

Toxicity and Carcinogenic Potentials of Particulate Bound Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons Emitted At the Epicenter of Major Abattoirs in Ilorin Metropolis, Kwara State, Nigeria

Ismail E. Muhibbudin^{1,*}, Ismail Jeje², Agnes Ifeoluwa Tinuoye¹, Pelumi David Kehinde¹, and Oiza Heekmah Jimoh¹

¹University of Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria

²Chemical Engineering Department, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria

Abstract

Abattoirs have been identified as significant sources of aromatic hydrocarbons, particularly polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), due to the combustion-intensive nature of meat processing activities, especially in developing countries such as Nigeria. These compounds are recognized as persistent environmental pollutants with carcinogenic, mutagenic, and toxicological effects, thereby posing substantial risks to both human health and ecological systems. Both passive and active air sampling techniques were employed to determine particulate-bound PAHs. A fabricated polyurethane foam (PUF) disk sampler, air quality monitor and using Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry analysis. The particle bound polycyclic hydrocarbons were measured for Sobi and Ipata abattoirs in Kwara state, Nigeria. PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and TSP were 121-1557 µg/m³, 139 -1744µg/m³, and 265- 3301µg/m³ respectively for Sobi while 165.25-684.5 µg/m³, 196.25- 726.25 µg/m³ and 265-1178.25 µg/m³ respectively for Ipata abattoirs. The toxicity potential (TP) for the particulate emissions at Sobi abattoir ranges between 0.47- 30.54 while that Ipata abattoir ranges between 0.54 -18.75. The incremental cancer inhalation risk assessment (ILRC) for exposure within the Sobi and Ipata abattoirs were estimated at 3.319×10^{-7} and 5.01×10^{-7} respectively. The adverse non-cancer health risk is 1.481 and 0.300 for Sobi and Ipata respectively. The study confirms that PAHs emissions from these abattoirs pose measurable non-cancer health risks to the exposed vulnerable populations and recommends adopting cleaner technologies such as solar or biogas heated scalding system to mitigate emissions and protect the vulnerable.

Keywords: Environmental Protection; Environmental Sampling; Environmental carcinogenesis.

1. Introduction

Aromatic hydrocarbon compounds as air pollutants form a distinctive category of organic molecules characterized by the presence of one or more benzene rings [1]. Their cyclic structure, featuring alternating single and double bonds, results in delocalized π -electron systems that impart exceptional stability and unique reactivity compared to non-aromatic hydrocarbons [2]. These conjugated systems exhibit characteristic ultraviolet-visible (UV-Vis) absorption spectra, reflecting their electronic and chemical behaviors. Aromatic compounds encompass diverse classes, including aromatic amines, heterocyclic aromatic compounds, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), each with distinct physicochemical properties [3].

*Corresponding author E-mail: muhibbudin.ei@unilorin.edu.ng

Received January 30, 2026, received in revised form February 18, 2026, accepted February 19, 2026.

(ASWJST 2021/printedISSN:2735-3087and on-line ISSN:2735-3095)

<https://journals.aswu.edu.eg/stjournal>

Atmospheric aging transforms these hydrocarbons into more reactive and toxic derivatives. These derivatives, often co-emitted and co-exist from shared sources, pose significant health risks due to their mutagenic and carcinogenic potential [4]. The incomplete combustion of organic materials, particularly fossil fuels and biomass, introduces these compounds into the atmosphere. Their affinity for adsorption onto fine particulate matter enhances environmental distribution and human exposure risks [5].

Aromatic amines, defined by an amine group ($-NH_2$, $-NHR$, or $-NR_2$) attached to an aromatic ring, arise from industrial emissions, vehicular exhaust, and natural events like wildfires and microbial degradation [6]. Once airborne, they undergo photooxidation and adsorb onto particulates, contributing to secondary organic aerosol formation. These processes exacerbate health risks such as respiratory disorders, neurotoxicity, and cancer, necessitating stringent environmental control measures [7].

Heterocyclic aromatic amines (HAAs), incorporating heteroatoms like nitrogen, oxygen, or sulfur within their aromatic frameworks, are primarily byproducts of high-temperature combustion and pyrolysis [8]. HAAs are persistent, undergo atmospheric photochemical reactions, and adsorb onto particulate matter, contributing to long-range environmental transport. Exposure to HAAs is linked to severe health outcomes, including carcinogenicity and respiratory dysfunctions, reinforcing the imperative for regulatory interventions [9].

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are a major subgroup of persistent organic pollutants, composed of multiple fused benzene rings. Generated largely through the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels, biomass, and industrial processes [7]. PAHs occur in both gaseous and particulate phases, influencing their atmospheric transport and deposition [10]. Natural sources, such as wildfires, volcanic activity, and crude oil seepage, also contribute to PAH emissions [11].

The toxicological and environmental significance of PAHs has prompted extensive investigation [12]. Urban areas experience higher PAH concentrations primarily due to vehicular emissions, with additional contributions from industrial activities and domestic combustion [13]. Seasonal variations, particularly elevated wintertime concentrations, arise from reduced atmospheric mixing and increased combustion for heating [14].

The atmospheric chemistry of PAHs is highly dynamic. Oxidative processes involving ozone and nitrogen oxides produce nitrated and oxygenated PAHs, compounds often exhibiting enhanced mutagenicity compared to their parent molecules [15]. Photochemical transformations also generate secondary organic aerosols, contributing further to particulate pollution and complexifying air quality management [16].

