

Lead Contamination in Drinking Water: Health Risks to Children and Filtration Strategies

Prisha Gupta

Department of Biology and Psychology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4L8

Abstract

Lead contamination in drinking water is a serious public health concern due to the toxicity and persistence of lead in the environment and human body. Children are particularly vulnerable because their developing brains are highly sensitive to lead exposure. Lead neurotoxicity occurs through several mechanisms, including interference with essential metal ions, oxidative stress, mitochondrial dysfunction and disruption of the blood-brain barrier. Socioeconomic and geographic factors can further contribute to unequal exposure, particularly in rural and underserved communities where access to healthcare, testing, and remediation may be limited. Properly certified point-of-use filters can substantially reduce lead concentrations in drinking water. However, their performance depends on water chemistry, the physical and chemical form of lead, filter capacity, installation, and maintenance. Effective lead mitigation therefore requires reliable filtration alongside long-term control and remediation of contamination sources.

Introduction

Lead is a soft, malleable metal that can virtually damage every organ system in the body upon exposure. It is a naturally occurring yet highly toxic element found in the Earth's crust. Although it is present throughout the environment, human activities such as mining, manufacturing, and the combustion of fossil fuels have significantly increased its accumulation and distribution.

Common routes of human exposure include the consumption of drinking water that is contaminated by aging or corroded lead-containing pipes. Other common routes include inhalation in industrial settings and ingestion of lead-based paint, particularly when deteriorating paint produces flakes or dust that may be accidentally ingested by children. Although the use of lead in gasoline and paint has been largely banned or restricted, exposure remains a significant concern because lead does not readily degrade and can persist in the environment (Abadin et al., 2007).

Among the various health concerns associated with lead exposure, its effects on the central nervous system are specifically important in children. Lead is particularly harmful to the central nervous system, making children's developing brains especially vulnerable. Longitudinal studies have demonstrated that prolonged lead exposure is associated with cognitive and behavioural

impairments in children, including hyperactivity, reduced fine motor function, impaired hand-eye coordination, slower reaction times, and lower performance on intelligence tests.

Additionally, there is no safe level of lead exposure in children which means that any amount can negatively affect neurological development (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2019). The severity of lead toxicity depends on several factors, including the dose and duration of exposure, the age of the individual, nutritional status, and lifestyle factors (OSHA, 2015).

A Detailed Review of Neurotoxicity in Children

Understanding how lead produces these neurological effects requires examining what happens after lead enters the body and reaches the nervous system. Neurotoxicity refers to physiological or functional changes in the nervous system caused by exposure to toxic agents, which may result in cognitive impairment, memory disorders, mood alterations and the onset of psychiatric disturbances (Han et al., 2011). Lead neurotoxicity occurs when exposure to lead disrupts the normal functioning of the central nervous system (CNS), resulting in neurological and cellular damage (Hwang, 2007). Children's developing neurosystems are particularly vulnerable to lead exposure since they can absorb a greater proportion of ingested lead due to behavioural patterns like playing in contaminated soil and placing their hands or other objects in their mouths.

Once lead enters the bloodstream, it can be distributed throughout the body. A portion of circulating lead is excreted through the kidneys, while much of the remaining lead binds to red blood cells and is transported to soft tissues. Over time, lead can accumulate in mineralizing tissues, especially bone, where it may remain stored for extended periods and later be released back into the bloodstream (Abadin et al., 2005). This persistence provides an important context for understanding why lead exposure can have prolonged effects on the body and nervous system.

Mechanisms of Lead Neurotoxicity

At the cellular and molecular levels, several interconnected mechanisms help explain how lead produces these neurological effects. At the molecular level, lead can contribute to neuronal damage through several mechanisms.

The primary one is lead interfering with calcium-dependent cellular processes. This happens because lead (Pb^{2+}) has similar physiochemical properties to calcium (Ca^{2+}). This allows Pb^{2+} to compete with calcium ions at critical binding sites on proteins and enzymes, disrupting their normal structure and function. With calcium-like properties, lead can pass even through the highly selective blood brain barrier. Unlike calcium, however, lead cannot perform the

physiological functions of the ions it replaces (Molecular Mechanisms of Lead Neurotoxicity, 2021).

This interference affects mitochondrial calcium regulation, which can promote the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) and oxidative stress. Lead contributes to oxidative damage through two interconnected mechanisms: increasing the generation of reactive species and depleting cellular antioxidant defenses. One important target is glutathione (GSH), an antioxidant that plays a major role in protecting cells from oxidative damage. The sulfhydryl (-SH) groups present in glutathione have a high affinity for lead and other heavy metals. When lead binds to these groups, it can reduce the availability and effectiveness of glutathione as an antioxidant, weakening the cell's ability to neutralize reactive species (Patrick, 2006).

Excessive oxidative stress can damage cellular components and contribute to apoptosis, or cell death. Collectively, these mechanisms can impair the normal functioning and survival of neurons, ultimately damaging the brain.

