

**SOLAR PHOTOCATALYTIC DEGRADATION OF DICHLOROACETIC ACID
WITH SILICA-SUPPORTED TITANIA AT PILOT PLANT SCALE**

Javier Marugán^a, Jose Aguado^a, Wolfgang Gernjak^b, Sixto Malato^b

^a Departamento de Tecnología Química y Ambiental, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos
C/ Tulipan s/n 28933 Móstoles (Madrid), Spain.

Tel: +34 91 664 7466, Fax +34 91 488 7068, E-mail: javier.marugan@urjc.es

^b Plataforma Solar de Almería – CIEMAT

Carretera Senés km 4, 04200 Tabernas (Almería), Spain

Tel: +34 950 387 940, Fax +34 950 365 015, E-mail: sixto.malato@psa.es

Published on

Catalysis Today, 129: 59-68 (2007).

[doi:10.1016/j.cattod.2007.06.054](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2007.06.054)

ABSTRACT

A multivariate analysis using experimental design techniques was performed to determine the effect of iron, hydrogen peroxide and titanium dioxide in the solar photodegradation of dichloroacetic acid in a combined TiO₂/photo-Fenton process. The study was carried out at pilot-plant scale, using TiO₂ supported on silica as the heterogeneous photocatalyst to facilitate separation of the solids after the reaction, and iron concentrations of less than 3 mg·L⁻¹ to avoid removal of iron from the effluent. The results show that iron is the most important factor influencing the reaction rate, which suggests that in strongly acidic solutions, the Fenton mechanism controls the process even at such low iron concentrations. Under these conditions, the expected synergism between TiO₂ and iron degradation pathways seems to be negligible compared to the antagonistic effect between hydrogen peroxide and TiO₂, which reduces the activity of the combined system. However, in the absence of hydrogen peroxide, the activity achieved by the combined Fe/TiO₂ system is similar to that of the photo-Fenton process, with the advantage that H₂O₂ is replaced by a reusable TiO₂-based catalytic material. Consequently, the analysis of pilot-plant operation economics took not only the degradation rate, but also the cost of chemicals into account.

KEYWORDS

Photocatalysis, photo-Fenton, supported titania, dichloroacetic acid, experimental design, optimization, economic analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of photochemical technologies has been shown to be a promising alternative for the detoxification of industrial effluents [1-3], especially from the environmental point of view [4]. Solar-driven advanced oxidation technologies such as semiconductor photocatalysis and photo-Fenton processes have demonstrated their suitability for the disposal of toxic and non-biodegradable pollutants resistant to conventional biological treatments [5-9].

One of these resistant chemicals is dichloroacetic acid (DCA), a widely-used industrial pollutant also identified as an intermediate in the biological degradation pathway of many chlorinated hydrocarbons, and as one of the potentially carcinogenic disinfection by-products (DBP) formed in chlorination of water with traces of natural organic matter [10]. Since the early work of Ollis et al. [11], DCA has been used as the model pollutant by many research groups for the study of fundamental photocatalytic mechanisms [12], the influence of operating variables on solar photocatalytic processes [13,14], for kinetic modelling and photoreactor design [15], to compare the activity of new TiO₂ photocatalysts [16,17], and also to assess the activity of supported TiO₂ [18-20]. The use of supported titania has been shown to be a satisfactory way of recovering the catalyst after the reaction [21], one of the main problems hindering commercial application of TiO₂ photocatalysis in aqueous systems.

A previous work has studied Fe/TiO₂/pH interaction in the solar photodegradation of a model pesticide using TiO₂ supported on silica in the presence of excessive H₂O₂ [22]. Results showed that simultaneous semiconductor and photo-Fenton photocatalytic mechanisms were present. The reaction rates observed were controlled mainly by the iron chemistry, and pH was clearly the most influential variable, the reaction rate being fastest at acidic pH, as expected for a Fenton mechanism. However, at higher pH, the presence of TiO₂/SiO₂ photocatalysts produces a synergistic combination of the two degradation mechanisms, reducing the required amount of iron to below discharge limits.

