Air Quality Assessment of Port Harcourt Urban Slums and Health Implications
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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to assess the outdoor air quality of some urban slums in Port Harcourt. Six sampling sites were selected, from the Port Harcourt urban slums; two sites from each slum represented with a suffix 1 or 2. The slums are designated Marine base (#1 and #2), RSU BG, Obudu 2, Bundu (#1 and #2). The air quality was analyzed using portable handheld air quality analyzer and the microbiological parameters were determined by standard cultural method. The study revealed that the sampled sites were laden with bacterial and fungal species. namely; Klebsiella sp., Micrococcus sp., Escherichia sp., Pseudomonas sp., Bacillus sp., Aeromonas sp., Streptococcus sp., Serratia sp., Aerococcus sp., Proteus sp. Penicillium sp., Fusarium sp., Candida sp., Aspergillus sp., Mucor sp., Rhizopus sp. and Tricorderma sp. Highest obtained noise level was at Marine base 1 which was 66 db, highest relative humidity of 54.8% at RSU BG, CO₂ (ppm) values of 4.8, 80, 796, 850, 638, 698 for Marine base 2, Marine base 1, Obudu 2, RSU BG, Bundu
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1 and Bundu 2 respectively. The values for NO\textsubscript{2} (ppm) was (0.05, 0.053, 0.071, 0.022, 0.035, 0.023), suspended particulate matter (ppm) was (7.1, 8.7, 9.5, 9.5, 6.2, 6.2), SO\textsubscript{2} (ppm) was (0.42, 0.15, 0.50, 0.34, 1.26, 0.41) CO (ppm) was (4.8, 1.7, 2.2, 3.0, 3.9, 3.6) and volatile organic compound (ppm) was (1.0, 1.1, 0.9, 75 and 1.2). This study has shown that Port Harcourt urban slums are experiencing some degree of contamination not acceptable for healthy living that requires attention to curb. These areas require all-round improvement in sanitation.

M Give one sentence on methodology.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Air is a bearer of suspended matter, which remains generally laden with microorganism but not a natural medium for microorganisms [1]. Air transports the microorganisms and the ultimate fate of such microorganisms depends on factors such as sunlight, temperature, humidity, size of microorganism, particulate carriers, degree of susceptibility of the microorganism and their ability to form spores or cyst [1].

Human activities are contributing to the alteration of atmospheric condition by the introduction of gaseous pollutants [2]. Chief among the anthropogenic sources contributing to atmospheric pollution are vehicular transport, power generation, burning of waste and bio-matter [3]. These processes emit sulphur dioxide, NO\textsubscript{x} gases, carbon monoxide (CO), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), benzene (C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6}), Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and Suspended Particulate Matter (SPM) which could exceed permissible limits.

Bioaerosol containing microorganisms are produced anywhere human activities take place [3]. Under normal environmental conditions, low bioaerosol concentrations are produced which does not pose any health risk. Unfortunately, some of microorganisms may be pathogenic, allergenic, or toxic. Their presence in the environment can lead to adverse health effects in people, from simple irritation, through allergic reactions, to the occurrence of infections or toxic reactions [3].

Objectionable air quality is a threat to human health in that we are compelled to breathe the air around us [4]. In so doing, toxic chemicals gain entrance into the body and compromise respiratory health. Air pollution triggers acid rain and eutrophication, both conditions that adversely impact on flora and fauna [4].

Urban areas of the world are often confronted with the challenge of population due to unceasing migration of people from rural areas to urban areas to enhance their living standards through job seeking, businesses and trading [5]. The population increase results in skyrocketing demands for housing that culminate in the development slums. In most developing countries, the environmental impacts of urbanization are enormous; the most common of these being air pollution.

