ID: 755

E-Waste Management in the Digital Age: Global Trends, Toxicological Risks, and Green Recovery Technologies

Najib Altawell[1*], Batuhan Selamoglu[2], Koshanova Gulnazira Danebekovna[3], Zeliha Selamoglu[4,5], Abdol Ghaffar Ebadi[6]

[1]Energy Management Department, Coventry University, Greenwich campus 6 Mitre Passage, Greenwich, SE10 0ER – UK
[2]Mersin University, Institute of Science, Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Mersin, Turkey
[3]Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Faculty of Sciences, Department of Mathematics, Turkestan, Kazakhstan
[4]Department of Medical Biology, Medicine Faculty, Nigde Omer Halisdemir University, Nigde, Türkiye
[5]Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan
[6]Researcher and Faculty member, Jouybar branch, Islamic Azad University, Jouybar, Iran
*Presenter Author's Email: najibaltawell@gmail.com

Abstract
The exponential growth of electronic waste (e-waste) has become an urgent environmental and public health concern due to its toxic composition and propensity for illegal disposal. This review synthesizes e-waste generation, composition, and policy responses globally. It discusses the toxicological risks posed by heavy metals, brominated flame retardants, and persistent organic pollutants contained in the majority of end-of-life electronics. The paper then goes on to discuss emerging green technologies for e-waste recycling such as hydrometallurgical leaching, bioleaching, supercritical fluid extraction, and microfactory systems that minimize environmental damage while maximizing material recovery. It also explores the impact of producer responsibility, integration of the informal sector, and eco-design on the evolution of sustainable e-waste management systems. Global policies, for example, Basel Convention and WEEE Directive, are critically discussed alongside problems of transboundary dumping, informal recycling hazards, and inadequate public enlightenment. The article concludes by propounding multi-stakeholder frameworks towards creating secure, efficient, and equitable circular e-waste systems.
Keywords: E-waste, Toxicity, Recycling technology, Bioleaching, Producer responsibility, Circular electronics

Introduction
New technology diffusion, speedy product development, and push consumption have reduced the product life cycle to unprecedented dimensions, resulting in unprecedented generation of e-waste. Global e-waste generation through 2019 was 53.6 million metric tons, 21% growth over five years, as per Global E-waste Monitor 2020. Global e-waste projection is that global e-waste will surpass 74 million metric tons by the year 2030, an virtual doubling over ten years (Ilankoon et al., 2018).
E-waste, for all its vast resource pool, is otherwise dominated by hazard. Many of the different components are made with lead, mercury, cadmium, brominated flame retardants (BFRs), and persistent organic pollutants (POPs), and both disposal and recycling are complicated and risky unless properly carried out. Compounding the issue is that a mere reported 17.4% of the globe's e-waste has actually been gathered and recycled as such, so the rest has to be treated illegally or informally disposed of (Ahirwar & Tripathi, 2021).
The socio-economic complexity of the e-waste problem is also technical and environmental. The poorly equipped developing world is being used as a dumping site for obsolete electronics in illegal or poorly controlled flows. Workers and local communities in the unorganized recycling that provides livelihood for millions are generally exposed to serious health hazards. The resolution of these issues requires an intervention across the entire range by sets of technological, regulatory, economic, and social measures (Lee et al., 2024).

Toxicological Risks and Environmental Impacts
The toxic chemistry of e-waste results from the chemically diverse composition of metals, plastics, glass, and other additive chemicals. Cadmium and lead are heavy metals that are nephro- and neurotoxic and are extremely toxic to extremely vulnerable groups such as children. Neurological damage and impairment of development have been associated with mercury exposure, which permeates switches and flat-panel displays (Lin et al., 2022).
Brominated flame retardants BFRs or plastic additives used as fire retardants are known endocrine disruptors and possible carcinogens alongside metals. They are also classified as persistent organic pollutants and bioaccumulating substances with a suspected causative role in diseases concerning the thyroid, affected reproduction, and neurotoxicity (Darnerud, 2008).
Environmental contamination caused by e-waste is largely caused by careless recycling. Incinerating wires to obtain copper releases dioxins and furans, the most poisonous chemicals at parts per million. Acidic baths used to recover noble metals off printed circuit boards release heavy metals and sulfuric acid into water and land,

respectively. These contaminants change soil chemistry, lower agricultural yields, and destroy aquatic life (Leung, 2019).

No effect on health deterioration. Recyclers also have very high rates of chronic diseases including respiratory disease, bodywide infection, and skin diseases. In the two biggest e-waste dumping grounds Agbogbloshie (Ghana) and Guiyu (China) compared, their children employed at the dumping grounds have lead blood levels very high, which require immediate intervention (Zeng et al., 2016).