This work focuses on the study of TiO₂/H₂O₂/Fe interaction in the solar photodegradation of DCA when Fe/H₂O₂ and silica-supported titania are used simultaneously in a pilot plant. Nogueira et al. [14] have reported on a small-scale multivariate analysis of the combined TiO₂/photo-Fenton process using powdered Degussa P25 TiO₂ and iron concentrations up to 60 mg·L⁻¹. The purpose of this study was to assess the activity and the synergies of the

combined TiO₂/H₂O₂/Fe system at pilot-plant scale using SiO₂-supported TiO₂ photocatalysts to improve recovery of the solids after the reaction and iron concentrations of less than 3 mg·L⁻¹ to avoid iron removal. Experiments at acidic pH to maximize photo-Fenton efficiency and a multivariate analysis were performed to find out the effects of the three selected variables. Concentrations of TiO₂/SiO₂, iron and hydrogen peroxide were studied at five different levels (-1.68, -1, 0, +1, +1.68), using a statistical approach to find the response surface of the photodegradation reaction rate. This method enables the influence of each variable to be determined along with any possible synergistic or antagonistic effects. The mathematical model obtained makes it possible to optimize pilot-plant operating conditions, minimizing the number of experiments required for process scale-up.

2. EXPERIMENTAL

2.1. Materials.

Titanium dioxide was incorporated into a commercial porous silica (INEOS ES70Y, $S_{\text{BET}} = 257 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$) using a sol-gel method. The synthesized photocatalyst consists of large approx. 50-70- μm silica particles with TiO₂ nanocrystals with a mean size of 7.2 nm homogeneously distributed over the SiO₂ surface. Further information on laboratory-scale synthesis, characterization and photocatalytic activity is available in a previous work [23].

Iron sulphate (FeSO₄·7H₂O) and reagent-grade hydrogen peroxide (30wt% aqueous solution) were used as the Fenton catalyst. No pH adjustment was required, as experiments were carried out at the natural acid pH of 5.0 mM dichloroacetic acid (DCA) reacting solution (~2.4). Demineralised water came from the PSA (Plataforma Solar de Almería) distillation plant (conductivity < 10 $\mu\text{S}\cdot\text{cm}^{-1}$, Cl⁻ = 0.2-0.3 mg·L⁻¹, NO₃⁻ = 0.5 mg·L⁻¹, organic carbon < 0.5 mg·L⁻¹).

2.2. Solar photodegradation experiments.

Photocatalytic reactions were carried out under solar irradiation in compound parabolic collectors (CPC) at the Plataforma Solar de Almería (latitude 37°N, longitude 2.4°W). The twin pilot-plant systems each have a total volume of 35 L and 3.09 m² of irradiated surface. The 22 L irradiated aqueous suspension inside the solar collectors is recirculated through the system by a pump connected to a holding tank. A schematic of the experimental set-up can be found elsewhere [24]. At the beginning of the experiment, with collectors covered, all the chemicals and the TiO₂/SiO₂ material are added to the tank and mixed until constant concentration is achieved throughout the system. Usually 15 minutes are enough to assure the complete mixture of the reactor volume and then the photodegradation reaction is begun by removing the collector cover.

Samples were taken at preset time intervals and filtered through Millex-GN 0.2 μm syringe filters prior to analysis. Mineralization of DCA was monitored by measuring the total organic carbon (TOC) concentration remaining in the clear solution, using a Shimadzu 5050A TOC analyser calibrated with hydrogen potassium phthalate standard solutions. According to the accepted DCA photocatalytic degradation mechanism [11,16], TOC analysis provides information on the remaining amount of reagent due to the absence of any stable intermediates during the total mineralization process. In addition, chloride formation was measured by ion chromatography (IC) using a Dionex-600 (anions column IonPac AS14) with NaOH as the eluent. The mass balance between DCA degradation measured by TOC and the stoichiometric chloride formation detected by IC was achieved in all the experiments.

H₂O₂ concentration was monitored by iodometric titration, and dissolved iron concentration was determined by its colorimetric reaction with 1,10-phenanthroline after reduction of the iron(III) ions with ascorbic acid.

Solar ultraviolet radiation was measured by a global UV radiometer (KIPP & ZONEN, model CUV3) mounted on a south-facing platform tilted 37° (the same angle and orientation as the CPCs), which provides data in terms of incident $W_{UV} \cdot m^{-2}$, UV_G . As the irradiation conditions change during the experiments, to compare the results, the concentration profiles refer to the accumulated energy, $Q_{UV,n}$ (kJ·L⁻¹), calculated as follows:

$$Q_{UV,n} = Q_{UV,n-1} + \Delta t_n \cdot \overline{UV_{G,n}} \cdot \frac{A_{CPC}}{V_{TOT}} \quad (1)$$

where, t_n is the experimental time for each sample, $\overline{UV_{G,n}}$ is the average UV_G during Δt_n , A_{CPC} is the collector surface (3.09 m²) and V_{TOT} is the total plant volume (35 L).

