables and constants into Equation (4) produced the developed model.

2.8 Statistical Analysis

Water quality measurements from the borehole samples monitored around the dumpsite were compared statistically using one-way multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to check for any significant difference between them.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Dumpsite Waste Characterization

Table 2 presents the results of the physical characterization of dumpsite waste. The

dumpsite is composed mainly of plastics, with the fraction of leather as the least in the total composition. Previous studies have reported plastics/polythene as a major component of municipal solid waste in Nigeria [14,23,24]. This high percentage of plastic (40%) poses a real threat to the environment, especially to groundwater, as toxic chemicals can leach out of them and seep into groundwater. Human exposure to these toxic chemicals can also be linked to cancers, birth defects, impaired immunity, endocrine disruption and other ailments.

3.2 Dumpsite Leachate Analysis

The results of the analysis carried out on the leachate sample of the dumpsite is presented in Table 3. The temperature, pH, iron, TSS, DO, zinc, BOD₅, alkalinity, ammonia, total hardness, and total coliform are not within WHO and NSDWQ permissible limits, indicating a potential risk when discharged into the environment without necessary treatment [24]. The 29.5°C temperature value of the dumpsite leachate depicts resemblance to normal lithospheric temperature, and important in the metabolic activities of microbes that enhance degradation of waste. The pH of 9.7 indicates that the leachate is basic (alkaline) hence the high alkalinity (674.3mg/L) measured. Similar result was obtained by Kamble and Saxena [25] and Mekonnen et al. [12]. The high pH indicates that the dumpsite is an old one [26,12] and may have witnessed washing away by rainfall or percolated over time into the soil. According to Omorogieva and Igberase [24], the high pH and alkalinity values is a reflection of the decrease in volatile fatty acid of the dumpsite.

Table 2. Physical characterization of solid waste

Waste Component	Mass (kg)	Percentage (%)
Food waste	14	14
Tin/can	5	5
Rubber	4	4
Plastic	40	40
Textile	4	4
Yard waste	10	10
Paper	11	11
Ash/dirt	2	2
Leather	0.5	0.5
Glass	5	5
Wood	4.5	4.5
Total	100	100

Table 3. Physicochemical properties of leachate sample

Parameters	Values	WHO	NSDWQ
Temperature (°C)	29.5	25	25
pH	9.7	6.5 – 8.5	6.5 – 8.5
E.C (µS/cm)	621.67	1000	1000
Turbidity (NTU)	0.345	5	5
Iron (mg/L)	9.08001	0.3	0.3
TDS (mg/L)	373.5	500	500
TSS (mg/L)	3.68	3	NA
DO (mg/L)	3.9	5.7	NA
Zinc (mg/L)	4.28947	3	3
BOD ₅ (mg/L)	7.2	5.9	NA
Alkalinity (mg/L)	674.3	200	200
Ammonia (mg/L)	3.07	0.5	NA
Calcium (mg/L)	13.20514	200	NA
Total hardness (mg/L)	235.8	150	150
Chloride (mg/L)	149.98	250	250
Nitrate (mg/L)	4.23	10	10
Total coliform (Cfu/mL)	1.87 × 10 ²	NA	10

NA – Not Available

The high level of iron (9.08mg/L) and zinc (4.29mg/L) in the leachate indicates that iron and zinc scraps may have been disposed of in the dumpsite. Omorogieva and Igberase [24] reported similar high iron and zinc values for leachate from Benin city in Nigeria. The slightly higher level of TSS (3.68mg/L) may not be an issue as filtration by soil will get rid of it before leachate percolates to groundwater. The lower value of DO (3.9mg/L) and the higher values of BOD₅ (7.2mg/L) and total coliform (1.87×10²Cfu/mL) indicate the presence of decomposing waste and active microorganisms that use up the oxygen in the leachate [18] and capable of polluting the groundwater. The high value of ammonia (3.07mg/L) obtained provides evidence of its release from decomposition of nitrogenous substances in the waste. Much higher value for ammonia (64 mg/L) has been reported in a previous study in Nigeria [24]. The high value of total hardness (235.8mg/L) of the leachate is an indication of the presence of agents of hardness such as calcium, magnesium, and carbonate as reported by Omorogieva and Igberase [24] who had higher value of hardness (622mg/L), which could be transferred to groundwater.