However, lead-induced neurological damage is not limited to cellular and oxidative processes. Lead can also interfere with the communication between neurons. Lead neurotoxicity extends beyond its interference with calcium-dependent processes. Exposure can also disrupt neurotransmission, systems that are essential for brain development and normal neurological function. Disruption of these neurotransmitter systems may contribute to the behavioural and cognitive difficulties associated with childhood lead exposure (Brown et al., 1997).

Lead can also interfere with the formation and functioning of neuronal synapses, potentially disrupting the establishment of neural connections that are essential for normal brain development (Bressler & Goldstein, 1991).

Impact in Rural Areas

While these biological mechanisms help explain the effects of lead exposure at the individual level, the risk of exposure is not distributed equally across populations. Socioeconomic status is an important factor associated with childhood lead exposure, as children from lower-income households may face greater exposure to environmental sources of lead and barriers to accessing healthcare. In a study examining blood lead concentrations among children, 16.3% of children from low-income families had BPb levels of $\geq 10 \mu\text{g/dL}$, compared with 5.4% and 4.0% of children from middle and high-income families, respectively (Brody, 1994). This disparity demonstrates the relationship between socioeconomic conditions and the risk of lead exposure.

Geographic location can further compound these socioeconomic disparities. A study examining early-childhood lead burden found consistently higher rates of elevated blood lead levels outside suburban areas, with particularly high rates observed in more isolated and rural communities. Higher elevated blood lead levels were associated with smaller population sizes, lower

population densities, and a greater proportion of rural residents. Several factors may contribute to these geographic disparities, including limited access to and affordability of healthcare services, increased soil contamination, and exposure to industrial emissions.

Furthermore, due to lack of infrastructure, poor filtration facilities fail to effectively filter out lead from drinking water. Rural communities may also face greater challenges in accessing lead screening, environmental testing, and remediation services, potentially allowing exposure to persist undetected (Yeter et al., 2022).

Together, these findings demonstrate that the consequences of lead exposure extend beyond its direct biological effects. These disparities highlight that lead exposure is not solely an environmental issue but also a social and geographic health inequity. The combination of environmental contamination, socioeconomic disadvantage, and limited healthcare access can increase the likelihood that children in rural and underserved communities experience prolonged exposure and delayed identification of elevated blood lead levels.

Given these disparities, reducing exposure at its source and limiting contact with contaminated environments are essential components of lead prevention. Among the different pathways through which individuals may encounter lead, drinking water presents an important and potentially preventable route of exposure (*Basic Information about Lead in Drinking Water* | US EPA, 2016). This is particularly relevant in communities where aging infrastructure or inadequate filtration may increase the risk of lead entering household water.

Filtration

Since drinking water can represent an important pathway for lead exposure, reducing lead at the point of consumption is an important component of exposure prevention. Filtration is an important strategy for reducing lead exposure through drinking water, particularly at the point of use. Evidence from a field study conducted in Flint, a city in the USA, demonstrated that properly certified faucet mounted point-of-use filters can effectively reduce lead concentrations in drinking water (Bosscher et al., 2019).

However, not all filtration systems provide the same level of protection. Point-of-Entry (POE) systems are ineffective for lead because lead primarily enters drinking water after the point of entry. According to the US EPA, lead contamination is rarely found in source water; instead, it leaches directly from a home's internal plumbing, including lead solder, older brass fixtures, and pipes. Since POE system filters water only where it first enters the building, any lead leached by the home's internal pipes will bypass the filter entirely and flow directly to your tap.

Table 1. A comparison of filtration media and their effectiveness against lead

Method	Lead Removal Mechanism	Main limitations
--------	------------------------	------------------

Activated carbon block	Uses a small pore size to physically trap particulate lead; some cartridges also use adsorption.	Performance depends on filter capacity, water chemistry, and maintenance. Filters must be replaced before their rated capacity is exceeded.
Ion exchange	Exchanges dissolved Pb^{2+} with other ions on specialized media.	Effectiveness can vary depending on the chemical form of lead and the surrounding water chemistry. It also has complex operational requirements for media replenishment.
Point-of-use filtration	Filters water directly at the outlet,	Protects the water actually consumed but does not remove the lead source (e.g., a lead service line). Requires correct installation, maintenance and cartridge replacement.

The effectiveness of these filtration approaches depends heavily on the conditions in which they are used. One of the most important factors affecting filtration performance is water chemistry. Lead does not always occur in drinking water in the same physical or chemical form. It may be present as dissolved or particulate, and the proportion of each form can change according to factors such as pH, alkalinity, and corrosion-control treatment. Since different filtration mechanisms target different forms of lead, a filter that performs effectively under one set of water conditions may not perform identically under another. Consequently, filtration performance observed in one household or water system cannot be assumed to apply universally.

In addition to water chemistry, the effectiveness of a filter depends on how it is maintained over time. Another major limitation is filter capacity and maintenance. Even highly effective filters have a finite treatment capacity. As a cartridge approaches or exceeds its rated capacity, its ability to remove contaminants may decrease. Therefore, POU filters must be installed correctly and replaced according to the manufacturer's recommended schedule. Failure to maintain the filter can compromise both contaminant removal and water flow.