A multivariate analysis of the influence of iron, TiO₂ and H₂O₂ concentrations on the photodegradation rate has been carried out, following a statistical approach based on a factorial design of experiments. It consisted of i) 8 experiments carried out at the -1/+1 levels of the three variables, ii) 3 experiments at the centre point of the experimental domain (level 0 of the 3 factors) to determine the experimental error and check the linearity of results, and iii) 6 experiments at the so-called *star points* where two variables are at the centre value and the third is set at two additional levels (-1.68/+1.68) above and below the maximum and minimum of the factorial design. These points are located on the axes of the coded variables at the same distance from the centre point as the factorial design experiments, defining a spherical experimental domain in which the same experimental error can be assumed. Table 1 summarizes the values and levels of the variables used to find a quadratic model by the response surface methodology [25]. Notice that the values of the factors were chosen in such a way that pure (Fe/H₂O₂), (Fe/TiO₂) and (TiO₂/H₂O₂) experiments were conducted at three of the star points.

Table 1. Experimental factor values and code levels.

Factor	Code level				
	-1.68	-1	0	+1	+1.68
F1: TiO ₂ concentration (g·L ⁻¹)	0.0	0.06	0.15	0.24	0.30
F2: H ₂ O ₂ concentration (g·L ⁻¹)	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.8	1.0
F3: Iron concentration (mg·L ⁻¹)	0.0	0.6	1.5	2.4	3.0

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 shows an example of the typical concentration profiles for total organic carbon (TOC), chloride and hydrogen peroxide versus incident energy accumulated in the system, $Q_{UV,n}$. Linear dependencies were found in all experiments, so the reaction rate can be described by fitting the experimental data to a zero order linear kinetics model.





Figure 1. Example of zero-order kinetics fit of hydrogen peroxide consumption and DCA photodegradation measured by TOC disappearance and chloride formation.

Disappearance of DCA derived from the chloride formation profiles agrees with the values calculated from TOC evolution, indicating no significant disappearance of DCA due to adsorption and that the material balance is closed without the participation of any organic intermediates. Degradation therefore seems to take place through one of the following overall reactions, depending on the oxidizing species present in the medium:





Stoichiometric consumption of 2 mol of hydrogen peroxide per mol of DCA is derived from Reaction (2). This yields a value of $340 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ as the stoichiometric H_2O_2 required for total mineralisation of the $5 \text{ mmol}_{\text{DCA}}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ solution. Figure 1 shows that the actual consumption rate of H_2O_2 could be much higher than that of DCA degradation. Consequently, the ratio of the depletion rates of the two reactants is also of economic importance in evaluating reaction performance.

Table 2 shows the calculated DCA degradation rates and hydrogen peroxide consumption expressed in terms of $\text{mol}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$ per mol_{DCA} . Although experiments are listed in a logical order to facilitate discussion, they were carried out in a random sequence to increase the statistical significance and avoid systematic errors.

Table 2. Experimental results and DCA photodegradation rates predicted by the model .

Experiment		Variable levels			$r_{\text{DCA}} \cdot 10^6$ (mol _{DCA} ·kJ ⁻¹)			$r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}/r_{\text{DCA}}$ (mol _{H2O2} /mol _{DCA})		
Number	Code	[TiO ₂] (g·L ⁻¹)	[H ₂ O ₂] (g·L ⁻¹)	[Fe] (mg·L ⁻¹)	Experi- mental	Model Prediction	Residue	Experi- mental	Model Prediction	Residue
1	-1/-1/-1	0.06	0.2	0.6	52.7	47.7	-4.9	2.74	3.14	0.39
2	+1/-1/-1	0.24	0.2	0.6	47.9	46.0	-1.9	3.81	4.03	0.22
3	-1/+1/-1	0.06	0.8	0.6	61.7	58.3	-3.5	6.52	7.25	0.73
4	+1/+1/-1	0.24	0.8	0.6	41.5	43.1	1.5	10.4	10.8	0.43
5	-1/-1/+1	0.06	0.2	2.4	80.6	79.4	-1.2	2.42	2.41	-0.01
6	+1/-1/+1	0.24	0.2	2.4	82.3	86.1	3.7	4.12	3.31	-0.81
7	-1/+1/+1	0.06	0.8	2.4	87.8	89.9	2.2	6.56	6.52	-0.04
8	+1/+1/+1	0.24	0.8	2.4	77.2	83.1	5.9	9.80	10.11	0.31
9	0 / 0 / 0	0.15	0.5	1.5	74.0	74.3	0.3	5.32	5.73	0.41
10	0 / 0 / 0	0.15	0.5	1.5	73.6	74.3	0.7	5.98	5.73	-0.25
11	0 / 0 / 0	0.15	0.5	1.5	74.8	74.3	-0.5	6.35	5.73	-0.63
12	-α / 0 / 0	0.00	0.5	1.5	73.6	77.9	4.3	3.88	3.85	-0.02
13	+α / 0 / 0	0.30	0.5	1.5	76.8	70.7	-6.0	7.46	7.61	0.15
14	0 / -α / 0	0.15	0.0	1.5	68.0	71.1	3.1	0.00	0.27	0.27
15	0 / +α / 0	0.15	1.0	1.5	80.7	77.5	-3.2	10.1	9.44	-0.71
16	0 / 0 / -α	0.15	0.5	0.0	17.8	23.3	5.5	8.73	7.81	-0.92
17	0 / 0 / +α	0.15	0.5	3.0	89.0	83.0	-6.1	6.14	6.62	0.47
					$\chi^2 =$		240.2	$\chi^2 =$		3.97