3.3 Borehole Water Analysis

The analysis carried out on the borehole water samples revealed that water quality parameters such as turbidity, alkalinity and ammonia are within the permissible limits set by WHO and NSDWQ while others (pH, DO, zinc and iron) are

not as shown in Table 4. The pH values of the boreholes ranged from 6.38 to 9.39 with borehole 6 having the least pH value and borehole 3 having the highest value, both outside the WHO and NSDWQ permissible range of 6.5 to 8.5, and slightly acidic and alkaline, respectively. It is likely that borehole 3 was affected by the high alkalinity of the leachate, suggesting that leachate flow may have occurred towards south, but borehole 6 was definitely not affected by the alkaline leachate, perhaps by an unknown acidic source. Acidic water can lead to corrosion of metal pipes and plumping system, while alkaline water shows disinfection in water [27]. High pH for drinking water is undesirable since it could impart a bitter taste to the water, and depresses the effectiveness of disinfection by chlorination, thereby requiring the use of additional chlorine or longer contact times [27]. Angaye and Abowei [14] reported similar acidic and alkaline pH for groundwater across different states in Nigeria.

DO values for all the boreholes ranged from 5.1 to 7.4mg/L. The higher the value of DO, the better the water quality, while any value lower than the permissible limit (5.7mg/L) would indicate that the water is unsuitable for drinking. BH1 (5.6mg/L), BH2 (5.4mg/L) and BH7 (5.1mg/L) did not meet the set permissible limit of 5.7mg/L, while the rest met the permissible limit. The observed trend does not clearly show that the dumpsite affected the DO of the boreholes. Similar results were reported by Akinbile [28] and Akinbile and Yusoff [18]. According to Akinbile and Yusoff [18], lower DO values (<5.7mg/L) is

an indication of oxygen depletion (DO) in the boreholes which also inferred the presence of pollutants that use up the oxygen in groundwater, and implied that the water is unsafe for drinking.

The concentrations of zinc for all the boreholes ranged from 0.481 to 3.002mg/L with boreholes 1 and 4 having the lowest and highest concentrations, respectively. All boreholes except BH4 have zinc concentrations lower than the permissible limit of 3mg/L set by WHO and NSDWQ. Similar low concentrations of zinc in boreholes have been reported [29,30]. Considering that BH1 to BH3 closer to the dumpsite (than BH4) have zinc concentrations below the permissible limit, it could be deduced that the slightly higher concentration of zinc at BH4 (3.002mg/L) may not have emanated from the dumpsite but likely from another source. According to Dohare et al. [9], symptoms of zinc toxicity in human include vomiting, dehydration, electrolyte imbalance, and abdominal pain. However, the levels of zinc that produce adverse health effects are much higher than the recommended daily allowances of 15 mg/day for men and 12 mg/day for women [30].

The concentrations of iron from the sampled boreholes ranged from 0.517 to 3.298mg/L and generally higher than the permissible limit of 0.3mg/L for drinking water set by WHO and NSDWQ. Similar higher values were reported for all monitored boreholes by Akinbile and Yusoff [18]. It is possible that the high concentration of iron in the leachate (9.08mg/L) may have impacted on the boreholes, especially towards the east direction. As reported by Omorogieva and Andre-Obayanju [20], excess concentration of iron (Fe) in human liver and other vital organs in the body can cause gene mutation a situation known as hemochromatosis and harbinger for cardio-vascular diseases.

3.4 Water Quality Index (WQI)

The estimated WQI values for the seven boreholes are presented in Table 5. The WQI values for all the boreholes show that the quality of the water is unsuitable for drinking. It is likely that the leachate from the dumpsite impacted on the groundwater quality more in the east direction than any other directions (west, north and south), hence the very high WQI in BH2 as compared to other boreholes.