Toxicologically, PAHs induce damage through DNA adduct formation, oxidative stress, and disruption of critical cellular signaling pathways [17]. Exposure has been epidemiologically linked to respiratory diseases, cardiovascular conditions, and multiple cancer types [18]. Given their bioaccumulative potential and persistence, PAHs are designated as persistent organic pollutants (POPs), necessitating global regulatory frameworks for their monitoring and control [19].

Monitoring atmospheric PAH concentrations is essential for air quality assessment and pollution management. Analytical techniques such as gas chromatography-mass spectrometry

(GC-MS) are widely employed to detect and quantify PAHs [20]. These assessments inform source attribution, pollution mitigation strategies, and predictive modeling efforts [21].

The operational activities of abattoirs in Nigeria contribute substantially to the emission of particulate-bound polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) into the atmosphere. Research has shown that abattoirs, particularly those using biomass and fossil fuel-based singeing methods, contribute significantly to local air pollution [22]. Heavy smoke and soot, primarily from biomass and fossil fuel combustion during the singeing of cattle, sheep, and goats, elevate local pollution levels. Workers and residents near abattoirs face heightened exposure to PAHs and thermal stress, posing serious health and environmental concerns. PAHs possess the ability to bind to critical human cellular components and can enter the human body primarily through inhalation or ingestion routes [23]. Their role as markers of biomass combustion makes them critical for air quality monitoring. However, PAH emissions from abattoirs remain understudied. Thus, this study assesses the toxicity and carcinogenic risks of PAHs from major abattoirs in Ilorin Metropolis, Nigeria, and explores mitigation strategies. Two abattoirs using distinct singeing methods are analyzed for PAH composition, concentration, and environmental impact, aiming to inform pollution control measures.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Description of the Study Area

Ilorin, the capital of Kwara State, Nigeria, has an estimated population of approximately 777,667, making it the seventh-largest city in Nigeria by population, according to the National Population Commission [24]. The geographical coordinates of Ilorin are 8.4799° N latitude and 4.5418° E longitude. The metropolis comprises three Local Government Areas (LGAs): Ilorin West, Ilorin East, and Ilorin South, covering an estimated land area of 105 km².

Ilorin experiences a tropical climate characterized by two distinct seasons: the wet season, which spans from April to October, and the dry season, which lasts from November to March. The annual rainfall varies between 1,000 mm and 1,500 mm, with peak precipitation occurring between September and early October. The mean monthly temperature remains relatively high throughout the year, ranging between 23°C and 28°C [12].

Description of Sampling Sites

For this study, two major abattoirs within Ilorin metropolis have been selected as sampling sites:

A. Ipata Abattoir (Ipata Market)

Ipata Abattoir is a highly populated with meat processing center known for the large-scale slaughtering and singeing of goats and sheep for daily human consumption, utilizing kerosene as fuel. It is a major commercial hub in Ilorin, accommodating approximately 1,000 individuals at any given time, including traders, butchers, and customers but less than 50 people within the abattoir section. The abattoir is located in close proximity to residential buildings. The geographical coordinates of the Ipata Abattoir are 8°29'58.49"N latitude and 4°33'43.13"E longitude.

B. Dr. Abubakar Sola Saraki Memorial Abattoir

The Dr. Abubakar Sola Saraki Memorial Abattoir, is situated along Sobi Road, Ilorin, is the largest and busiest abattoir in Kwara State. It primarily processes and singes mainly cows for human consumption using dried biomass as fuel on daily basis. The abattoir accommodates approximately 500 individuals at a time, including workers and meat traders. The geographical coordinates of this site are 8°31'36.90"N latitude and 4°33'08.61"E longitude.

Description of Sampling Location

The assessment of PAHs was conducted at the epicenter of each abattoir, where the slaughtering, singeing, and processing of animals occur using both passive and active sampling simultaneously. An air sampling system was deployed at the core of the abattoir for duration of one month. The air sampling system was positioned at a height of 1.5 meters above ground level above the typical human breathing zone to ensure representative measurements. Particulate sampling was specifically being conducted during the singeing process, with a sampling duration of eight hours per day over four days at each abattoir. This method provided a comprehensive assessment of airborne particulate-bound PAHs emitted from meat singeing operations.

3. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

3.1 Equipment

Fabricated Polyurethane Foam Disk (PUF) Sampler: Passive sampling

A fabricated passive sampler composed of two stainless steel bowls, one larger than the other, with diameters of 24 cm and 19 cm, respectively, was employed for air sampling. These bowls were fixed on a joint axis that also supported the polyurethane foam (PUF) disk, ensuring stability and efficiency in capturing airborne particulate emissions.

The PUF passive samplers were suspended at a typical human breathing height of 1.5 to 2.0 meters above ground level in an open space, ensuring optimal air circulation without any obstructions. This setup facilitated the free movement of air around the sampler, allowing for effective pollutants collection through natural convection. The sampler was deployed for an exposure period of 30 days (one month) before retrieval for subsequent analysis.

The fabricated PUF sampler was selected due to its several advantages, including affordability, low maintenance costs, and the absence of electrical power requirements, making it suitable for long-term atmospheric monitoring. Additionally, the porous structure of the polyurethane foam disk allows efficient entrapment of airborne particulates within its matrix. Once captured, these particulates are significantly less prone to re-suspension, ensuring reliable sample retention and analysis [25].

The polyurethane foam disk sampler proved to be effective in capturing smoke deposits and airborne aromatic hydrocarbons in the selected abattoirs, making it an essential tool in this research study.



Figure 3.1: Passive Sampler

3.1.1 Air Sampler Monitoring: Active Sampling

Active air sampling was conducted at the epicenter of the abattoir using a particulate matter (PM) air quality monitor to quantify the mass concentration of emissions generated during the singeing process. This approach enabled real-time measurement of airborne particulates, providing critical data on emission levels and atmospheric pollutant load within the abattoir environment.



