

**Humic acids adsorption and decomposition on Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles
in aqueous suspensions in the presence of ozone**

Julia S. Salla¹, Natan Padoin¹, Suélen M. Amorim¹, Gianluca Li Puma² and Regina F. P.
M. Moreira^{*1}

- $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanocatalyst is better than Mn_2O_3 and exhibit a high humic acid removal.
- $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanocatalyst remove humic acid using lower ozone dosage than common catalysts.
- Adsorption of humic acid contributes to its catalytic ozonation.
- Mn_2O_3 decomposes O_3 faster than $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$.

**Humic acids adsorption and decomposition on Mn₂O₃ and α-Al₂O₃ nanoparticles
in aqueous suspensions in the presence of ozone**

Julia S. Salla¹, Natan Padoin¹, Suélen M. Amorim¹, Gianluca Li Puma² and Regina F. P. M. Moreira^{*1}

¹Department of Chemical and Food Engineering, Federal University of Santa Catarina, 88040-900,
Florianópolis, SC, Brazil.

²Environmental Nanocatalysis & Photoreaction Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering,
Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom

***Corresponding author: Regina de Fatima Peralta Muniz Moreira**

E-mail: regina.moreira@ufsc.br

Tel.: +55-48-3721-2536

Fax: +55-48-3721-9687

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract – The removal and decomposition of humic acids (HAs) in the presence of ozone and aqueous suspensions of Mn₂O₃ and α-alumina (Al₂O₃) nanoparticles was investigated. Mn₂O₃ presented lower BET specific surface area (15.6 m² g⁻¹ vs 45.8 m² g⁻¹) but a higher point of zero charge (PZC) (5.9 vs 4.2) than α-Al₂O₃. Solution pH played a key role in the adsorption of HAs and catalytic oxidation on the surface of α-Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles. The adsorption capacity of α-Al₂O₃ at the natural pH of HAs in water (pH 5.5) was up to 2.903 g_{HAs} g⁻¹, but no adsorption occurred onto the Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles, due to the unfavorable surface charge at pH 5.5. In consequence, although Mn₂O₃ was a more efficient catalyst ($k_{het} = 0.7 \text{ L}^{-1} \text{ min}^{-1} \text{ g}^{-1}$) than α-Al₂O₃ ($k_{het} = 0.2 \text{ L}^{-1} \text{ min}^{-1} \text{ g}^{-1}$) for the decomposition of O₃, Mn₂O₃ did not exhibited catalytic action during the ozonation of HAs at pH 5.5. Instead, the Mn₂O₃ catalytic action was significant at pH equal to PZC (catalytic rate constant ratio $k_{1-HAcat} / k_{1-HA} = 1.562$). Overall, α-Al₂O₃ exhibited the highest catalytic removal rate of HAs during ozonation ($k_{1-HAcat} / k_{1-HA} = 2.298$) due to favorable surface charge and larger specific surface area. The main mechanism for HAs removal in the presence of α-Al₂O₃ involves simultaneous adsorption of both HAs and O₃, the reaction of ozone from the bulk solution and the catalytic decomposition of HAs on the solid surface by ROS, through complex series-parallel reactions. The α-Al₂O₃ dosage up to 0.5 g L⁻¹ required to remove HAs by catalytic ozonation was significantly lower than in other studies employing granular activated carbon, iron coated zeolite or γ-alumina catalysts.

Keywords: Ozonation; adsorption, manganese oxide, aluminum oxide, humic acid.

1. Introduction

The removal of natural organic matter (NOM) is one of the main goals in drinking water treatment, since NOM can lead to undesirable color, taste and odor, as well as bacterial regrowth in water distribution systems. In aqueous solution, NOM is a complex mixture of heterogeneous organic compounds with different molecular sizes, structures and functionalities. Approximately 80% of NOM comprises humic acids (HAs) with high molecular weight [1,2]. Since NOM can react with the most common disinfection agents used in water treatment (e.g. chlorine, chlorine dioxide or chloramines) to yield hazardous disinfection byproducts, such as N-nitrosodimethylamine [3] or trihalomethane [4], NOM must be removed prior to water disinfection. In general, the effectiveness of common oxidants on the destruction of the byproducts generated from NOM in drinking water treatment follows the order: ozone (O_3) > chlorine > chlorine dioxide ~ UV [3].