Table 4. Borehole values of water quality parameters

Parameter	BH 1	BH 2	BH 3	BH 4	BH 5	BH 6	BH 7	WHO	NSDWQ
pH	7.26	6.77	9.39	7.03	7.15	6.38	7.54	6.5-8.5	6.5-8.5
Turbidity (NTU)	0.014	0.018	0.011	0.012	0.008	0.017	0.015	5	5
DO (mg/L)	5.6	5.4	7.4	5.7	6.2	6.8	5.1	5.7	NA
Alkalinity (mg/L)	120.37	153.18	150.28	115.34	138.15	75.69	50.14	200	200
Ammonia (mg/L)	0.014	0.042	0.056	0.056	0.070	0.017	0.026	0.5	NA
Zinc (mg/L)	0.481	2.043	0.845	3.002	1.003	2.709	1.3002	3	3
Iron (mg/L)	1.180	3.298	1.003	0.517	1.393	0.890	0.570	0.3	0.3

NA – Not Available

Table 5. Water quality index for the seven boreholes

Borehole	WQI	Status
BH1	217.7497	Unsuitable for drinking
BH2	603.5833	Unsuitable for drinking
BH3	196.2364	Unsuitable for drinking
BH4	105.1749	Unsuitable for drinking
BH5	260.3335	Unsuitable for drinking
BH6	168.0941	Unsuitable for drinking
BH7	114.0905	Unsuitable for drinking

Table 6. Output of multivariate test for concentrations of water quality parameters from the monitored boreholes

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.967	29.689 ^b	1.000	1.000	.116	.967
	Wilks' Lambda	.033	29.689 ^b	1.000	1.000	.116	.967
	Hotelling's Trace	29.689	29.689 ^b	1.000	1.000	.116	.967
	Roy's Largest Root	29.689	29.689 ^b	1.000	1.000	.116	.967
Distance	Pillai's Trace	.861	1.237 ^b	5.000	1.000	.590	.861
	Wilks' Lambda	.139	1.237 ^b	5.000	1.000	.590	.861
	Hotelling's Trace	6.186	1.237 ^b	5.000	1.000	.590	.861
	Roy's Largest Root	6.186	1.237 ^b	5.000	1.000	.590	.861

a. Design: Intercept + Distance

b. Exact statistic

Table 7. Actual and predicted water quality index

WQI (Actual)	WQI (Predicted)	Residual
217.7497	221.3479	-3.5982
603.5833	602.6072	0.9761
196.2364	190.7182	5.5182
105.1749	102.0321	3.1428
260.3335	261.0799	-0.7464
168.0941	167.9745	0.1196
114.0905	114.6161	-0.5256




Fig. 2. Measured and predicted WQI

3.5 Statistical Analysis

The data obtained for the monitored boreholes were tested using one-way multivariate ANOVA for similarity in concentrations of water quality parameters. Table 5 shows the values of the multivariate test. The multivariate test tells if there is a significant difference among at least

one group across the seven dependent variables (pH, turbidity, DO, alkalinity, iron, zinc and ammonia). It is observed that the Lambda under distance (0.590) is associated to a p-value that is much higher than the significant level (0.05). Therefore, there is no effect of distance on the water quality parameters monitored.

3.6 Model Development and Validation

Equation (6) shows the model for the prediction of WQI when the pH, turbidity and iron concentrations of borehole water samples around the dumpsite are known. The equation was obtained by solving Equation (5) using matrix triangulation to obtain the regression constants, and substituting the regression constants and independent variables into Equation (4).

$$WQI = 9.338 + 0.3pH - 228.232Turbidity + 180.507Iron \quad (6)$$

Table 7 shows the measured and predicted WQI values which were later plotted against boreholes to check if the predicted WQI will give a good fit to the measured WQI (Fig. 2). The observed overlap between the measured and predicted WQI in Fig. 2 shows that the developed model has an excellent fit to the measured data.