In as recent as November 2016, plumes of soot hovered menacing over the city of Port Harcourt and its environs. Periodically in Port Harcourt, thick haze of rising visible black soot settles on materials and is inhaled by humans as evidenced by black particles in nostrils and throat soreness. All over the slums of Port Harcourt, evidence of noxious smoke emissions from generators, kerosene stove, burning of firewood, burning of coal for cooking and vehicles coupled with lack of ventilation continue to raise the imminent human health challenges in these suburbs.

The aim of this study was to assess the air quality of Port Harcourt urban, in terms of its microbiological and physicochemical parameters.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Area

Six sampling sites were selected from three Port Harcourt urban slums; two sites from each slum represented with a suffix 1 or 2. The slums are Marine base, Diobu and Bundu waterside which are designated Marine base 1, Marine base 2, Rivers State University Back gate (RSU BG), Obudu 2, Bundu 1 and Bundu 2. They were selected because they are within the capital city and are unplanned settlements, generally harbouring large number of inhabitants, typical of any urban slum.
2.2 Sample Collection

The settling plate technique also known as sedimentation method was used as sample collection method for microbiological analysis [1]. This technique of sample collection is known as scheme 1/1/1, as described by Pasquarella et al. [5]. The Aeroqual 500 Series gas monitor was used to monitor the air pollutants. The samples were collected once at noon on each day of sampling.

2.3 Identification of Microorganisms

Identification of isolates was based on Gram reaction, biochemical, cultural and colonial morphologies with reference to Bergey and Holt [6] and Cheesbrough [7].

2.4 Statistical Analysis

Data obtained were analysed using descriptive statistics and subjected to One Way Analysis of Variance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Tables 1 and 2 present the results for the characterization and identification of bacterial isolates sampled from the study sites. The bacterial isolates were identified as *Klebsiella* sp., *Micrococcus* sp., *Escherichia* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Aeromonas* sp., *Streptococcus* sp., *Serratia* sp., *Aerococcus* sp. and *Proteus* sp. The fungal isolates were identified as *Penicillium* sp., *Fusarium* sp., *Candida* sp., *Aspergillus* sp., *Mucor* sp., *Rhizopus* sp. and *Tricoderma* sp. (Table 3) According to Stetzenbach et al. [8] bioaerosols in suspended, aerosolized droplets typically contain microbes and cell fragments combined with byproducts of cellular metabolism. In addition, they may carry viruses, bacteria, and fungi that float on dust particles along with cells and parts of cells. Most of the isolated organisms such as *Bacillus* sp., *Candida* sp., *Klebsiella* sp and *Streptococcus* sp. are potential pathogens and could cause infection in susceptible individuals based on immune status and dose response [9].

The lowest bacterial count was recorded at RSU BG with a bacterial count of 12×10^3 CFU/m^3 and the highest bacterial count was recorded at Obudu 2 with a count of 722×10^6 CFU/m^3 which is about three times higher than the second highest which is 260×10^6 CFU/m^3 recorded at Bundu 1. Marine base 1 had the highest fungal count of 35×10^3 SFU/m^3 and the lowest fungal count of 2×10^3 SFU/m^3 was recorded at Marine base 2 (Fig. 1) The area had the highest human activity and vehicular movement during the sampling periods, and there was statistical significant difference (p<0.05) in bacteria population between this site and others. Ambrose et al. [10], reported lower bacterial count (1.386 × 10^7 - 2.470 × 10^7 CFU/m^3) and fungal count (7.23 × 10^3 1.536 × 10^3 SFU/m^3) in the suburb of Uyo, the capital of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Both Uyo and Port Harcourt are highly populated cities in the Niger Delta, attracting immigrants because of the concentration of the oil and gas industries in both states. However, the city of Uyo is known to be better in keeping with sanitation standards [11].

Human and related activities coupled with atmospheric condition normally influence the bacterial and fungal count, as reported by other researchers who reported that high microbial concentrations was a reflection of economic growth and human population [12-14].