Figure 3.2: Particulate Air Monitor

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Air Monitoring Sampling Method

Air sampling was conducted using an active monitoring approach at the designated meat singeing sites. Sampling was performed hourly over an eight-hour period, from 5:30 AM to 12:30 PM, the main time for meat singeing processing, for four consecutive days at each study location (Ipata and Sobi abattoirs). The air quality monitor was utilized to measure and record particulate matter (PM) concentrations, specifically $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} , and Total Suspended Particles (TSP), to assess the extent of atmospheric emissions from the singeing process of meat.

3.2.2 Polyurethane Foam (PUF) Sampling Method

The preparation of the polyurethane foam (PUF) disk for sampling was conducted in accordance with the guidelines outlined by [26] and [27]. The procedure comprised the following sequential steps:

- a. Initial Cleaning: The PUF disk was thoroughly rinsed with distilled water by immersing it in a 500 mL beaker filled with distilled water, ensuring complete saturation. Excess water was subsequently drained, and this process was repeated to enhance the removal of potential impurities.
- b. Solvent Conditioning: The cleaned PUF disk was conditioned using acetone through a Soxhlet extraction process to eliminate residual contaminants.
- c. Secondary Extraction: Following the acetone extraction, the foam underwent a second Soxhlet extraction using petroleum ether under identical conditions. The selection of petroleum ether was based on its effectiveness in extracting the target compounds intended for subsequent analysis.

d. **Drying and Storage:** Upon completion of the second extraction, excess solvent was carefully drained, and the PUF disk was placed in a desiccator for 24 hours to remove any remaining moisture. The dried foam was then securely wrapped in aluminum foil, labeled appropriately, and stored in a light-protected container until deployment for sampling.

Foam Disk Collection and Sampler Disassembly

Upon completion of the sampling period, the polyurethane foam (PUF) disks were carefully collected to prevent contamination and ensure sample integrity for further analysis. The disassembly procedure followed the [27] and [28] protocol and was conducted as follows:

- a. The passive sampler was carefully dismounted from its hanging support.
- b. The hanging hook and hook adaptor were detached.
- c. The upper bowl was removed by unscrewing the wing nut and detaching the nut.
- d. The first flat washer and the longer distance tube were taken out, followed by the second flat washer using sterilized tweezers. The polyurethane foam disk was carefully extracted using tongs wrapped in aluminum foil to prevent contamination and then placed in a double-layered aluminum foil sheet.
- e. The wrapped foam disk was labeled with a unique identifier code for proper tracking.
- f. Finally, the remaining components of the sampler including the shorter distance tube, flat washers, lower bowl, nut, and axis were fully disassembled for storage and maintenance.

3.3 Sample Analysis

Based on established research methodologies, following the passive sampling of aromatic hydrocarbons in the selected study areas, the polyurethane foam (PUF) disks were carefully retrieved from the sampling equipment. The trapped particulate-bound aromatic hydrocarbons were subsequently extracted using Soxhlet extraction with dichloromethane (DCM) as the organic solvent. The extracted samples were then prepared for analysis using Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS)

A Gas Chromatograph (GC) from Agilent Technologies, USA, coupled with a Mass Spectrometer (5975C) equipped with a triple-axis detector and an auto-injector (10 μ L syringe), was utilized for compound identification and quantification. Helium gas served as the carrier gas. Chromatographic separation was performed using a capillary column with the following specifications: 30 m length, 0.2 μ m internal diameter, and 250 μ m film thickness, treated with phenyl methyl siloxane.

The GC-MS operational parameters were as follows: Ion Source Temperature (EI): 250°C, Interface Temperature: 300°C, Column Pressure: 16.2 psia, Injection Mode: Split mode (split ratio 1:50), Injection Temperature: 300°C, Oven Temperature Program: Initial temperature: 35°C (held for 5 min); Ramp 1: Increased to 150°C at 4°C/min; Ramp 2: Increased to 250°C at 20°C/min and held for 5 min; Total elution time: 47.5 minutes.

The system was controlled and data acquisition was conducted using MS Solution software provided by the instrument manufacturer. The identification of aromatic hydrocarbon compounds

was carried out by comparing the mass spectra of detected compounds with reference spectra from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Library.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Particulate Sampling Results

The results of the particulate matter (PM) sampling conducted at the Sobi and Ipata abattoirs are presented in Tables 1 to 6. These tables provide a detailed account of the daily and hourly concentrations of particulate emissions recorded over four consecutive days. The recorded values include PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, and Total Suspended Particles (TSP), along with their corresponding average concentrations.

4.1.1 Sobi Abattoir

Table 1 presents the hourly PM_{2.5} concentrations over the four-day sampling period. PM_{2.5} ranges between 121 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 1557 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ while Table 2 displays the hourly PM₁₀ concentrations ranges from 139 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 1744 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and Table 3 summarizes the hourly TSP concentrations that ranges from 265 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 3301 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$

Table 1: Measured particulate concentrations from the emission of singeing operations for PM_{2.5} ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at Sobi abattoir.

S/N	Day 1 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 2 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 3 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 4 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
1	190	281	191	267	232.25
2	447	714	646	849	664
3	464	749	889	939	760.25
4	1140	822	944	999	976.25
5	994	907	1221	1338	1115
6	584	974	705	1557	955
7	210	138	149	126	155.75
8	114	121	135	119	122.25

Table 2: Measured particulate concentrations from the emission of singeing operations for PM₁₀ ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at Sobi abattoir.