4. CONCLUSION

Assessment of the impact of a municipal dumpsite on the quality of nearby boreholes has been conducted. Plastic (40%) dominated the dumpsite waste. The leachate analysis revealed that it has the potential to contaminate the underlying groundwater. Computed water quality index (WQI) for the sampled boreholes gave values ranging from 105.17 to 603.58, indicating that the groundwater around the dumpsite is unsuitable for drinking. The developed multiple linear regression model for WQI has an excellent fit to the measured data. The statistical analysis carried out showed that there is no significant variation in water quality with increasing distance from the dumpsite. Thus, it is concluded that leachate from the municipal dumpsite impacted on the quality of the neighbouring underlying groundwater.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Onweluzo JC, Akuagbazie CA. Assessment of the quality of bottled and sachet water sold in Nsukka Town. *Agro-Science Journal of Tropical Agriculture, Food, Environment and Extension*. 2010; 9:104 – 110.
2. Okonko IO, Ogunjobi AA, Adejoye AD, Ogunnusi TA, Olasogba MC. Comparative studies and microbial risk assessment of different water samples used for processing frozen sea foods in Ijora-Olopa, Lagos State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 2008;7:2902 – 2907.
3. Umeh CN, Okorie OI, Emesiani GA. Towards the provision of safe drinking water: the bacteriological quality and safety of sachet water in Awka, Anambra State. In: *The Book of Abstract of the 29th Annual Conference and General Meeting on Microbes as Agents of Sustainable Development*, organized by Nigerian Society for Microbiology (NSM), University of Agriculture, Abeokuta. 2005;22.
4. Hughes JM, Koplan JP. SAVING Lives through Global Safe Water. *Journal of Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2005;11: 1636 – 1637.
5. Chandra S, Singh A, Tomar PK. Assessment of Water Quality Values in Porur Lake Chennai, Hussain Sagar Hyderabad and Vihar Lake Mumbai, India. *Chem Sci Trans*. 2012;1:508 - 515
6. Hermann, E. and Prunes E. What is groundwater and why is it so Important?; 2022. Available:<https://www.worldwildlife.org/stories/what-is-groundwater-and-why-is-it-so-important> on 6th March 2023.
7. Okello C, Tomasello B, Greggio N, Wambiji N, Antonellini M. Impact of Population Growth and Climate Change on the Freshwater Resources of Lamu Island, Kenya. *Water*. 2015;7:1264-1290.
8. United Nations. *UN World Water Development Report 2019*; 2019. Available:<https://www.unwater.org/publications/un-world-water-development-report-2019> on 6th March 2023.
9. Dohare D, Deshpande S, Kotiya A. Analysis of Ground Water Quality Parameters: A Review. *Research Journal of Engineering Sciences*. 2014;3(5):26-31.
10. Soujanya KB. Characterization of Leachate and its Effects on Groundwater Quality around Jawaharnagar Municipal Open Dumpsite, Rangereddy, Telangana. *Curr World Environ*. 2016;11 (1) C(0):10.12944/CWE.11.1.15
11. Fatta D, Papadopoulous A, Hoizidoi MA. A Study on the Landfill Leachate and its impact on the Groundwater Quality on the greater area. *Environ Geochem Health*. 1999;21:175-190.