Table 4 presents the parameters monitored using the Aeroqual 500 Series gas monitor. The noise level ranged from 11.23-66 db; wind speed from 1-2.2 M/s; relative humidity from 40.1-54.8%; temperature from 34.4-39°C; CO₂ from 4.8-698 ppm; NO₂ from 0.022-0.071 ppm; CO from 1.7-4.8 ppm and VOC from 0.9-75 ppm. Noise level, VOCs, SOx and temperature at some locations exceeded the Federal Ministry of Environment (FMEV) limits. The values of SOx in this study (0.15-1.26 ppm) are more than values (0.02-0.1 ppm) reported by Nwockocha et al. [15], in a study of air quality in urban areas of Port Harcourt, but within the range (0.03-1.4 ppm) reported by Gobo et al. [16] in a study of air quality in Okrika, another urban slum in Port Harcourt. However the CO values (1.7-4.8 ppm) and SPM (6.2-9.5 ppm) values reported in this study are lesser that the values (CO 34-53 ppm and SPM 8.2-14 ppm) reported by Nwockocha et al. [15]. The NOx values in this study (0.022-0.071 ppm) are lesser in range compared to values (0.025-1.7 ppm) reported by Gobo et al. [16] but the CO values (1.7-4.8 ppm) are within the range (CO 0.5-12.7 ppm) reported in the same study. However, the VOCs values (0.9-75 ppm) in this study are far lesser than values (10-520 ppm) reported by Gobo et al. [16]. The difference in values could be from the location of sampling and the type of activity taking place there. VOCs have been muted as possible carcinogens and mutagens in humans [17], noise impact on hearing [18], SOx...
and temperature can alter the ecological balance of pH and temperature which could be injurious to health [4].

Owing to the epileptic power situation in the city of Port Harcourt, majority of households rely on power generating sets to meet their energy need [17]. Thus, power generating sets used as the common source of electric power in these slums might have contributed to the elevated levels of noise, VOCs, SOx and temperature. The use of kerosene fuelled cooking stove and firewood for cooking could be another reason for the observed high levels of pollutants. Fagbeja et al. [19] reported that substantial emissions of CO, CO$_2$, CH$_4$, NOx, SOx; VOC and particulate matter in cities in the Niger Delta, like Port Harcourt are from household generators, cooking stove using kerosene and firewood. According to Ede and Edokpa [20], cities within the Niger Delta including Port Harcourt are observing a “double air pollution burden”, as the air quality has been by particle matter, SOx and NOx pollution.

### Table 1. Morphological characteristics of bacteria isolates from sampling sites

| S/NO | Sampling site    | Isolate code | Morphological description                                      |
|------|------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Marine Base 1    | JJ1          | Serrated, pinpointed, Cream, dull and dry surface             |
| 2    | Marine Base 2    | JJ2          | Yellow, Flat, shinny, smooth, entire margin                    |
| 3    | Marine Base 2    | JJ3          | Yellow, entire, raised, moist, shinny, smooth and entire       |
| 4    |                  | JJ5          | Orange, raised, small, entire, smooth and shinny               |
| 5    |                  | JJ6          | Serrated, rough, dry flat, dull surface                       |
| 6    |                  | JJ7          | Straw coloured, raised smooth, shinny and entire               |
| 7    |                  | JJ8          | Rough surface, dry flat and irregular (swarming)               |
| 8    | RSU Back gate    | JJ9          | Pinpointed, dull, rough, entire straw colour                  |
| 9    | Bundu 2          | JJ10         | Segmented, White, dry rough surface,                           |
| 10   | Obudu Street     | JJ12         | Rhizoid, transparent, dry, rough surface                      |
| 11   | Bundu 1          | JJ13         | Rough, flat, dry surface, serrated margin                     |
| 12   | Bundu 2          | JJ14         | Orange, raised, entire, shinny and smooth                      |
| 13   |                  | JJ15         | Small, entire, shinny, flat                                   |
| 14   |                  | JJ16         | Yellow, shinny, raised, entire, smooth surface.                |
| 15   |                  | JJ17         | Rough, dry, flat surface                                      |
| 16   |                  | JJ18         | Entire, raised, dry smooth white                              |
| 17   |                  | JJ19         | Bright, yellow, entire, shinny, smooth surface                |
| 18   |                  | JJ20         | White, flat, dry, entire, smooth surface                      |