S/N	Day 1 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 2 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 3 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 4 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
1	208	327	226	281	260.5
2	492	865	740	936	758.25
3	544	824	1060	962	847.5
4	1565	968	1565	880	1244.5
5	830	802	1345	1638	1153.75
6	728	1375	821	1744	1167
7	247	160	139	154	175
8	174	148	146	146	153.5

Table 3: Measured particulate concentrations of the emission from singeing operations for TSP ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at Sobi abattoir.

S/N	Day 1 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 2 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 3 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 4 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
1	398	608	417	548	492.75
2	939	1579	1386	1785	1422.25
3	1008	1573	1949	1901	1607.75
4	2705	1790	2509	1879	2220.75
5	1824	1709	2566	2976	2268.75
6	1312	2349	1526	3301	2122
7	457	298	288	280	330.75
8	318	269	281	265	283.25

Table 4: Measured particulate concentrations from the emission of singeing operations for PM_{2.5} ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at Ipata abattoir.

S/N	Day 1 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 2 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 3 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 4 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
1	128	176	186	171	165.25
2	200	388	228	295	277.75
3	356	437	371	374	384.5
4	402	780	526	526	558.5
5	451	920	726	641	684.5
6	340	622	611	441	503.5
7	186	211	202	315	228.5
8	178	195	131	203	176.75

Table 5: Measured particulate concentrations from the emission of singeing operations for PM₁₀ ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at Ipata abattoir.

S/N	Day 1 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 2 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 3 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 4 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
1	156	206	215	208	196.25
2	235	397	268	337	309.25
3	418	503	403	423	436.75
4	492	799	611	577	619.75
5	530	912	760	703	726.25
6	400	748	728	549	606.25
7	217	274	271	389	287.75
8	208	229	215	250	225.5

Table 6: Measured particulate concentrations from the emission of singeing operations for TSP ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at Ipata abattoir .

S/N	Day 1 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 2 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 3 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Day 4 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
1	284	382	401	379	361.5
2	435	785	496	632	587
3	774	940	774	797	821.25
4	894	1579	1137	1103	1178.25
5	981	1832	1486	1341	1410
6	740	1370	1339	990	1109.75
7	403	585	473	704	541.25
8	386	424	346	453	402.25

4.1.2 Ipata Abattoir

Table 4 presents the PM_{2.5} concentrations over four days which ranges from 165.25 µg/m³ to 684.5 µg/m³ and Table 5 details the PM₁₀ concentrations ranges from 196.25 µg/m³ to 726.25 µg/m³ while Table 6 outlines the TSP concentrations, which ranges from 265µg/m³ to 1178.25 µg/m³.

The measured hourly concentration of the particulate at the Sobi abattoir tabulated in Table 7 below is the average hourly concentrations of the particulate calculated in Tables 1, 2, 3 and the extrapolated concentration was calculated from the measured concentration using the air stability formula.

The measured hourly concentrations of the particulate concentrations at the Ipata abattoir tabulated in Table 8 below is the average hourly concentrations of the particulate emissions from the Tables 4, 5, 6 and the extrapolated concentration was calculated from the measured concentration using the air stability formula.

Table 7: Measured concentration (1-hour) vs. Extrapolated concentrations (24-hours) of the emissions from the singeing operation at Sobi abattoir.

S/N	PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)	PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) 1HR	TSP (µg/m ³)	PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)	PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) 24HR	TSP (µg/m ³)
1	232.25	260.5	492.75	95.41	107.01	202.421
2	664	758.25	1422.25	272.77	311.49	584.26
3	760.25	847.5	1607.75	312.31	348.15	660.46
4	976.25	1244.5	2220.75	401.04	511.24	912.28
5	1115	1153.75	2268.75	458.04	473.96	932
6	955	1167	2122	392.31	479.4	871.72
7	155.75	175	330.75	63.98	71.9	135.87
8	122.25	153.5	283.25	50.22	63.06	116.36

Table 8: Measured concentration (1-hour) vs Extrapolated concentrations (24-hours) of the emissions from the singeing operation at Ipata abattoir

S/N	PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)	PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) 1HR	TSP (µg/m ³)	PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)	PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) 24HR	TSP (µg/m ³)
1	165.25	196.25	361.5	67.88	80.62	148.5
2	277.75	309.25	587	114.1	127.04	241.14
3	384.5	436.75	821.25	157.95	179.42	337.37
4	558.5	619.75	1178.25	229.43	254.59	484.03
5	684.5	726.25	1410	281.19	298.34	579.23
6	503.5	606.25	1109.75	206.84	249.04	455.89
7	228.5	287.75	541.25	93.87	118.21	222.35
8	176.75	225.5	402.25	72.61	92.64	165.24

The air stability formula is expressed mathematically from Coccia [29] and Muhibbudin [30]:

$$C_2 = C_1 \times F$$

Where C_2 is the concentration of particulate at time t_2

C_1 is the concentration of particulate at time t_1

F is the factor to convert from the concentration in time t_1 to time t_2 and is expressed mathematically as:

$$F = \left(\frac{t_1}{t_2}\right)^n$$

Where n is the stability dependent exponent and is a constant (0.28)

t_1 is the time period at concentrations C_1 (1 hour)

t_2 is the time period at concentration C_2 (24 hours)

The statutory limits concentration that was used in the calculation of the potential toxicity of particulate emitted at the sampling sites are that of EPA (Environmental Protection Agency), WHO (World Health Organization), ASHRAE (American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-condition Engineers), and FMENV (Federal Ministry of Environment) for the three different particulates (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, and TSP) in the Table 9 below.