Ozonation is considered an effective technology for the treatment of water for public supply, wastewater and industrial effluents, due to its high capacity for oxidation, removal of color and odor and disinfection from pathogens [5]. The ozonation of HAs causes several structural modifications, which contribute to the removal of color and the reduction of absorption of visible light. Ozonation also decreases the total organic carbon (TOC) of the water, the content of high molecular weight compounds and results in an increase in the oxygenated organic molecules [6].

Although the ozonation of water at circumneutral and alkaline pH generates hydroxyl radicals ($\cdot OH$), which is a highly reactive and nonselective oxidant, other radical oxygen species (ROS) can also be generated through the combinations of ozone with catalysts, with UV radiation or with other oxidants such H_2O_2 [7]. Ozonation at acidic pH, generally, is not an efficient process for the complete removal of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

dissolved organic matter, due to the selective nature of ozonation reactions towards electron rich polar compounds, and as a result of the low solubility of ozone in water [8].

A more efficient water treatment process is catalytic ozonation, which has successfully been applied for the degradation of aqueous organic compounds, such as aromatic hydrocarbons, organic acids, pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and dyes [8,9]. A wide range of materials have been used as catalysts, notably activated carbon [2,10], Al₂O₃ [9,11,12], manganese oxides [13] and other metallic oxides [2,14–18]. However, due to the generally low levels of catalytic activity of these materials, high catalyst doses are often required (up to 10 g L⁻¹) [2,9,14], in order to effectively treat the water. The use of such very high catalyst concentrations in industrial scale water treatment is often uneconomical. Among the catalysts used for the decomposition of ozone, manganese and aluminum oxides are of interest due to their generally low cost, abundance, low toxicity and high catalytic activity when applied in combination with other oxidative processes [19]. However, contradictory results have been reported regarding the mechanism of chemical decomposition of ozone on these catalysts [2,9,11,18,20–23], the rate of production of hydroxyl radicals [24–26], the role of the adsorption of pollutants onto their surface [9], and the effect of alkaline impurities present on the catalyst surface [18]. The false catalytic activity of alumina has been ascribed to the presence of impurities which increase the pH of the water [18]. In addition, the role played by rate of adsorption of the water contaminants in catalytic ozonation is rarely discussed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In this study, the catalytic role played by Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles in aqueous suspensions is investigated for the removal of HAs, in the presence and in the absence of ozone. HAs were selected as representative species of the NOM in drinking water supplies. The roles played by adsorption, ozone decomposition, attack of ozone from the bulk solution and catalytic decomposition on the solid surface, on the kinetics of humic acids removal is examined, and clear evidence of the catalytic effect exerted by the $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles is demonstrated.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials

The commercial sample of humic acids (HAs) used in all experiments was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (CAS 1415-93-6). Homogeneous aqueous stock solutions were prepared by adding 200 mg of HAs to 1.0 L of distilled deionized water, following by ultrasonic sonication (60 min).

The Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles with average particle diameter of 40-60 nm were obtained from SkySpring Nanomaterials (USA). All other chemicals were of analytical grade and used without further purification.

2.2. Characterization of catalysts

The specific surface area, pore diameter distribution and pore volume of the catalysts ($\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ and Mn_2O_3) were determined using a Quantachrome Autosorb-3b BET surface area analyzer at -196°C . Prior to the analysis, the samples were degassed for 2 h at 300°C under vacuum. The point of zero charge (pH_{pzc}) of the Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles was obtained by measurements of the zeta potential at different pH values (3.0-11.0) performed on a Stabino-Nanoflex analyzer.

1 The composition of the solids before and after the kinetic runs was determined
2 through FTIR analysis using an Agilent Technologies spectrophotometer (model Cary
3 600). The particle size and morphology of the nanoparticles were examined by field
4 emission gun scanning electron microscopy (FEG-SEM) and by transmission electron
5 microscopy (TEM). SEM and TEM analyses were performed using JEOL JSM-6701F
6 and JEOL JEM-1011 microscopes, respectively. The crystallographic composition of
7 the nanoparticles was examined by X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis, carried out on a
8 Philips X-Pert diffractometer, with a scan of $0.038^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ and Cu $K\alpha$ radiation. The
9 oxidation state and surface composition of the nanoparticles were assessed through X-
10 ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) analysis of the samples before and after the
11 kinetic runs. The XPS analysis of the nanoparticles was performed using a hemispheric
12 VSW HA-100 analyzer.