Analysis of the experimental DCA photodegradation rates followed the steps below, as described previously [22]:

i) The two-level factorial design consisting of Experiments 1 to 8 and the three replications of the centre point were done first. The estimated experimental error calculated from the standard deviation of these three replications and the Student's test parameter for a 95% confidence level and two degrees of freedom is $0.090 \text{ mol}_{\text{DCA}} \text{ kJ}^{-1}$. With an average of $4.45 \text{ mol}_{\text{DCA}} \text{ kJ}^{-1}$ for the centre point experiments, the relative error is only 2%, certainly low for pilot-plant scale.

ii) Second, model linearity is verified by calculating the curve as the difference between the average of the 8 experiments of the factorial design and the average of the centre points. This was found to be 0.458 ± 0.11 , which means there is a significant curve (above the corresponding error), so further experiments were conducted (Experiments 12 to 17) to include quadratic terms in the response surface equation.

iii) Finally, a multiple linear regression was used to fit the experimental results to a 10-parameter model including the 3 effects of every variable, the 3 binary interactions, the 3 quadratic effects and an offset, neglecting the possible influence of XY^2 -type and ternary interactions. The most significant effects were identified in the first fit, removing those with coefficients below the corresponding error. The reduction in the number of parameters makes the mathematical model more plausible, which can be quantitatively assessed using the Fisher value as derived from the ANOVA.

The final mathematical model that best fits the experimental response of the reaction rate of DCA solar photodegradation as a function of the concentration of TiO_2 , iron and H_2O_2 is:

$$r_{\text{DCA}} \cdot 10^6 (\text{mol}_{\text{DCA}} \cdot \text{kJ}^{-1}) = 20.1 + 25.1 \cdot [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] + 44.2 \cdot [\text{Fe}] - 124.96 \cdot [\text{TiO}_2] \cdot [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] + 25.86 \cdot [\text{TiO}_2] \cdot [\text{Fe}] - 9.39 \cdot [\text{Fe}]^2 \quad (4)$$

Correlation coefficient: $r^2 = 0.9568$

Sum of quadratic residuals: $\chi^2 = 240.2$

F value (from ANOVA): $F = 48.74$

Response variable error: $r_{\text{DCA error}} = 4.67 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ mol}_{\text{DCA}} \cdot \text{kJ}^{-1}$

Similarly, for the hydrogen peroxide consumption, the following mathematical model was obtained:

$$r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / r_{\text{DCA}} (\text{mol}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / \text{mol}_{\text{DCA}}) = 2.41 + 8.79 \cdot [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] - 2.38 \cdot [\text{Fe}] + 25.0 \cdot [\text{TiO}_2] \cdot [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] - 3.43 \cdot [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]^2 + 0.657 \cdot [\text{Fe}]^2 \quad (5)$$

Correlation coefficient:	$r^2 = 0.9703$
Sum of quadratic residuals:	$\chi^2 = 3.97$
F value (from ANOVA):	$F = 71.96$
Response variable error:	$r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / r_{\text{DCA}} \text{ error} = 0.60 \text{ mol}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / \text{mol}_{\text{DCA}}$

Table 2 gives the predicted DCA photodegradation rate and hydrogen peroxide consumption. To be sure that the response errors calculated for the models are statistically significant throughout the experimental domain, random distribution of residues must be verified and any systematic errors discarded. From the graphical analysis of the residuals after fitting (not shown), no tendency is observed in either the correlation of calculated and experimental values or any of the three variables studied. Consequently, polynomial expressions can be used to model the response surface well enough, and there is no need for variable transformation (e.g., logarithmic of the response), as when modelling the influence of variables causing differences of more than one order of magnitude in the experimental response [22].

