FIGURES

Fig. 1.1: Water distribution on Earth **29**

Fig. 1.2: Timeline of safe drinking water statements **30**

Fig. 1.3: Household water treatments **32**

Fig. 1.4: Photoinactivation mechanisms and their spectral actions **35**

Fig. 1.5: Optimal properties for a SODIS container **39**

Fig. 1.6: Sensitivity of bacteria, viruses, and protozoa to types of damage. The more transparent, the less sensitive **43**

Fig. 1.7: The path the radiation travels from the sun to the pathogen in the SODIS process. #=1: Radiation source: #=2: Crossing through the container; #=3: Crossing through the water: #4 Radiation that reaches pathogens **46**

Fig. 1.8: Objectives, chapters, and publications **58**

Fig. 2.1: Schematic representation of the multiple target – multiple hit kinetic model **73**

Fig. 3.1: Fit for the daily dose during the year for a latitude of 45°N and validation of the procedure to calculate $G_{day}(\lambda)$ as a function of the latitude and the day of the year. A: Latitudes from 0° to 60°N with steps of 5°. B: Latitudes from 60°S to 0° with steps of 5° **81**

Fig. 3.2: Worldwide representation of the annual average values of *F*2 calculated from historical data of the last 12 years, based on the procedure developed by Moreno–SanSegundo ***et al***. (2021) **82**

Fig. 3.3: Comparison between literature (red squares, Frank and Klöpffer, 1988) and predicted data (Gday***(307.5 nm)***, green circles) of the cumulated radiation intensity **83**

Fig. 3.4: Transmission spectra of PMMA, PP, PC, and PET **85**

Fig. 3.5: Disinfection time to achieve 3–log reduction of ***E. coli*** for different solar exposure times and plastic containers **86**

Fig. 3.6: Capture screen of the ***Solar UV Calculator*** tool. Top: Parameters design (thickness and plastic material) and numerical data and distribution

(%) of the transmitted solar radiation. Bottom: Graphical data of the spectral incident radiation outside and inside the device in the UV–Vis range. **88**

Fig. 3.7: Effect of the presence of carbohydrates, bicarbonates, humic acids, iron, and solids: A) on the bacterial inactivation efficacy, B) on water transmission spectra **91**

Fig. 3.8: Distribution of the incident radiation ($W \cdot m^{-2}$) in the longitudinal axis for a UVA irradiance in the front side (left in the plot) of 28.2 $W \cdot m^{-2}$ for different levels of iron and humic acids concentration (top) and turbidity (bottom) **93**

Fig. 3.9: Comparison of experimental first–order kinetic constant for *E. coli* photoinactivation and estimated by the kinetic model of radiation attenuating substances. A) kinetic model for low–volume containers, B) Kinetic model for high–volume containers **94**

Fig. 3.10: Agreement between observed and predicted kinetic constants of the complete kinetic model **98**

Fig. 3.11: Observed and predicted MS2 photoinactivation kinetic constant for experiments of validation using PP, PMMA, and PET to modify the spectral distribution of radiation **99**

Fig. 3.12: Observed and predicted photoinactivation profiles of *C. parvum* oocysts **103**

Fig. 3.13: Observed and predicted inactivation profiles of *C. parvum* oocysts at different conditions of radiation intensities, radiation spectral distribution and water temperatures **104**

Fig. 3.14: Experimental and predicted pseudo first–order kinetic constant of the *E. coli* inactivation under dark conditions **110**

Fig. 3.15: Evolution of the *E. coli* concentration profiles depending on the UV irradiance Line: predicted data. Dots: experimental data **111**

Fig. 3.16: Evolution of the *E. coli* concentration profiles depending on the initial H_2O_2 external concentration. Line: predicted data. Dots: experimental data **112**

Fig. 3.17: Integrated mechanistic proposal for *E. coli* inactivation under the H_2O_2–enhanced inactivation process **113**

Fig. 3.18: Predictions of the required solar exposure time to achieve 99.99% of bacteria removal **115**