23 **2.3. Experimental setup**

24 *2.3.1 Humic acids adsorption onto Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles in absence of* 25 *ozone*

26 The adsorption of humic acids onto the nanoparticles (Mn_2O_3 or $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$) was
27 determined through experiments performed at room temperature (25°C). Known
28 amounts of nanoparticles (25 - 250 mg) were added to flasks containing 250 mL of an
29 aqueous solutions of HAs with a fixed initial concentration of 50 mg L^{-1} . The pH of the
30 aqueous suspension, measured with a Quimis Q 400A pH meter, was maintained at 5.5
31 in all experimental runs.

32 Aliquots of the liquid phase, withdrawn at various contact times, were filtered
33 and analyzed by spectrophotometry (Shimadzu, UV-Vis 1650PC) at 254 nm to
34 determine the residual concentration of HAs. The concentration of HAs was determined

1 from a calibration curve made in the spectrophotometer with different HA solutions.
2 The concentration of HAs in the aqueous phase reached an equilibrium after
3 approximately 60 min of contact time and the amount of HAs adsorbed onto the solid
4 phase was calculated from the mass balance (Eq. 1).
5
6
7
8
9

$$10 \quad q_e = \frac{V(C_0 - C_e)}{w} \quad (1)$$

11 where C_0 and C_e ($\text{mg}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$) are the HAs initial and equilibrium concentrations,
12 respectively, V is the solution volume (L) and w is the amount of catalyst (g) added to
13 the system. Langmuir and Freundlich isotherms (Eqs. 2 and 3, respectively) were fitted
14 to the experimental data to model the adsorption process:
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

$$25 \quad q_e = \frac{q_m b C_e}{1 + b C_e} \quad (2)$$

$$26 \quad q_e = k C_e^{1/n} \quad (3)$$

27 where q_m is the maximum humic acids loading (complete monolayer covering), b is the
28 equilibrium adsorption constant and k and n are constants related to the capacity and
29 intensity of adsorption.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 2.3.2 Ozone dissolution and decomposition in water

43 The ozonation experiments were carried out in a 2.0 L glass reactor (68 cm high
44 and 8 cm in diameter) kept at ambient temperature and constant stirring (~500 rpm).
45 Ozone generated from high purity oxygen by a corona discharge ozonator ID-5 (O3R
46 Philozon) fitted with an oxygen concentrator was continuously bubbled in the vessel
47 through two air diffusers at a rate of $0.063 \text{ m}^3 \text{ h}^{-1}$. All the experiments were carried out
48 in duplicate and the average results were reported.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The rate of ozone mass transfer and steady state ozone concentration in the
2 reactor system, in the absence of Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha-Al_2O_3$, was investigated at different pH,
3 ranging from 4 to 7. Solutions of 0.1 mol L^{-1} NaOH or H_2SO_4 were used to adjust the
4 pH. The impact of the catalyst ($\alpha-Al_2O_3$ and Mn_2O_3) at low loadings (0.1 and 0.5 g L^{-1})
5 on the rate of decomposition of ozone was examined at pH 5.5, since this corresponded
6 with the natural pH of the humic acid aqueous solution. In a typical experiment, ozone
7 was bubbled into distilled water with or without nanoparticles until the medium reached
8 a steady-state ozone concentration. Samples withdrawn at regular time intervals were
9 analyzed spectrophotometrically at 258 nm in a Shimadzu UV-Vis 1650PC
10 spectrophotometer to determine the residual dissolved ozone concentration. The
11 concentration of dissolved ozone in water was determined from the Beer-Lambert law,
12 considering the molar extinction coefficient of ozone ($2950 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$ at 258 nm) [27].
13 The solid particles, when present, were removed from the samples by filtering through a
14 PVDF membrane (Millipore, $0.22 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ pore size) prior to the spectrophotometric
15 analyses.

16 The mass transfer and solubility parameters of ozone in the aqueous medium
17 were determined by fitting the solution of the mass balance equation of ozone
18 absorption and decomposition (Eq. 4) to the experimental data.

$$19 \frac{dC_{O_3}}{dt} = k_L a (C_{sat} - C_{O_3}) - k_{1-O_3} C_{O_3} \quad (4)$$

20 where C_{sat} (mg L^{-1}) is the saturation concentration of O_3 , C_{O_3} (mg L^{-1}) is the
21 concentration of dissolved O_3 , $k_L a$ (min^{-1}) is the volumetric mass transfer coefficient of
22 O_3 and k_{1-O_3} (min^{-1}) is the decomposition constant of O_3 given by Eq. 5 [28,29]:

$$23 k_{1-O_3} = k_d + w k_{het} \quad (5)$$

1 where w (g L^{-1}) is the catalyst concentration, k_{het} (min^{-1}) is the rate constant for the
2 catalytic decomposition of ozone, k_d (min^{-1}) is the rate constant for the non-catalytic
3 decomposition of ozone.
4
5