Figures 2, 3 and 4 show the three dimensional plots of both response surfaces at constant factor values. The spherical experimental domain defined by the factorial design has been projected over the surface marking the area in which the model could be properly applied and the area outside the projected circles in which the model has been extrapolated.




Figure 2. 3-D graphical representation of the response surfaces of DCA reaction rate and H_2O_2 consumption at the TiO_2 concentration -1, 0 and +1 code levels. ● represents the experimental points. The curve over the 3-D surface is the projection of the experimental domain in which the model could be applied.




Figure 3. 3-D graphical representation of the response surfaces of DCA reaction rate and H_2O_2 consumption at the H_2O_2 concentration -1, 0 and +1 code levels. ● represents the experimental points. The curve over the 3-D surface is the projection of the experimental domain in which the model could be applied.




Figure 4. 3-D graphical representation of the response surfaces of DCA reaction rate and H_2O_2 consumption at the iron concentration -1, 0 and +1 code levels. ● represents the experimental points. The curve over the 3-D surface is the projection of the experimental domain in which the model could be applied.

Prior to any mechanistic discussion of the response surfaces, some general considerations about the $\text{TiO}_2/\text{Fe}/\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ photochemical system chemistry should be analyzed. The combination of TiO_2 photocatalysis and photo-assisted Fenton reaction significantly increases the number of homogeneous and heterogeneous catalytic reactions that take place in the reactor. In addition to the reactions of the two degradation mechanisms considered separately, the presence of TiO_2 provides a pathway for ferric iron reduction supplementing the light-activated reaction, which can boost the Fenton cycle and, thereby, hydroxyl radical generation [26,27]. On the other hand, the presence of ferric ions can improve charge separation on the TiO_2 surface by capturing the conduction band electron, stabilizing the valence band hole, and reducing the recombination rate [26]. Consequently, TiO_2/Fe combination could produce a synergistic effect, increasing the activity of both TiO_2 and Fenton hydroxyl radical generation mechanisms. A detailed analysis of the chemistry of the $\text{TiO}_2/\text{Fe}/\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{UV}$ system can be found elsewhere [22].

In view of the analysis in Figures 2 to 4, it may be said that the iron concentration is the most influential DCA degradation rate factor. r_{DCA} increases with higher $[\text{Fe}]$ significantly more than with $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$ and $[\text{TiO}_2]$. Consequently, the overall degradation process seems to be controlled by the iron mechanism. The oxidation / reduction cycle can take place not only in the homogeneous phase but also on adsorbed iron. Heterogeneous processes could also be produced over iron hydroxides and oxides precipitated at higher pH, but usually at lower reaction rates [28]. Iron measurements confirmed that, in all the experiments, soluble species are mainly present as expected at the measured pH (1.9 to 2.4). Solution pH showed progressive acidification during irradiation as the reaction took place, due to the formation of HCl as a product of mineralization. This low pH is close to the optimum range for photo-Fenton. TiO_2 photocatalytic degradation of DCA has also been shown to be optimum at acidic pH values in the range in which DCA is dissociated ($\text{pK}_a = 1.29$) [20] and TiO_2 is positively charged ($\text{pH}_{\text{ZPC}} = 5.5 - 7.0$ [29]). Moreover, close to $\text{pH} = 2$, as is the case in this study, interaction with the silica support is also favored, as it could even be below the zero-charge point of silica ($\text{pH}_{\text{ZPC}} = 2.0 - 4.0$ [29]).

Figure 2 shows that at the lowest $[\text{TiO}_2]$, the reaction rate seems to increase with higher $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$, whereas at the highest $[\text{TiO}_2]$, the degradation rate is observed to decrease with increasing $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$. Similarly, from the plots in Figure 3, it may be concluded that an increase in titania concentration decreases r_{DCA} much more as the concentration of hydrogen peroxide