![Fig. 1. Bacterial and Fungal counts from sample sites](chart.png)
Table 2. Characterization and identification of bacteria isolates from sampling sites

| Isolate | Code | Citrate | Oxidase | Catalase | Glucose | Lactose | Indole | MR | VP | Motility | Butt | Slant | Gas | H₂S | Gram Reaction | Probable isolate |
|---------|------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|--------|-----|----|----------|------|--------|-----|-----|----------------|------------------|
| JJ1     |      | -       | -       | -        | +       | +       | B      | B   | -  | -        |       |         |     |     | -              | Rods Klebsiella sp. |
| JJ2     |      | +       | -       | -        | +       | +       | A      | B   | -  | -        |       |         |     |     | +Cocci         | Micrococcus sp.     |
| JJ3     |      | -       | -       | -        | +       | -        | +      | A   | -  | -        | B     |         |     |     | -              | Escherichia coli    |
| JJ5     |      | +       | +       | -        | +       | -        | B      | B   | -  | -        |       |         |     |     | -              | Pseudomonas sp.      |
| JJ6     |      | -       | -       | -        | +       | -        | +      | A   | B  | -        |       | +Rod    |     |     | -              | Baccillus sp.       |
| JJ7     |      | -       | -       | -        | +       | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Proteus sp.         |
| JJ8     |      | -       | -       | -        | +       | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Aeromonas sp.       |
| JJ9     |      | +       | -       | +        | +       | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Aeromonas sp.       |
| JJ10    |      | -       | -       | -        | +       | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Aeromonas sp.       |
| JJ11    |      | -       | +       | +        | -        | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Aeromonas sp.       |
| JJ12    |      | +       | -       | +        | -        | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | +Cocci  |     |     | -              | Staphylococcus sp.  |
| JJ13    |      | -       | -       | -        | +        | -        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | +Cocci  |     |     | +Cocci         | Aerococcus sp.      |
| JJ14    |      | +       | -       | +        | -        | +        | B      | B   | -  | -        |       | +Cocci  |     |     | +Cocci         | Aerococcus sp.      |
| JJ15    |      | -       | -       | -        | -        | -        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Serratia sp.        |
| JJ16    |      | -       | -       | +        | -        | +        | B      | B   | -  | -        |       | +Cocci  |     |     | +Cocci         | Streptococcus sp.   |
| JJ17    |      | +       | -       | +        | -        | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Aeromonas sp.       |
| JJ18    |      | +       | +       | +        | +        | +        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Klebsiella sp.      |
| JJ19    |      | -       | +       | +        | +        | +        | B      | B   | -  | -        |       | -Rod    |     |     | -              | Aeromonas sp.       |
| JJ20    |      | +       | +       | +        | -        | -        | A      | B   | -  | -        |       | +Rod    |     |     | -              | Baccillus sp.       |

*Separate Genus from species eg Bacillus sp*
### Table 3. Morphological and microscopic characterization of fungal isolates