6
7 Different kinetic equations have been proposed to evaluate k_d (min^{-1}) [28,30,31].
8
9 Considering the range of applicability of the different equations, the k_d value was
10 estimated according to Sullivan and Roth [28,32] (Eq. 6), that is applicable in the region
11
12 $2 \leq \text{pH} \leq 8$ and $276.7 \leq T \leq 333.2 \text{ K}$:
13
14
15

$$16 \quad k_d = 9.811 \cdot 10^7 [\text{OH}^-]^{0.123} \exp \left[-\frac{5606}{T} \right] \quad (6)$$

17
18 where $[\text{OH}^-]$ is the concentration of hydroxyl ions and T is the temperature (K).
19
20
21

22 The model used in this study (Eq. 4 - 6) considers that ozone is absorbed in
23 water and simultaneously decomposes through reaction with the hydroxyl ions (non-
24 catalytic decomposition) and through reaction on the surface of the nanoparticles
25 (catalytic decomposition). Eq. (4) was discretized through the Euler's method and
26 implemented in Matlab[®] (MathWorks, The MathWorks Inc., MA) to determine the
27 model parameters. The value of each parameter was obtained by minimizing the error
28 between the model predictions and the experimental data.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 2.3.3 Humic acid removal in the presence or absence of ozone and/or catalyst

44
45 The kinetics of HAs removal, in the presence or absence of ozone and/or
46 catalyst, was investigated in the experimental setup described above using 1.0 L of an
47 aqueous solution of HAs (50 mg L^{-1}). The ozonation of HAs, in the absence of solid
48 nanoparticles, was investigated in the range $4.0 < \text{pH} < 10.0$, while in the presence of
49 Mn_2O_3 or $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles (0, 0.1 or 0.5 g L^{-1}) it was performed at pH 5.5, the
50 natural pH of HAs in water. The experiments were performed under vigorous stirring
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and continuous ozone bubbling. Aliquots of the liquid phase (3 mL) withdrawn at
2 regular time intervals were filtered and analyzed by UV/vis spectrophotometry.
3

4 A small amount (0.1 mL) of a solution of sodium sulfite (3 g L⁻¹) was added to
5 all aliquots immediately after sampling to suppress the residual dissolved ozone and
6 further chemical reactions. The decay of HAs over the time (*t*) was described according
7 to a pseudo-first order kinetic model (Eq. 7).
8
9
10
11
12
13

$$14 \quad -\ln \frac{[HA]}{[HA]_0} = k_1 t \quad (7)$$

15
16
17
18
19
20 The stability of the nanoparticles (α -Al₂O₃) was investigated by reusing the solid
21 in consecutive experiments performed under the same conditions. After every cycle, the
22 nanoparticles were removed by filtration through a PVDF membrane (Millipore, 0.22
23 μ m pore size) and dried at 60 °C for 24 h before reuse in the next experiment. A fresh
24 HAs solution was used in each cycle.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **3. Results and Discussion**

35 *3.1. Characterization of α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles*

36
37
38 The results of the textural characterization of the solids are presented in Table 1.
39 The specific surface areas, determined by the BET method, were typical of
40 nanomaterials [26,33]. Mn₂O₃ surface area and pore volume were significantly lower
41 than the values for α -Al₂O₃. The pore diameter distribution shown in Table 1 was
42 determined by the Barret, Joyner and Halenda (BJH) method [34]. According to IUPAC
43 classification, the average pore diameters of the nanoparticles were characteristic of
44 mesoporous materials [35].
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1 shows the N₂ adsorption/desorption isotherms of Mn₂O₃ and α-Al₂O₃ at 77 K. Clearly, the two curves were similar and no hysteresis was observed. Both isotherms were type III according to the IUPAC classification, indicating multilayer adsorption onto non-porous, macroporous or mesoporous materials [36].




Figure 1 – N₂ adsorption/desorption isotherms at 77K using (a) Mn₂O₃ and (b) Al₂O₃.