According to [31] and [32], the toxicity potential of particulate is a quantitative measure of the severity of the potential physical harm a unit pollutant emission poses to the environment and it is expressed mathematically as ratio of the measured PM concentration to the statutory limit concentration.

$$TP = \frac{C_i(t)}{SL_i(t)}$$

Where TP represent the toxicology potential of pollutant i

$C_i(t)$ is the measured concentration of particulate matter i at time t ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

$SL_i(t)$ is the statutory concentration limits of particulate matter i ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

(The guideline limit set for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})

Table 9: Air quality standard for maximum 24-hour concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) of inhalable particulates.

AUTHORITIES	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	TSP
USEPA ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	150	35	-
WHO ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	50	25	-
ASHRAE ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	50	15	-
FMENV ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	100	-	250

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); World Health Organisation (WHO); American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE); Federal Ministry of Environment in Nigeria (FMENV).

Table 10: Toxicity potentials of particulates of the emissions from singeing operations at Sobiabattoir .

S/N	PM _{2.5} ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)			PM ₁₀ ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)		TSP ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)		
	TP _{EPA}	TP _{WHO}	TP _{ASHRAE}	TP _{EPA}	TP _{WHO}	TP _{ASHRAE}	TP _{FMENV}	TP _{FMENV}
1	2.73	3.82	6.36	0.71	2.14	2.14	1.07	0.81
2	7.79	10.92	18.18	2.08	6.23	6.23	3.11	2.34
3	8.92	12.49	20.82	2.32	6.96	6.96	3.48	2.64
4	11.46	16.04	26.74	3.41	10.22	10.22	5.11	3.65
5	13.086	18.32	30.54	3.16	9.48	9.48	4.74	3.73
6	11.21	15.69	26.15	3.2	9.59	9.59	4.79	3.49
7	1.828	2.56	4.27	0.48	1.44	1.44	0.72	0.54
8	1.435	2.0	3.35	0.42	1.26	1.26	0.63	0.47

Table 11: Toxicity potentials of particulates of the emissions from singeing operations at Ipata abattoir

S/N	PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³)			PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³)			TSP(µg/m ³)	
	TP _{EPA}	TP _{WHO}	TP _{ASHRAE}	TP _{EPA}	TP _{WHO}	TP _{ASHRAE}	TP _{FMEPV}	TP _{FMEPV}
1	1.94	2.72	4.52	0.54	1.61	1.61	0.81	0.59
2	3.26	4.56	7.61	0.85	2.54	2.54	1.27	0.96
3	4.51	6.32	10.53	1.2	3.59	3.59	1.79	1.35
4	6.56	9.18	15.3	1.7	5.09	5.09	2.55	1.94
5	8.03	11.24	18.75	1.99	5.97	5.97	2.98	2.32
6	5.91	8.27	13.79	1.66	4.98	4.98	2.49	1.82
7	2.68	3.75	6.26	0.79	2.36	2.36	1.18	0.89
8	2.07	2.9	4.84	0.62	1.85	1.85	0.93	0.66

4.2 GC-MS SAMPLE ANALYSIS RESULTS

Figure 4.1 and 4.2 shows the result obtained from the GC/MS sample analysis gotten from Sobi and Ipata abattoir respectively. Table 12 and 13 shows the aromatic compounds present in the foam sampler for Sobi and Ipata abattoir respectively. Both show the identified PAHs and their concentrations for Sobi and Ipata abattoir respectively.

Table 12: GC/MS analysis result from Sobi abattoir.

Spec line	Peak height	Mass peak	Compound name	Compound group
1	14894	15.594	2,2,4-trimethyl-3-nitromethylpentanoic acid	Aromatic amines
2	164719	23.665	2,4-bis(1,1-dimethyl)phenol	Heterocyclic aromatic compounds
3	8899	29.146	6-amino-[1,3]dioxolo[4,5-g]quinoline-7-carboxamide	Aromatic amines
4	9550	31.989	3,6-dibutyl-2,5-dimethylpyrazine	Aromatic amines
5	10665	34.476	2-methyl-1H-phenanthro[3,4-d]imidazol-10-ol	PAH
6	8382	35.136	Bicyclo[2.2.2]octane-1,4-dicarboxylic acid	Heterocyclic aromatic compounds
7	12423	37.318	10-methylanthracene-9-carboxyaldehyde	PAH
8	34629	38.334	4,5,9,10-tetrahydro-pyrene	PAH
9	292965	38.892	8-cyano-6,7-dihydro-2-dimethylaminoimidazo[1,2-a]-1,3,5-triazin-4-(8H)-one	Aromatic amines
10	31668	39.856	1-(4-methylphenyl)-4-phenylbuta-1,3-diene	Heterocyclic aromatic compounds
11	68173	54.931	1-acenaphthylenone	PAH
12	28798	56.403	2,6-dinitro-benzenamine	Aromatic amines
13	28907	72.9	2-ethyl phenanthrene	PAH
14	117094	77.265	3,5-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)	Heterocyclic aromatic compounds

Table 13: GC/MS analysis result from Ipata abattoir.

Spec line	Peak height	Mass peak	Compound name	Compound group
1	35234	9.706	Isopropylbabituric acid	Aromatic amines
2	70648	23.614	2,6-bis(1,1-dimethylethyl)phenol	Heterocyclic aromatic compounds
3	15112	30.771	9-ethyl-1,9-dihydro-6H-purine-6-thione	Aromatic amines
4	27574	37.319	6,7,8,8-benzo[b]fluorene	PAH
5	307556	38.943	8-cyano-6,7-dihydro-2-dimethylaminoimidazo[1,2-a]-1,3,5-triazin-4(8H)-one	Aromatic amines
6	30476	54.881	1,3-dinitrobenzene	Aromatic amines
7	27203	56.403	1,1-diphenylmethanol	Heterocyclic aromatic compounds

Table 14: The identified PAHs and their percentage concentration in the foam extract.