increases. This antagonistic effect between $[\text{TiO}_2]$ and $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$ is confirmed in Figure 4, where it is clearly shown that at a constant iron concentration, the higher degradation rates are obtained at the maximum $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$ but minimum $[\text{TiO}_2]$, and at the maximum $[\text{TiO}_2]$ and minimum $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$. The combination of high concentrations of both factors leads to results similar to when both of them are at their lowest levels. This negative effect can also be observed in Eq. (4), the mathematical expression of the response surface, where the product of both factors shows a negative coefficient with a high absolute value. From a mechanistic viewpoint, this negative interaction could be due to modification of the TiO_2 surface by the reaction with peroxide, or to more scavenging of hydroxyl radicals formed from the valence band holes than conduction band electrons, as previously suggested for pure $\text{TiO}_2/\text{UV}/\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ systems [30,31]. H_2O_2 has two functions in the photocatalytic oxidation process. It accepts photogenerated electrons from the conduction band of the semiconductor, thus promoting charge separation, and it also forms OH radicals. As H_2O_2 is a better electron acceptor than Fe^{3+} , when H_2O_2 is at high concentration it impedes the reduction of Fe^{3+} by the photogenerated electrons of TiO_2 . Under these circumstances the unique way of reducing Fe^{3+} is by solar photons. But if we increase at the same time the concentration of TiO_2 , we are impeding the correct illumination of Fe^{3+} . Therefore, at high TiO_2 and H_2O_2 concentrations, the extension of the photo-Fenton mechanism is limited producing a decrease in the overall reaction rate. Moreover, when there is an excess of H_2O_2 , it may react with TiO_2 , and form peroxy compounds, which would also reduce the extension of the semiconductor mediated photocatalytic mechanism [32].

The factor that most influences the $r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / r_{\text{DCA}}$ ratio is the initial concentration of H_2O_2 itself. From Figures 2 and 4 it may be seen that at constant titanium dioxide and iron concentrations, the increase in hydrogen peroxide leads to H_2O_2 consumption several times higher than the stoichiometric amount for mineralization according to Reaction (2). Figure 4 also shows that a significant increase in the $r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / r_{\text{DCA}}$ ratio is observed when the TiO_2 concentration is increased at high $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$, confirming a waste of H_2O_2 in unproductive reactions with TiO_2 as mentioned above. As H_2O_2 is a reagent (and not a catalyst like Fe and TiO_2), the only important point to be considered is that its concentration is high enough so as not to limit the reaction. In this context, we propose automatic dosing in an attempt to keep it at a predefined concentration in order to maximize the reaction rate. On the other hand, it seems that efficient use of hydrogen peroxide is only slightly affected by the iron concentration. The $r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / r_{\text{DCA}}$ ratio is at a minimum at intermediate iron concentrations, and variation is not very significant.

Finally, the unexpected, almost negligible influence of hydrogen peroxide concentration on the DCA photodegradation rate is worth mentioning. With Fe/TiO₂ in the total absence of H₂O₂ (Experiment 14), r_{DCA} was only 16% lower than with 1.0 g L⁻¹ of H₂O₂ (Experiment 15). These results suggest that hydrogen-peroxide-mediated degradation is not always what is mainly responsible for the disappearance of DCA in all cases. It might therefore be concluded that the main mechanism governing photodegradation is neither heterogeneous TiO₂ photocatalysis nor pure photoassisted Fenton (Fe/H₂O₂) alone, but the Fe/TiO₂ combination. Měšťánková et al. [26] have reported that a very positive effect is achieved by adding iron to a TiO₂ photocatalytic process, especially at very low pH, such as in DCA degradation. A detailed explanation of the photochemical cycle of the combined iron-TiO₂ system can be found in their work. In fact, from an analysis of Eq. (4), it may be inferred that the effect of TiO₂ on the DCA degradation rate is not simple, but involves a negative interaction with H₂O₂ and a positive interaction with iron.

Summarising, results show that iron concentration controls the kinetics observed in the solar photodegradation of DCA even at concentrations as low as 1 mg·L⁻¹. When titanium dioxide is present at low concentrations, the photo-assisted Fenton degradation pathway seems to drive the process. However, when titania concentration increases, instead of the global reaction rate increasing due to the above-mentioned synergistic effect, it seems to produce a small decrease in r_{DCA} . The reason is that a large part of the H₂O₂ is consumed in unproductive reactions with TiO₂, so that the mechanism responsible for degradation seems to be the photochemical iron-TiO₂ cycle proposed by Měšťánková et al. [26]. TiO₂ has the advantage of being a catalytic material that can be recovered and reused, in contrast to the expense associated with H₂O₂ consumption. On the other hand, TiO₂ usually causes more mechanical problems in the system due to abrasion, and requires further treatment of the water after the reaction for the separation of solids.