The values for the point of zero charge (PZC) of the Mn₂O₃ and Al₂O₃ nanoparticles are shown in Table 1 and Figure S-1. These represent the pH value where negative ([MO⁻]) and positive ([MOH₂⁺]) surface concentrations are equal, i.e., the surface charge is zero. The catalyst surface charge is negative at pH > PZC and positive at pH < PZC. The PZC of Al₂O₃ was well below the natural pH 5.5 of HAs in solution (the pH applied in the catalytic ozonation experiments), therefore the surface of Al₂O₃ was negatively charged during the ozonation experiments, while the net surface charge of Mn₂O₃ was slightly positive at the pH 5.5.

Table 1 – Textural characterization and the point of zero charge of Mn₂O₃ and α-Al₂O₃.

	Mn ₂ O ₃	α-Al ₂ O ₃
BET area (m ² g ⁻¹)	15.6	45.8
Pore volume (cm ³ g ⁻¹)	0.008	0.162
Pore diameter distribution (nm)	3.78	23.20
Point of zero charge - pH _{pzc}	5.9	4.2
Cristallite size (nm)*	15.9	41.7

* Calculated by Scherrer Equation [37].

Figure S-2 (Supplementary Material) shows the FTIR spectra of the α-Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles before and after the ozonation of HAs. Clearly, the vibrational absorption spectra of the aluminum and manganese oxide do not show a significant change caused by the ozonation of the HAs, indicating that the nanoparticles remained stable and that their chemical composition was maintained during the reactive catalytic process.

The large absorption bands at 3450 cm⁻¹ observed in Figure S-1, were due to the symmetric/asymmetric stretching of the OH group, indicating the presence of water in the structure of the compounds. In Figure S-2 (a), the peak observed in the region around 1100 cm⁻¹ can be attributed to the Al³⁺ and O²⁻ groups at the vibrational surface of Al-O. Furthermore, the bands encountered at 495 cm⁻¹ can be assigned to the angular deformation of the A-O bonds, while the bands at 550 cm⁻¹ and 950 cm⁻¹ relate to the symmetrical flexion of O-Al-O [38].

Figure S-1 (b) shows absorption bands between 700 cm⁻¹ and 500 cm⁻¹, which can be attributed to Mn-O and Mn-O-Mn vibrations, respectively [39]. Moreover, the peaks observed at 1550 cm⁻¹ and 3500 cm⁻¹ can be related to the symmetric/asymmetric stretching of the OH group associated with the water content in the compound [40].

The FEG-SEM and TEM results for the morphological analysis of the Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles are shown in Figure 1 and 2. Overall, both materials presented a heterogeneous morphology and regions with irregular particle size. In particular, the α-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Al_2O_3 appeared as coalescent particles with a platelet format, typically encountered in the structure of $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ [41,42]. In contrast, the Mn_2O_3 particles were circular well-organized grains. The particles of Mn_2O_3 and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ formed aggregates (Figure 2) with diameters of 20-60 nm and less than 20 nm (Figure 3), respectively.




Figure 2 – FEG-SEM images for Mn_2O_3 (a, b) and $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ (c, d) nanoparticles.




Figure 3 – TEM images for Mn₂O₃ (a, b) and α-Al₂O₃ (b, c) nanoparticles.

The X-ray diffraction patterns of the Mn₂O₃ or α-Al₂O₃ nanoparticles (Figure S-3, Supplementary Material) showed the formation of crystalline phases in both solids. The characteristic diffraction peaks of Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles were identified at $2\theta = 23.13^\circ, 32.95^\circ, 38.23^\circ, 45.16^\circ, 49.34^\circ, 55.17^\circ$ and 65.77° (JCPDS-89-4836) [43,44]. The diffraction peaks of α-Al₂O₃ nanoparticles appeared at $2\theta = 25.57^\circ, 35.14^\circ, 37.76^\circ, 43.33^\circ, 52.53^\circ, 57.47^\circ, 61.27^\circ, 66.49^\circ, 68.18^\circ$ and 76.84° (JCPDS-88-0826), as also reported by Kim et al. [42]. However, diffraction peaks associated with Al(OH)₃ ($2\theta = 18.68^\circ, 20.25^\circ$ and 45.57° , JCPDS-15-0138) were also observed, which indicated the presence of residual traces of this compound during the synthesis process of α-Al₂O₃.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The crystallite sizes (Table 1) calculated according to Scherrer equation [37] were near to the particle size informed in the supplier data sheet.

The oxidation state of the α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles before and after ozonation process was investigated by XPS and the results are shown in Figure 4 and 5, respectively.