Importantly, reducing lead exposure through filtration should not be considered independently of overall drinking-water quality. Filtration can also introduce considerations related to microbial water quality. Some carbon-containing POU filters may provide surfaces that support microbial growth, depending on the disinfectant residual and characteristics of the water. Carbon filters of any kind, POU or POE or standing Brita filter pitchers, are all subject to serious biofilm risks.

Therefore, an effective lead-removal strategy must consider not only the reduction of lead but also the broader effects of filtration on drinking water quality.

Taken together, these limitations demonstrate why filtration should be viewed as one component of a broader lead-mitigation strategy rather than a complete solution. Overall, filtration can substantially reduce lead concentrations at the point of consumption, but its effectiveness depends on the type of lead present, water chemistry, filter design, certification, capacity, installation, and maintenance. POU filtration is particularly valuable because it can provide a practical barrier between contaminated plumbing and the water people actually drink. However, filtration should be viewed as a means of reducing exposure rather than eliminating the underlying source of lead contamination (Bosscher et al., 2019).

Conclusion

Lead contamination in drinking water therefore represents both a biological and an environmental health challenge. Lead contamination in drinking water can have serious and lasting effects, particularly on the developing brain. By interfering with essential metals, increasing oxidative stress, disrupting mitochondria, and potentially affecting the blood-brain barrier, lead can impair neurological development and contribute to cognitive and behavioural problems. Rural and underserved communities may face additional risks due to environmental contamination and limited access to healthcare and remediation. Filtration, particularly properly certified point-of-use systems, can significantly reduce lead exposure. However, filtration alone does not eliminate the contamination source. Ultimately, reducing the health burden of lead exposure requires both immediate measures to reduce exposure and longer-term efforts to address the sources of contamination. Long-term protection therefore requires effective filtration alongside water testing, infrastructure improvements, and source remediation.

References:

- Abadin, H., Ashizawa, A., Stevens, Y.-W., Llados, F., United States. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry., & Syracuse Research Corporation. (2005). *Toxicological Profile for Lead: August 2007*.
https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Toxicological%20Profile%20For%20Lead&publication_year=2007&
- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry . (2019). *Lead exposure in children affects brain and behavior*. Aacap.Org.
https://www.aacap.org/aacap/families_and_youth/facts_for_families/fff-guide/Lead-Exposure-In-Children-Affects-Brain-And-Behavior-045.aspx
- Basic Information about Lead in Drinking Water | US EPA. (2016, February 2). US EPA.
<https://www.epa.gov/ground-water-and-drinking-water/basic-information-about-lead-drinking-water>
- Bosscher, V., Lytle, D. A., Schock, M. R., Porter, A., & Del Toral, M. (2019). POU water filters effectively reduce lead in drinking water: A demonstration field study in Flint, Michigan. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part A*, 54(5), 484–493.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10934529.2019.1611141>
- Bressler, J. P., & Goldstein, G. W. (1991). Mechanisms of lead neurotoxicity. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 41(4), 479–484. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-2952\(91\)90617-e](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-2952(91)90617-e)
- Brody, D. J. (1994). Blood Lead Levels in the US Population. *JAMA*, 272(4), 277.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1994.03520040039038>

Brown, L. L., Schneider, J. S., & Lidsky, T. I. (1997). Sensory and cognitive functions of the basal ganglia. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 7(2), 157–163.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4388\(97\)80003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-4388(97)80003-7)

Han, D. Y., Hoelzle, J. B., Dennis, B. C., & Hoffmann, M. (2011). A Brief Review of Cognitive Assessment in Neurotoxicology. *Neurologic Clinics*, 29(3), 581–590.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ncl.2011.05.008>

Hwang, L. (2007). Environmental stressors and violence: Lead and polychlorinated biphenyls.

Reviews on Environmental Health, 22(4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/reveh.2007.22.4.313>

Lidsky, T. I., & Schneider, J. S. (2003). Lead neurotoxicity in children: Basic mechanisms and clinical correlates. *Brain*, 126(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awg014>

Molecular mechanisms of lead neurotoxicity. (2021). *Advances in Neurotoxicology*, 159–213.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.ant.2020.11.002>

OSHA. (2015). 1910.1025 - Lead. | *Occupational Safety and Health Administration*. Osha.Gov.

<https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1910/1910.1025>

Patrick, L. (2006). Lead toxicity part II: The role of free radical damage and the use of antioxidants in the pathology and treatment of lead toxicity. *Alternative Medicine Review: A Journal of Clinical Therapeutic*, 11(2), 114–127.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16813461/>

Sanders, T., Liu, Y., Buchner, V., & B Tchounwou, P. (2009). *Neurotoxic Effects and Biomarkers of Lead Exposure: A Review*. NIH. <https://doi.org/10.1515/reveh.2009.24.1.15>

Yeter, D., Woodall, D., Dietrich, M., & Polivka, B. (2022). Rural and Urban Ecologies of Early Childhood Toxic Lead Exposure: The State of Kansas, 2005 to 2012. *Kansas Journal of Medicine*, 15(2), 285–292. PubMed Central. <https://doi.org/10.17161/kjm.vol15.17960>