Pilot-plant performance optimization must therefore consider system economics. On one hand, a high degradation rate is desirable to reduce the costs of investment amortization, energy and labour. On the other hand, hydrogen peroxide consumption, as the major chemical cost, must be kept as low as possible. The cost of iron may be considered negligible (below 5 10⁻⁶ €·mg⁻¹ from FeSO₄·7H₂O), and also the cost of TiO₂, as above 98% of it may be reused. A cost function for the optimization procedure may therefore be defined as follows:

$$\text{Cost} (\text{€} \cdot \text{mol}_{\text{DCA}}^{-1}) = C_{\text{time}} (\text{€} \cdot \text{kJ}^{-1}) \cdot (1 / r_{\text{DCA}}) + C_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} (\text{€} \cdot \text{mol}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}^{-1}) \cdot (r_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} / r_{\text{DCA}}) \quad (6)$$

A price of $C_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} = 0.0453 \text{ € mol}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}^{-1}$ has been considered, taking a reference price of 0.4 € L^{-1} of commercial H_2O_2 30wt%. $C_{\text{time}} = 2.02 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ € kJ}^{-1}$ is the estimated cost of operating time, considering an average annual irradiation of 18.8 W m^{-2} (from historical data recorded at the Plataforma Solar de Almeria) and a cost of 600 € m^{-2} of solar collectors estimated from previous experience in scaling-up photocatalytic pilot plants to medium-sized plants 100-500 m^2 , assuming 4380 h yr^{-1} and a 10-year amortization.

Application of the Newton optimizing algorithm to Eq. (6) in this experimental domain leads to the following values of the factors for which the lowest treatment cost is found:

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{TiO}_2] &= 0.210 \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \quad (\text{codified level: } 0.66) \\ [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] &= 0.122 \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \quad (\text{codified level: } -1.26) \\ [\text{Fe}] &= 2.30 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \quad (\text{codified level: } 0.89) \\ \text{Estimated cost: } &2.49 \text{ €} \cdot \text{mol}_{\text{DCA}}^{-1} \quad (19.3 \text{ €} \cdot \text{kg}_{\text{DCA}}^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Figure 5 shows the contour plots (curves of equal values on the response surface) at constant factor values corresponding to the point of minimum-cost operation. It can be seen that this point does not correspond to an absolute minimum. The extrapolation of the model predicts that a lower treatment cost can be achieved at higher concentrations of iron and titanium dioxide, and also by removing the titanium dioxide and using high concentrations of hydrogen peroxide. It is worth mentioning that the estimated cost associated with $\text{Fe}/\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ treatment without TiO_2 is only slightly higher than Fe/TiO_2 without H_2O_2 . The reason is that hydrogen peroxide only accounts for less than 4% of the estimated total cost, the amortization of the investment being the main factor. In any case, the goal of this work was not an accurate economic evaluation of the plant, but the identification of the main factors determining the cost of the treatment. Among the two factors considered, reagent and investment cost, the latter is by far the more important. This paper also shows how response surface methodology (RSM) can be applied to an approximate economic analysis based on process performance indicators (kinetics and reagent consumption as a function of process parameters). For a more rigorous analysis, accurate economic data, which are strongly dependent on the specific pilot plant and wastewater, are required.




Figure 5. Response surface contour plots for every factor at the optimal operating conditions. The circle represents the projection of the experimental domain in which the model could be applied.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The activity of the combined TiO₂/photo-Fenton photocatalytic system at strongly acidic conditions is controlled by the iron concentration even at concentrations below 3.0 mg Fe L⁻¹. The potential synergistic effect of TiO₂ and iron degradation pathways is overcome by an antagonistic effect between hydrogen peroxide and TiO₂ that reduces the activity of the combined system. At acidic pH values with low concentrations of titania, degradation is controlled by the photo-Fenton mechanism, whereas a photochemical Fe/TiO₂ cycle leads to similar activity at higher TiO₂ concentrations in the absence of H₂O₂. These conditions seem to be of more economic interest, as TiO₂ can be recovered and reused, whereas the consumption of hydrogen peroxide is irreversible. Consequently, economic optimization of pilot-plant performance must take into account not only the conditions under which the reaction rate is highest, but also the lowest consumption of H₂O₂. A brief analysis of reagent and investment (depending on process kinetics) costs showed that in this case study the investment costs by far prevail over reagent costs. Hence, optimisation of process kinetics is of higher priority than optimising reagent consumption.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support for this work was provided by the Spanish “Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología” through the Project PPQ2003-3984 and “Comunidad de Madrid” through Program S-0505/AMB/0395 “Red Madrileña de Tratamientos Avanzados para Aguas Residuales con Contaminantes No Biodegradables (REMTAVARES)”. Thanks are due to the whole Solar Chemistry Team at the Plataforma Solar de Almería for their help during the experiments.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Legrini, E. Oliveros and A.M. Braun, *Chem. Rev.*, 93 (1993) 671.
- [2] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Handbook of Advanced Photochemical Oxidation Processes*, EPA/625/R-98/004, 1998.
- [3] S. Parsons (Editor), *Advanced Oxidation Processes for Water and Wastewater Treatment*, IWA Publishing, 2004.
- [4] I. Muñoz, J. Rieradevall, F. Torrades, J. Peral and X. Doménech, *Solar Energy*, 79 (2005) 369.
- [5] S. Malato, J. Blanco, J. Cáceres, A.R. Fernández-Alba, A. Agüera and A. Rodríguez, *Catal. Today*, 76 (2002) 209.
- [6] I.K. Konstantinou and T.A. Albanis, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.*, 42 (2003) 319.
- [7] M. Pera-Titus, V. García-Molina, M.A. Baños, J. Giménez and S. Esplugas, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.*, 47 (2004) 219.
- [8] P.R. Gogate and A.B. Pandit, *Adv. Environ. Res.*, 8 (2004) 501.
- [9] P.R. Gogate and A.B. Pandit, *Adv. Environ. Res.*, 8 (2004) 553.
- [10] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Toxicological review of dichloroacetic acid*, EPA 635/R-03/007, 2003.
- [11] D.F. Ollis, C.Y. Hsiao, L. Budiman and C.L. Lee, *J. Catal.*, 88 (1984) 89.
- [12] S.T. Martin, C.L. Morrison and M.R. Hoffmann, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 98 (1994) 13695.
- [13] S. Malato, J. Blanco, A. Campos, J. Cáceres, C. Guillard, J.M. Herrmann and A.R. Fernández-Alba, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.*, 42 (2003) 349.