Figure 4 – XPS spectra of O 1s and Al 2p for α -Al₂O₃ nanoparticles before (a, b) and after (c, d) ozonation.

The fresh α -Al₂O₃ sample (Figure 4(a)), showed two contributions to the O 1s signal at 531.2 eV and at 532.6 eV, corresponding to the Al-O bond and to the oxygen of the OH group, respectively [45]. Moreover, the peak at 75 eV observed in Figure 4(b) related to Al 2p and was attributed to Al in the 3+ oxidation state [45].

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The peaks at binding energies of 531.8 eV and 533.4 eV observed after ozonation (Figure 4(c)) corresponded to the O_2^- and OH ions, respectively, while the level Al 2p shifted to higher binding energies (75.4 eV) after ozonation (Figure 4(d)) indicating a possible increase in the oxidation state [46].

Figure 5 shows the XPS spectra for the Mn_2O_3 nanoparticles after ozonation. The XPS spectra of the fresh Mn_2O_3 sample can be found in a previously published work of the same research group [47].




Figure 5 – XPS spectra of O 1s and Mn 2p for Mn_2O_3 nanoparticles after ozonation.

In the O1s region, Figure 5 (a), the XPS spectra of the manganese oxide sample taken after ozonation showed peaks with binding energies of 529.3 and 531.2 eV, due to the Mn-O bond which was also present in the fresh Mn_2O_3 [47], while the peak at 533.1 eV related to the oxygen of the OH group. Moreover, peaks related to the binding energies of 653 eV and 642 eV shown in Figure 5 (b), corresponded to Mn $2p_{1/2}$ and Mn $2p_{3/2}$, respectively [48]. The fresh Mn_2O_3 nanoparticles showed the same peak at 653 eV, but the second peak, related to Mn $2p_{3/2}$, had binding energy of 641 eV [47]. According to Li et al. [33], the peak due to Mn $2p_{3/2}$ can be used to determine the oxidation state of manganese in its oxides. Peaks close to 640, 641 and 642 eV can be

1 attributed to Mn^{2+} , Mn^{3+} and Mn^{4+} , respectively. Therefore, before ozonation, the
2 Mn_2O_3 nanoparticles were in the 3+ oxidation state and, while after ozonation, the
3
4 manganese main oxidation states were Mn^{3+} (62.9 at %) and Mn^{4+} (37.1 at %).
5
6

7 The co-existence of two oxidation states Mn^{3+}/Mn^{4+} on the Mn_2O_3 surface is
8
9 indicative of electron transfer from the metal oxide to the ozone molecules, which could
10
11 result in the formation of free radicals ($\bullet OH$, $\bullet O_2H$ and $\bullet O_2^-$) [12,49,50]. This
12
13 observation might imply faster rate of degradation of HAs, if these were adsorbed onto
14
15 the solid surface where ozone would be continuously adsorbed and decomposed.
16
17
18
19
20

21 **3.2. Absorption and decomposition of ozone in water**

22

23 The study of ozone decomposition in non-catalytic and catalytic reactions and
24
25 the aspects of mass transfer are of fundamental importance in the study of ozonation
26
27 systems applied to water treatment. Mainly because the decomposition of ozone in
28
29 water and the formation of hydroxyl radicals is directly related to the rate of mass
30
31 transfer of ozone from the gas to the liquid phase.
32
33
34
35

36 Figure 6 shows the kinetics of dissolution of ozone in water at different pH in
37
38 the absence of catalyst and the impact of catalyst dosage at pH 5.5. The model
39
40 parameters fitted to the experimental data are shown in Table 2. Clearly, the
41
42 concentration of ozone in the aqueous medium increased until a steady state was
43
44 reached, when the ozone absorption rate equaled the sum of the ozone decomposition
45
46 rate due to reaction with hydroxyl ions (Eq. 9) and the heterogeneous reactions
47
48 occurring on the solid surface (Eq. 10 – 13) [29].
49
50
51
52
53
54
55