Site	Spec Line	Identified PAH Compounds	Percentage Concentration
Sobi	5	2-methyl-1H-phenanthro[3,4-d]imidazol-10-ol	2.13%
	7	10-methylanthracene-9-carboxyaldehyde	2.13%
	8	4,5,9,10-tetrahydro-pyrene	4.44%
	11	1-acenaphthylenone	5.49%
	13	2-ethyl phenanthrene	4.68%
Ipata	4	6,7,8,8-benzo[b]fluorine	4.82%

For this study [1] assessed the toxicity of the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon compounds of the contaminated air samples analyzed with GC/MS by calculating for the incremental cancer risk inhalation (ILRC) assessment using the following equations below:

$$ILRC = CD_i \times CSF$$

Where CD_i is the chronic daily intake (mg/kg/day)

CSF is the cancer slope factor of each of the individual aromatic hydrocarbon compounds (mg/kg/day)⁻¹

The cancer slope factor is given as:

$$CSF = C_A \times TEF$$

Where C_A is the concentration of aromatic hydrocarbon compounds in air (mg/m³)

TEF is the toxicity equivalent factor for each of the identified polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon compounds

The chronic daily intake is calculated from:

$$CD_i = \frac{C_A \times IR \times ET \times ED \times EF}{BW \times AT}$$

Where IR = inhalation rate for adults (m³/hr)

BW = body weight (57.8 kg, the average BW of workers from the questionnaire)

ET = exposure time (8 hrs/day for workers from the questionnaire)

EF = exposure frequency (355 days/year for workers from the questionnaire)

ED = exposure duration (25 years for workers from the questionnaire)

AT = average time for cancer estimation (60 years x 365 day/year from the questionnaire).

The adverse non-carcinogenic health risk associated with inhalation of aromatic hydrocarbon compounds was assessed using Hazard Quotient Index (HQ)

$$HQ = \frac{EDI}{RfC}$$

Where EDI = estimated daily intake of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon compounds (mg/m³)

RfC = reference dose concentration of a polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon compounds compound (mg/m³).

The estimated daily intake is calculated as:

$$EDI = \frac{C_A \times IR \times ED \times EF}{AT \times BW}$$

Table 15: Cancer Inhalation Risk Assessment and the Hazard Quotient factor.

Sample site	(Ci) mg/m ³	CA (mg/m ³ /day)	CDI (mg/kg/day)	CSF (mg/kg/day)-1	ILRC	EDI (mg/m ³)	HQ
	1.767	0.059	0.0027	0.000059	1.59×10^{-7}	3.34×10^{-4}	0.167
	1.77	0.059	0.0027	0.00059	1.60×10^{-6}	3.34×10^{-4}	0.167
Sobi	3.687	0.123	0.0056	0.000123	6.89×10^{-7}	6.97×10^{-4}	0.348
	4.564	0.152	0.0069	0.000152	1.04×10^{-7}	8.61×10^{-4}	0.431
	3.885	0.13	0.0059	0.00013	7.67×10^{-7}	7.36×10^{-4}	0.368
Total					3.319×10^{-7}		1.481
Ipata	3.194	0.106	0.0048	0.000106	5.01×10^{-7}	6.00×10^{-4}	0.300
Total					5.01×10^{-7}		0.300

Table 7 shows hourly measured concentrations of particulate emissions for Sobi abattoir ranging from 122.25 to 1115 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, 153.5-1244.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM_{10} and 283.5-2268.75 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for TSP, the extrapolated 24 hour concentrations of the particulate emissions ranging from 50.22 -458.04 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, 63.06-511.24 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM_{10} and 116.36-912.28 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for TSP, similarly for Table 8 that showed the measured concentrations ranging from 165.25- 684.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, 196.25-726.25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM_{10} and 361.5-1178.25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for TSP, with the extrapolated 24 hour concentrations ranging from 67.88-281.19 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, 80.62 -298.34 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM_{10} and 148.5- 455.89 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for TSP.

The Table 9 shows the standard set environmental authorities USEPA, WHO, ASHRAE and FMENV) for the daily concentration limit of particulate concentrations in air, the extrapolated values failed to comply with guidelines and all of their concentration were found to have breached the standard.

Table 10 shows the evaluated toxicity potentials (TP) of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, PM_{10} and TSP ranging from 1.435-30.54, 0.42-10.22 and 0.47-5.11 respectively for Sobi abattoir using USEPA, WHO, ASHRAE and FMENV guidelines. The most breached limit was the FMENV for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and the least breached was the EPA for PM_{10} .

Table 11 shows the TP of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, PM_{10} and TSP ranging from 1.94-18.75, 0.54-5.97 and 0.66-2.98 respectively for Ipata abattoir on guidelines of USEPA, WHO, ASHRAE and FMENV. The most breached limit was the FMENV for $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and the least breached was USEPA for PM_{10} .

The majority of the toxicity potential values were found to exceed unity, indicating that the meat singeing and charring operations at both Sobi and Ipata abattoirs occur under hazardous conditions characterized by intense heat (elevated temperatures). These conditions pose significant health risks to workers, butchers, and the surrounding environment, potentially causing skin and eye irritation as well as adverse effects on the overall human physiological system. Therefore, it is imperative to adopt a non-polluting alternative for meat charring to mitigate these health and environmental risks.