| Sampling site | Colony morphology | Microscopy | Probable organism                              |
|---------------|-------------------|------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Marine-base 2 | Green surface with a guiding white round ring, light reverse | Conidia are borne on phialides, showing brushlike conidiophore | *Penicillium* sp. |
| Marine base 2 | Whitish gray colouration, cotton wool like | Canoe shaped macro conidia, multicelled. | *Fusarium* sp. |
| Marine base 1 | Thick dark surface, dark on reverse | Yeast cells (Production of germ tube and chlamydosporial Positive term tube) | *Candida* sp. |
| Marine base 1 | Cream butyrous surface, light reverse | Large spherical vesicle that give rise to metulae, phialide and conidia | *Aspergillus* sp. |
| Obudu        | Thick dark surface, dark on reverse | Large spherical vesicle that give rise to metulae, phialide and conidia | *Aspergillus* sp. |
| Obudu        | Thick dark surface, dark on reverse | Conidia are borne on phialides, showing brushlike conidiophore | *Aspergillus* sp. |
| Obudu        | Cream butyrous surface, light reverse | Yeast cells, Production of germ tube and chlamydosporial Positive term tube | *Candida* sp. |
| Rsu BG       | Green surface with a guiding white round ring, light reverse | Conidia are borne on phialides, showing brushlike conidiophore | *Penicillium* sp. |
| Bundu 1      | Light green surface, fine green circles light reverse | Septate hyaline hyphae, conidiophores, and conidia observed | *Tricoderma* sp. |
| Bundu 2      | Thick dark surface, dark on reverse | Showing sporangiophore arising from pauciseptate hyphae | *Rhizopus* sp. |
| Bundu 2      | Green surface with a guiding white round ring, light reverse | Large spherical vesicle that give rise to metulae, phialide and conidia | *Penicillium* sp. |

Some Genus and species not separated

### Table 4. Values of physicochemical parameters from sample sites

| S/N | Parameters       | Marine base 1 | Marine base 2 | Obudu 2 | RSU BG | Bundu1 | Bundu2 | FMEV Limits          |
|-----|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------|
| 1   | Noise (db)       | 66            | 42.5          | 65      | 11.23  | 57.1   | 51     | 65                    |
| 2   | Wind speed (Ms^2_) | 0.5           | 2.2           | 1.1     | 0.9    | 1.6    | 1.0    | 1.0                   |
| 3   | Relative Humidity (%) | 46.5         | 48.6          | 40.1    | 54.8   | 50     | 53.6   | 4.90-75.9             |
| 4   | Temperature °C   | 37.5          | 35.9          | 39      | 35.2   | 34.5   | 34.4   | 29.5-36.9             |
| 5   | CO2 ppm          | 4.8           | 80            | 796     | 850    | 638    | 698    | -                     |
| 6   | NO2 ppm          | 0.05          | 0.053         | 0.071   | 0.022  | 0.035  | 0.023  | 0.04-0.06             |
| 7   | SPM ppm          | 7.1           | 8.7           | 9.5     | 9.5    | 6.2    | 6.2    | 115-150               |
| 8   | SO2 ppm          | 0.42          | 0.15          | 0.50    | 0.34   | 1.26   | 0.41   | 0.01-0.1              |
| 9   | CO ppm           | 4.8           | 1.7           | 2.2     | 3.0    | 3.9    | 3.6    | 50                    |
| 10  | VOC ppm          | 1.0           | 1.1           | 0.9     | 75     | 1.2    | 4.1    | 0.50                  |
Air pollution represents the nastiest of all of the environmental risks; causing about 3 million deaths per annum for outdoor air pollution exposure alone, with greater percentage of the deaths in low and middle-income countries [21].

Port Harcourt urban slum residents are encouraged to drink adequate quantity of water to be hydrated and help flush out some contaminants from their system, eat healthy food and more of fruit which can serve as anti-oxidant, plant more trees in our environments, stop activities that pollute the air such as burning of refuse and staying close to generator fumes and encourage the practice of hand washing whenever they come in from an outdoor environment.

4. CONCLUSION

This study has shown that Port Harcourt urban slums are experiencing some degree of contamination not acceptable for healthy living that requires attention to curb. The levels of contamination by bacteria, fungi, SOx and VOCs suggest the air quality of the slums is generally bad. This calls for improved sanitation; improvement of public transport and others means to cut down air pollution.
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