12
13
14
15
16 The reaction sequence of ozone decomposition on oxide surfaces (Eq 10-13)
17 involves the dissociative adsorption of ozone to form an oxygen molecule and atomic
18 oxygen. The reaction of atomic species with gaseous ozone forms an adsorbed peroxide
19 species and gas phase oxygen, and finally the decomposition of the peroxide
20 intermediate produces molecular oxygen [51].
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Moreover, the results showed that the ozone equilibrium concentration slightly
29 decreased at more alkaline pH (~15%), Figure 6 (a), due to the higher concentration of
30 OH⁻ ions in solution, which initiated the decomposition of ozone leading to a chain
31 reaction with the participation of free radicals [52]. Thus, the constant for the non-
32 catalytic decomposition of ozone (k_d), Table 2, increased at higher pH and this
33 translated with an increase in the overall rate of ozone decomposition. In the more
34 acidic medium the decomposition is smaller, since lower concentrations of OH⁻ ions are
35 available to decompose the O₃ molecule.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 6 –Dissolved ozone concentration in aqueous phase as a function of reaction time: (a) at different initial values of pH (4.0, 5.5 and 7.0) without catalyst; and (b) with different dosages (0.1 and 0.5 $g L^{-1}$) of Al_2O_3 or Mn_2O_3 nanocatalysts at pH 5.5 ($T = 25\text{ }^{\circ}C$, flow rate of $O_3 = 0.063\text{ m}^3\text{ h}^{-1}$). Model predictions (lines) and experimental data (points).

Table 2 –Parameters (k_d , k_{La} , C_{sat} and C_e) fitted to the experimental data of ozone absorption and decomposition in aqueous medium ($T = 25$ °C, flow rate of $O_3 = 0.063$ m³ h⁻¹).

pH	Catalyst	Catalyst dosage (g L ⁻¹)	k_d (min ⁻¹)	k_{het} (L ⁻¹ min ⁻¹ g ⁻¹)	k_{La} (min ⁻¹)	C_{sat} (mg L ⁻¹)	C_e (mg L ⁻¹)
4.0	-	-	0.0391	-	0.21	11.17	9.04 ± 0.09
5.5	-	-	0.0597	-			8.90 ± 0.19
	Mn ₂ O ₃	0.1		0.7			5.92 ± 0.06
		0.5		0.2			4.27 ± 0.05
	α-Al ₂ O ₃	0.1					7.92 ± 0.08
		0.5					6.83 ± 0.13
	7.0	-		-			0.0914

In this study, C_{sat} was considered as an adjustable parameter. However, the value determined from the fitting of the model to the experimental results (11.17 mg L⁻¹) considerably agrees with the literature (11.4 mg L⁻¹) [53].

The rate of decomposition of dissolved O_3 in the water significantly increased (up to 15%) in the presence of catalyst (Figure 6b). At pH 5.5, the neutral or weakly positively charged Mn_2O_3 produced a higher rate of ozone decomposition in comparison to $\alpha-Al_2O_3$, which is negatively charged at pH 5.5. The net surface charge affects the desorption of the peroxide species $O_2 \cdot S$ since these have a partial ionic character (O_2^{2-} , O_2^{2-}) [54], and consequently this facilitates the regeneration of the active sites on the surface of the catalyst. Since the desorption energy of peroxide species ($O_2 \cdot S$) increases with decreasing surface coverage [54], the desorption of ($O_2 \cdot S$) from the negatively charge $\alpha-Al_2O_3$ surface will decrease the desorption rate of O_2 molecules (Eq. 13) and therefore the regeneration rate of the $\alpha-Al_2O_3$ surface, resulting in slower O_3 decomposition in $\alpha-Al_2O_3$ than in Mn_2O_3 .

The rate constant of catalytic decomposition of ozone (k_{het}) is a function of the hydroxyl ion concentration [29], which is a typical equation commonly found from Langmuir Hinshelwood mechanism. At a constant pH (pH 5.5) the values of k_{het} for

1 Mn₂O₃ and α-Al₂O₃ are 0.7 and 0.2 L⁻¹ min⁻¹ g⁻¹, respectively (Table 2). The present
2 study shows clear evidence that α-Al₂O₃ is an effective catalyst to decompose ozone in
3 aqueous phase, although this effect has been associated by some authors [17,18] to the
4 impurities contained in the α-Al₂O₃ that raises the pH of the water. This effect was not
5 evidenced in this study. The only Al(OH)₃ impurity in the α-Al₂O₃ (Figure S-3) could
6 contribute to the catalytic effect, but no significant change of the pH was measured after
7 the introduction of the oxide to water due to the acidic character of the solid surface
8 (pH_{pzc} = 4.2) (Table 1).
9