- [14] R.F.P. Nogueira, A.G. Trovó and W.C. Paterlini, *Water Sci. Technol.*, 49 (2004) 195.
- [15] C.S. Zalazar, R.L. Romero, C.A. Martín and A.E. Cassano, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 60 (2005) 5240.
- [16] D.W. Bahnemann, S.N. Kholuiskaya, R. Dillert, A.I. Kulak and A.I. Kokorin, *Appl. Catal. B :Environ.*, 36 (2002) 161.
- [17] S. Sakthivel, M.C. Hidalgo, D.W. Bahnemann, S.-U. Geissen, V. Murugesan and A. Vogelpohl, *Appl. Catal. B:Environ.*, 63 (2006) 31.
- [18] R. Enriquez, B. Beaugiraud and P. Pichat, *Water Sci. Technol.*, 49 (2004) 147.
- [19] T.E. Doll and F.H. Frimmel, *Acta Hydrochim. Hydrobiol.*, 32 (2004) 201.
- [20] J. Marugán, D. Hufschmidt, G. Sagawe, V. Selzer and D. Bahnemann, *Water Res.*, 40 (2006) 833.
- [21] J. Aguado, R. van Grieken, M.J. López-Muñoz and J. Marugán, *Catal. Today*, 75 (2002) 95.
- [22] J. Marugán, M.J. López-Muñoz, W. Gernjak and S. Malato, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 45 (2006) 8900.
- [23] R. van Grieken, J. Aguado, M.J. López-Muñoz and J. Marugán, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.*, 148 (2002) 315.
- [24] M. Kositzki, I. Poullos, S. Malato, J. Cáceres and A. Campos, *Water Res.* 38 (2004) 1147.
- [25] G.E.P. Box, W.G. Hunter and J.S. Hunter, *Statistics for experimenters: An Introduction to Design, Data Analysis, and Model Building*, Wiley, 1978.

- [26] H. Měšťánková, G. Mailhot, J. Jirkovský, J. Krýsa, J. and M. Bolte, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.*, 57 (2005) 257.
- [27] J. Araña, O. González Díaz, M. Miranda Saracho, J.M. Doña Rodríguez, J.A. Herrera Melián and J. Pérez Peña, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.*, 36 (2002) 113.
- [28] W. Feng and D. Nansheng, *Chemosphere*, 41 (2000) 1137.
- [29] K. Bourikas, C. Kordulis and A. Lycourghiotis, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 39 (2005) 4100.
- [30] P. Pichat, C. Guillard, L. Amalric, A.-C. Renard and O. Plaidy, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 38 (1995) 391.
- [31] D.D. Dionysiou, M.T. Suidan, I. Baudin and J.-M. Lâiné, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.*, 50 (2004) 259.
- [32] E.J. Wolfrum and D.F. Ollis, *Hydrogen Peroxide in Heterogeneous Photocatalysis*. in G. Helz, R. Zepp and D. Crosby (Editors). *Aquatic and Surface Photochemistry*, Lewis Publs., CRC Press, 1994, p. 451-65.