Hence, the toxicological and environmental impact of e-waste in the absence of regulation is not only a local but also a global public health phenomenon demanding attention by coordinated global action and regulatory policies (Li & Achal, 2020).

Innovations in Sustainable Recycling Technologies

The ecological cost of native recycling regimes necessitates more sustainable alternatives. Modern technologies seem promising for eco-friendly disposal of e-waste. Hydrometallurgical operations have recently attracted much attention, involving aqueous solutions for the selective dissolution of metals. These operations are characterized by low temperatures of the processing, lower emissions of processes, and high-purity metal recovery options. The new developments include biodegradable solvents and microbial-derived organic acids that make these operations even more environmentally friendly (Huy Do et al., 2023).

Microbial activity helps in bioleaching and metal recovery during e-waste treatment. Some bacterial types oxidize sulfides of metals and release them in pure form such as gold, copper, and nickel. Compared to traditional processes, bioleaching reactions are long but cost-effective, energy-efficient, and environmentally friendly, especially applied at the industrial scale in optimized bioreactors.

Supercritical fluid extraction (SFE) in supercritical carbon dioxide is solvent-free. SFE has shown a selective disruption of the polymers, flame retardants, and noble metals for clean separations under controlled pressure and temperature conditions (Preetam et al., 2022).

Microfactory concepts are changing the game in decentralized recycling of e-waste management. Modular microfactories with automated processes will convert e-wastes into a diverse range of useable products, including metal alloys, engineered plastics, and glass microfibers. The localization of microfactories minimizes logistic emissions and promotes local economy stimulation through the creation of green jobs. The technical possibilities are therefore very reliant on cooperation between the public and private sectors, favourable governmental policies, and continuity in research and development efforts (Moure Abelenda & Aiouache, 2023).

Policy Frameworks, Challenges, and Opportunities

Policy interventions are the backbone for steering towards sustainable e-waste management, with the Basel Convention being an overarching instrument to regulate transboundary hazardous waste so as to ensure that e-waste is not dumped from developed to developing countries. However, the loophole of the export of "second-hand goods" makes enforcement difficult and continues the cycle of environmental injustice (Aycock et al., 2023).

Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) under which manufacturers are held liable for the end-of-life management of the products relates to the European Union's WEEE Directive, and has thus led to formal collection schemes, recycling standards, and eco-design practices forming. However, most countries will continue to face such problems such as enforcement of the regulation and industry resistance.

Regulatory frameworks are existing, at best, in only a nascent form or completely ineffective in many low- and middle-income countries. Here, the informal recycling economy has thus far become overwhelmingly predominant. This would therefore demonstrate the possibility of strong initiation of lobbying and development activities for policies that can facilitate this informal sector, such as in training and educational initiatives, certification as well as technology assistance (Ezeudu, 2024).

Reinforcement of these international alliances should be through strengthened capacity building, technology transfers and provision of finances to developing countries to help them develop their infrastructures unsustainably for dealing with e-waste.

In addition to that, policies should look at the upstream intervention of product design in the area of durability, reparability, and recyclability as important design considerations. Without such systemic shifts in the production-consumption aspects, little will be achieved with any regulatory changes (Wene, 2015).

The Role of Consumer Behavior in E-Waste Generation

Consumer behavior thus becomes an elemental factor in affecting the size and composition of the e-waste stream. Rapid turnover due to marketing practices, technological obsolescence, and a social perception of the new technologies as a status symbol is much worsened by the speediness of generation or e-waste (Islam et al., 2021).

It further induces a throwaway culture planned obsolescence: products are intentionally designed with limited lifespans. Most consumers may throw away devices that are still functional, simply to acquire the latest models, depleting more resources and compounding an already precarious situation.

Education awareness programs aimed at the consumers on the environmental and health hazards posed by e-waste can also change the landscape significantly. Such estimates can empower consumers to be agents of transformation in the circular economy by encouraging repair, reuse, and even responsible recycling behaviors (Wirtu & Tucho, 2022).

The policy instruments include eco-labeling, right-to-repair laws, and buy-back schemes that encourage sustainable consumer consumption. Companies engage in programs like trade-in old electronics or market their products based on easier repairability; such activities enhance loyalty and appreciation among customers while lessening environment footprints. Ultimately, behavioral dimensioning of et-waste involves consumption culture relocation to maintaining a sustainable culture where stewardship and intergenerational equity become priority concerns (Vidal-Ayuso et al., 2023).

Conclusion

E-waste becomes a product of techno-progress. It improves life, but on the other hand, produces a new element that threatens the ecological and social fabric of the earth. E-waste remains the cause of environmental degradation, toxic exposure, and social inequality in any uncontrolled condition. There which means, the crisis, availing a rare opportunity indeed: green recycling technologies advancing, robust policy frameworks strengthened, informal economies integrated, and consumers' mindsets evolving as a whole may pave the way for new sustainability actions (Bakhiyi et al., 2018).