Table 15 shows the incremental cancer inhalation risk assessment (ILRC) for exposure of workers and traders within the area Sobi abattoir and were estimated to be 3.319×10^{-7} and the adverse non-cancer health risk (HQ) is 1.481, also for Ipata abattoir, ILRC is 5.01×10^{-7} and HQ is 0.300. The estimation of the ILRC for Sobi abattoir was greater than that of Ipata abattoir.

According to USEPA standard for incremental lifetime cancer risk (ILCR) classifies values below 1×10^{-6} as non-carcinogenic and values above 1×10^{-4} as carcinogenic [33]. The value of ILCR at Sobi abattoir is 3.319×10^{-7} and that of Ipata abattoir is 5.01×10^{-7} both are well within safe limits, and no significant cancer risk is associated with the exposure pathway or scenario analyzed.

When value of $HQ > 1$ are considered adverse non-cancer health effect of concern while a value for $HQ \leq 1$ was considered acceptable or at safe levels, the value of HQ at the Sobi abattoir was greater than unity (one) and this indicates that the exposure to the particulate bounded aromatic hydrocarbon compounds at Sobi abattoir has a potential for non-carcinogenic effects to the workers, traders and nearby residents while at Ipata abattoir no adverse health effects are expected under current exposure conditions.

4.4 Proposed Strategies for Mitigating and Controlling Particulate Aromatic Hydrocarbon emissions from Nigerian Abattoirs

The process of singeing meat is a fundamental and widely practiced stage in meat processing, primarily aimed at the complete removal of hair from animal carcasses while preparing the skin for subsequent butchering. However, this practice results in the release of particulate-bound polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) into the atmosphere, contributing to significant environmental and health hazards. Short and long-term exposure to these pollutants degrades air quality and negatively impacts both human health and the ecosystem.

Given the detrimental effects associated with biomass and fuel combustion during the singeing process, the adoption of scalding as an alternative method is strongly recommended. Scalding involves the application of hot water to the carcass, followed by mechanical or manual friction to facilitate hair removal. This process heats the skin within a controlled temperature range, ensuring the dermal extracellular matrix remains intact while effectively loosening the hairs. The removal of hair can then be achieved through mechanical means, such as paddle washers or cylindrical rollers, or manually using a scraping knife. This method is significantly more environmentally sustainable, as it eliminates the emission of airborne pollutants [34].

The hot water required for the scalding process can be generated through solar water heating systems or alternatively, by utilizing biogas produced from the anaerobic digestion of animal dung collected during the butchering process. This approach not only mitigates PAH emissions but also promotes sustainable energy use within abattoirs, thereby reducing their overall environmental footprint.

5. Conclusion

This study investigated the composition and concentration of particulate-bound polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) within the broader spectrum of aromatic hydrocarbons emitted from two selected Nigerian abattoirs in Kwara state: Sobi and Ipata. The toxicity potentials of the detected particulate-bound PAHs were evaluated. The findings indicated that particulate-bound PAHs exceeded permissible thresholds, suggesting that the routine operational practices at these abattoirs substantially contribute to environmental degradation and contamination, thereby posing notable risks to public health. In addition, the carcinogenic potential of the identified particulate-bound PAHs at the selected abattoirs were assessed. The findings indicated that the routine operations at these abattoirs do not pose a significant carcinogenic threat to individuals

upon exposure but suggests a high potential for adverse non-carcinogenic health effects. To mitigate these risks, the study recommends the adoption of alternative scalding techniques, specifically those utilizing solar-heated or biogas-heated water, as sustainable and environmentally sound alternatives to the traditional open-flame singeing practices currently employed in Nigerian abattoirs.

Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: Many thanks to members of Clean Energy and Environmental Research Laboratory (CE²RL), Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

References

1. Patel, A.B.; Shaikh, S.; Jain, K.R.; Desai, C.; Madamwar, D. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons: Sources, toxicity, and remediation approaches. *Front. Microbiol.* 2020, 11, 562813.
2. John, D. Atomic Population of Effectively Localized Electrons of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons with the KP16/B13 Density Functional; Ph.D. Thesis, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN, USA, 2021.
3. Sahoo, B.M.; Ravi Kumar, B.V.; Banik, B.K.; Borah, P. Polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs): Structures, synthesis and their biological profile. *Curr. Org. Synth.* 2020, 17, 625–640.
4. Hrdina, A.I.; Kohale, I.N.; Kaushal, S.; Kelly, J.; Selin, N.E.; Engelward, B.P.; Kroll, J.H. The parallel transformations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the body and in the atmosphere. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 2022, 130, 025004.
5. Zhang, Z.; Li, Y.; Zhang, X.; Zhang, H.; Wang, L. Review of hazardous materials in condensable particulate matter. *Fuel Process. Technol.* 2021, 220, 106892.
6. Gheni, S.A.; Ali, M.M.; Ta, G.C.; Harbin, H.J.; Awad, S.A. Toxicity, hazards, and safe handling of primary aromatic amines. *ACS Chem. Health Saf.* 2023, 31, 8–21.
7. Manzetti, S. Ecotoxicity of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, aromatic amines, and nitroarenes through molecular properties. *Environ. Chem. Lett.* 2012, 10, 349–361.
8. Wang, H.; Chu, X.; Du, P.; He, H.; He, F.; Liu, Y.; Abd El-Aty, A.M. Unveiling heterocyclic aromatic amines (HAAs) in thermally processed meat products: Formation, toxicity, and strategies for reduction—A comprehensive review. *Food Chem. X* 2023, 19, 100833.
9. Ungvari, Z.; Fekete, M.; Varga, P.; Lehoczki, A.; Munkácsy, G.; Fekete, J.T.; Gyórfy, B. Association between red and processed meat consumption and colorectal cancer risk: A comprehensive meta-analysis of prospective studies. *GeroScience* 2025, 1–18.
10. Berrios-Rolón, P.J.; Cotto, M.; Márquez, F. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in freshwater systems: A comprehensive review of sources, distribution, and impacts. 2024.
11. Sawyer, W.E.; Amabie, T.; Sylva, L.; Nwodo, M.U.; Etim, N.G. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons as ambient air pollutants. In *Air Pollutants in the Context of One Health: Fundamentals, Sources, and Impacts*; Springer Nature Switzerland: Cham, Switzerland, 2024; pp. 313–340.
12. Odubo, T.C.; Kosoe, E.A. Sources of air pollutants: Impacts and solutions. In *Air Pollutants in the Context of One Health: Fundamentals, Sources, and Impacts*; Springer Nature Switzerland: Cham, Switzerland, 2024; pp. 75–121.
13. Cui, H.; Lu, Y.; Zhou, Y.; He, G.; Li, Q.; Liu, C.; Cheng, Y. Spatial variation and driving mechanism of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) emissions from vehicles in China. *J. Clean. Prod.* 2022, 336, 130210.
14. Szramowiat-Sala, K.; Marczak-Grzesik, M.; Karczewski, M.; Kistler, M.; Giebl, A.K.; Styszko, K. Chemical investigation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon sources in an urban area with complex air quality challenges. *Sci. Rep.* 2025, 15, 6987.