12. Mekonnen, B., Haddis, A. and Zeine, W. Assessment of the Effect of Solid Waste Dump Site on Surrounding Soil and River Water Quality in Tepi Town, Southwest Ethiopia. *Hindawi Journal of Environmental and Public Health*. 2020;9. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/5157046>
13. Amadi AN, Olasehinde PI, Okosun EA, Okoye NO, Okunlola IA, Alkali YB, DanHassan MA. A Comparative Study on the Impact of Avu and Ihie Dumpsites on Soil Quality in Southeastern Nigeria. *American Journal of Chemistry*. 2012;2: 17-23.
14. Angaye TCN, Abowei JFN. Review on the Environmental Impacts of Municipal Solid Waste in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects. *Greener Journal of Environmental Management and Public Safety*. 2017;6(2):018-033.
15. Ike CC, Ezeibe1 CC, Anijiofor SC, Nik-Daud NN. Solid Waste Management in Nigeria: Problems, Prospects, and Policies. *Journal of Solid Waste Technology and Management*. 2018;44(2): 163-172.
16. United Nations. UN World Water Development Report 2022 'Groundwater: Making the invisible visible'; 2022. Available:<https://www.unwater.org/news/un-world-water-development-report-2022-%E2%80%98groundwater-making-invisible-visible%E2%80%99> on 7th March 2023.
17. Ehi-Eromosele CO, Okiei WO. Heavy Metal Assessment of Ground, Surface and Tap Water Samples in Lagos Metropolis Using Anodic Stripping Voltammetry. *Resources and Environment*. 2012;2(3):82-86.
18. Akinbile CO, Yusoff MS. Environmental Impact of Leachate Pollution on Groundwater Supplies in Akure, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Development*. 2011;2(1). 81-86.
19. Ugwoha E, Emete KC. Effects of Open Dumpsite Leachate on Groundwater Quality: a Case Study of Alakahia Dumpsite in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Studies*. 2015; 1(1):1-8.
20. Omorogieva OM, Andre-Obayanju O. Impacts of Solid Waste Dumpsites Leachate on Groundwater Quality and Suggested Mitigation Measures by Targeting Specific Pollutant Sources: Ikhueniro, Nigeria. *Journal of Geological Research*. 2020;3(1):35-44.
21. Useh MU, Uzama D, Etuk-Udo G. Effect of Dumpsite Leachate on Groundwater Quality in Mpape Community, Bwari Area Council, Abuja, Nigeria. *Nigerian Research Journal of Chemical Sciences*. 2022;10 (1):197-216.
22. Sinha-Ray SP, Elango L. Deterioration of Groundwater Quality: Implications and Management. In: Singh A, Saha D, Tyagi A. (eds) *Water Governance: Challenges and Prospects*. Springer Water. Springer, Singapore. 2019;87-101.
23. Elemile O, Mynepalli S, Oluwatuyi OE. Solid waste characterization and its recycling potential: Akure municipal dumpsite, Southwestern, Nigeria. *Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management*. 2019;21(3):585-593.
24. Omorogieva OM, Igberase VI. Comparative study of Leachate Characterization: Implication for Sustainable Environmental Management. *International Journal of Earth Sciences Knowledge and Applications*. 2021; 3(3):305-313.
25. Kamble BS, Saxena PR. Environmental impact of municipal dumpsite leachate on groundwater quality in Jawaharnagar, Rangareddy, Telangana, India. *Applied Water Science*. 2017;7:3333–3343.
26. Futta D, Yocos C, Haralambous KJ, Loizidou M. An assessment of the effect of landfill leachate on groundwater quality. *Proceedings, Sardina 97. 6th Int. Landfill Symposium. S. Margheria dipole, Gaagliari-Italy*. 1997;181-187.
27. USGS. pH and water. *Water Science School*; 2019. Available: <https://www.usgs.gov/special-topics/water-science-school/science/ph-and-water> on 8th March 2023.
28. Akinbile CO. Hawked Water Quality and its Health Implications in Akure, Nigeria. *Botswana Journal of Technology*. 2006;15(2):70-75.
29. Kantoma D, Yusuf J, Bidam MY. Assessment of heavy metals concentration in drinking water samples from selected areas of Kauru Local Government Area of Kaduna State, Nigeria. *Bayero Journal of*

- Pure and Applied Sciences, 2017;10(1): 509–515.
30. Nkuah M, Agbemafle R. Assessment of heavy metals [As, Cu, Zn] fro boreholes in the Western Region of Ghana. African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology. 2019;13(6): 253-259.

© 2023 Ejikeme et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/97486>