A circular economy in e-waste requires integrated multi-front action: design of electronics for end of life; sound and enforced policy; financial commitment to innovations in technologies; and change in culture for responsible consumption behavior. The future of e-waste management will not be defined just by the ingenuity of technology but by what really commits our ethical being towards environmental justice, social inclusion, and planetary health for generations to come (Xavier et al., 2019).

References

Ahirwar, R., & Tripathi, A. K. (2021). E-waste management: A review of recycling process, environmental and occupational health hazards, and potential solutions. *Environmental Nanotechnology, Monitoring & Management*, *15*, 100409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enmm.2020.100409

Aycock, M., Cho, E., & Kim, K. (2023). “I like to buy pre-owned luxury fashion products”: Understanding online second-hand luxury fashion shopping motivations and perceived value of young adult consumers. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2023.2195677

Bakhiyi, B., Gravel, S., Ceballos, D., Flynn, M. A., & Zayed, J. (2018). Has the question of e-waste opened a Pandora's box? An overview of unpredictable issues and challenges. *Environment International*, *110*, 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2017.10.021

Darnerud, P. O. (2008). Brominated flame retardants as possible endocrine disrupters. *International Journal of Andrology*, *31*(2), 152–160. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2605.2008.00869.x

Ezeudu, O. B. (2024). Harnessing the Drivers and Barriers to Implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility for Circular Economy in Nigeria. *Circular Economy and Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43615-023-00340-8

Huy Do, M., Tien Nguyen, G., Dong Thach, U., Lee, Y., & Huu Bui, T. (2023). Advances in hydrometallurgical approaches for gold recovery from E-waste: A comprehensive review and perspectives. *Minerals Engineering*, *191*, 107977. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2022.107977

Ilankoon, I. M. S. K., Ghorbani, Y., Chong, M. N., Herath, G., Moyo, T., & Petersen, J. (2018). E-waste in the international context – A review of trade flows, regulations, hazards, waste management strategies and technologies for value recovery. *Waste Management*, *82*, 258–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.10.018

Islam, M. T., Huda, N., Baumber, A., Shumon, R., Zaman, A., Ali, F., Hossain, R., & Sahajwalla, V. (2021). A global review of consumer behavior towards e-waste and implications for the circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *316*, 128297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128297

Lee, J., Choi, H., & Kim, J. (2024). Environmental and economic impacts of e-waste recycling: A systematic review. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 152917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2024.152917

Leung, A. O. W. (2019). Environmental Contamination and Health Effects Due to E-waste Recycling. In *Electronic Waste Management and Treatment Technology* (pp. 335–362). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-816190-6.00015-7

Li, W., & Achal, V. (2020). Environmental and health impacts due to e-waste disposal in China – A review. *Science of The Total Environment*, *737*, 139745. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139745

Lin, S., Ali, M. U., Zheng, C., Cai, Z., & Wong, M. H. (2022). Toxic chemicals from uncontrolled e-waste recycling: Exposure, body burden, health impact. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, *426*, 127792. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.127792

Moure Abelenda, A., & Aiouache, F. (2023). Microfactory Design for Valorization of E-Waste Plastics (Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene, Polycarbonate, and Polypropylene) on Additive Manufacturing Sector. *Recycling*, *8*(3), 46. https://doi.org/10.3390/recycling8030046

Preetam, A., Ram Jadhao, P., Naik, S. N., Pant, K. K., & Kumar, V. (2022). Supercritical Fluid Technology - An Eco-friendly Approach for Resource Recovery from E-waste and Plastic waste: A Review. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 122314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2022.122314

Vidal-Ayuso, F., Akhmedova, A., & Jaca, C. (2023). The circular economy and consumer behaviour: Literature review and research directions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 137824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137824

Wene, C.-O. (2015). Future energy system development depends on past learning opportunities. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Energy and Environment*, *5*(1), 16–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/wene.172

Wirtu, Y. D., & Tucho, G. T. (2022). E-waste: Growing environmental and health problems and its management alternatives in developing countries. *Environmental Reviews*. https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2021-0120

Xavier, L. H., Giese, E. C., Ribeiro-Duthie, A. C., & Lins, F. A. F. (2019). Sustainability and the circular economy: A theoretical approach focused on e-waste urban mining. *Resources Policy*, 101467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2019.101467

Zeng, X., Xu, X., Boezen, H. M., & Huo, X. (2016). Children with health impairments by heavy metals in an e-waste recycling area. *Chemosphere*, *148*, 408–415. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.10.078