15. Yan, J.; Wang, X.; Gong, P.; Wang, C. Nitrated polycyclic aromatic compounds in the atmospheric environment: A review. *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2021, 51, 1159–1185.
16. Hu, W.; Liu, D.; Su, S.; Ren, L.; Ren, H.; Wei, L.; Fu, P. Photochemical degradation of organic matter in the atmosphere. *Adv. Sustain. Syst.* 2021, 5, 2100027.
17. Adegbola, P.I.; Adetutu, A. Genetic and epigenetic modulations in toxicity: The two-sided roles of heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from the environment. *Toxicol. Rep.* 2024, 12, 502–?.
18. Bălă, G.P.; Râjnoveanu, R.M.; Tudorache, E.; Motișan, R.; Oancea, C. Air pollution exposure—The (in)visible risk factor for respiratory diseases. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 2021, 28, 19615–19628.
19. Kumari, K.; Swamy, S.; Singh, A. Global monitoring plan on persistent organic pollutants (POPs). In *Persistent Organic Pollutants*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2021; pp. 227–252.
20. Vaye, O.; Ngumbu, R.S.; Xia, D. A review of the application of comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography MS-based techniques for the analysis of persistent organic pollutants and ultra-trace level organic pollutants in environmental samples. *Rev. Anal. Chem.* 2022, 41, 63–73.
21. González, L.T.; Hernández-Romero, I.M.; Mendoza, A.; Ramirez, A.I.; Mancilla, Y.; Kharissov, B.; Longoria, F.E. Source attribution, health risk analysis, and policy implications of PAHs and NPAHs in PM in Northern Mexico. *Sci. Rep.* 2024, 14, 31823.
22. Eghomwanre, A.F.; Edomwonyi, G.O. Particulate matter concentrations and health risks associated with cow hides singeing in abattoirs in Benin City, Nigeria. *J. Air Pollut. Health* 2024.
23. Mallah, M.A.; Changxing, L.; Noreen, S.; Liu, Y.; Saeed, M.; Zhang, Q. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon and its effects on human health: An overview. *Chemosphere* 2022, 296, 133948.
24. National Population Commission. National Population Census 2006; Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2006.
25. Jeong, C.-H.; Halappanavar, S.; Jariyasopit, N.; Su, Y. Polyurethane foam (PUF) disk samplers for measuring trace metals in ambient air. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2019, 6, 545–550. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.9b00420>
26. Abad, E.; Abalos, M.; Fiedler, H. Air monitoring with passive samplers for dioxin-like persistent organic pollutants in developing countries (2017–2019). *Chemosphere* 2022, 287, 131931.
27. UNEP. Global Monitoring Plan on Persistent Organic Pollutants: Passive Sampling of Ambient Air Methodology and Procedure; United Nations Environment Programme, 2017.
28. Fiedler, H.; de Boer, J.; Abad, E. Persistent organic pollutants in air across the globe using a comparative passive air sampling method. *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.* 2024, 171, 117494.
29. Coccia, M. The effects of atmospheric stability with low wind speed and of air pollution on the accelerated transmission dynamics of COVID-19. *Int. J. Environ. Stud.* 2021, 78, 1–27.
30. Muhibbudin, I. Ozone formation potential and toxicity potential of VOC emissions from a Nigerian petroleum products depot. *Anthropog. Pollut.* 2020, 4, 8–14.
31. Kolawole, T.O.; Olatunji, A.S. Assessment of concentration of potentially toxic elements and associated human health risk from particulate matter exposure along road intersections in Ibadan, southwestern Nigeria. *Discover Environ.* 2023, 1, 3.
32. Abulude, F.O.; Arifalo, K.M.; Adamu, A.; Kenni, A.M.; Akinnusotu, A.; Oluwagbayide, S.D.; Acha, S. Indoor air quality (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) and toxicity potential at a commercial environment in Akure, Nigeria. *Environ. Sci. Proc.* 2022, 24, 8.
33. Halfadji, A.; Naous, M.; Bettiche, F.; Touabet, A. Human health assessment of sixteen priority polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in contaminated soils of northwestern Algeria. *J. Health Pollut.* 2021, 11, 210914.
34. FSIP. Provincial Abattoirs Code of Practice; Food Safety and Inspection Branch, 2018.