10 Moreover, the concentration of ozone at the steady-state decreased as the
11 concentration of the nanocatalysts in the water increased (Figure 6b) giving strong
12 evidence of the catalytic effect of these oxides. Good agreement was found between the
13 kinetic model (Eq. 2 – 4) and the experimental data. The selection of the experimental
14 conditions for the effective removal of HAs with ozone and Mn₂O₃ and α-Al₂O₃
15 nanoparticles were therefore based on the results of ozone decomposition on the two
16 oxides.
17
18
19

20 **3.5. Ozonation of HAs in water**

21 The kinetics of HAs removal as a function of pH was investigated in the range
22 from 4 to 10 (Figure 7), to determine the impact of ozone decomposition in the absence
23 of nanoparticles. As expected, a higher degradation rate of HAs was observed under
24 alkaline conditions, since the ozonation mechanism follows an indirect route in which
25 the strong •OH radical is produced. However, a relatively high rate of HAs degradation
26 was also observed at acidic pH, as a result of the direct attack of ozone on the electron
27 rich sites in the HAs molecules, such as amines aromatics, olefins, and other polar
28 groups [55]. The reactions of HA with •OH radicals are non-selective, while the
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 mechanism of reactions of HAs with molecular ozone are selective [29]. The
2 decomposition of HAs with ozone was accompanied by a progressive decrease of pH,
3 due to the formation of acidic fragments [55]. Therefore, the uncompleted removal of
4 HAs observed in Figure 7 could be ascribed to the formation of intermediate acidic
5 compounds recalcitrant to attack by molecular ozone, since at this pH values the
6 concentration of $\cdot\text{OH}$ radical would be insignificant.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 Overall the results show negligible impact of pH in the interval from 5.5 to 10.0,
16 and a negative impact at pH 4.0, which decreased the HAs removal by approximately
17 10%. In all cases the removal of HAs was higher than 70%, it approaches 80% at
18 circumneutral pH and reached 87% at highly alkaline pH.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
Figure 7 – Kinetics of humic acid ozonation at different initial pHs ($T = 25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$; flow rate of ozone = $0.063\text{ m}^3\text{ h}^{-1}$; $[\text{HA}]_0 = 50\text{ mg L}^{-1}$).

56 3.4. Adsorption of HAs onto $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ and Mn_2O_3 nanoparticles

57 The adsorption of HA on $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles at equilibrium and at pH 5.5 is
58 shown Figure 8, whilst the adsorption on Mn_2O_3 was insignificant (Figure S-4,
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Supplementary Material). The equilibrium isotherm of $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ could be described by the Langmuir or Freundlich models, for which the parameters are shown in the inset of Figure 7.




Figure 8 – Adsorption of humic acid onto $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ nanoparticles ($\text{pH} = 5.5$; $T = 25\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$; $[\text{HA}]_0 = 50\text{ mg L}^{-1}$) and fitting of Langmuir and Freundlich isotherms. Model predictions (lines) and experimental data (points).

The adsorption of HAs onto $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ is pH dependent [56]. Although a fractionation of the HAs organic matter remaining in solution could occur as a result of adsorption onto $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ [56], this effect can be considered negligible in the present study since the HAs concentration adsorbed vastly exceed the limit of $20\text{ mg g}_{\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3}^{-1}$ reported in literature at which this phenomenon is considered important [56].

The HAs used in this study presented two pK_a values: one attributed to the OH group ($\text{pK}_a = 10.2$) and the other the related to the COOH group ($\text{pK}_a = 6.7$) [57]. Therefore, the dissolved HAs were mainly in the protonated form under the conditions

1 adopted in this study (pH 5.5) and could thus be attracted to and adsorbed onto the
2 negatively charged surface of the α -Al₂O₃ nanoparticles. On the other hand, the p*H*_{zpc} of
3 the Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles was close to that of the aqueous solution (Table 1), thus, only
4 weak interactions could be established between the surface of Mn₂O₃ and the HAs. In
5 addition, both the surface of Mn₂O₃ and the HAs were positively charged at pH 5.5.
6
7 Therefore, the low surface area of Mn₂O₃ (Table 1) coupled with the weak repulsion
8 forces at the surface of the Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles explains the insignificant extent of HAs
9 adsorption observed. These observations suggest that the reaction mechanism of
10 removal of HAs on α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ in the presence of ozone can also be
11 significantly different. α -Al₂O₃ adsorbs a significant fraction of HAs but has lower rate
12 of ozone decomposition, while Mn₂O₃ has very weak interactions with HAs but has a
13 higher rate of ozone decomposition.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 ***3.6 Ozonation of HAs with suspensions of α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles***

32
33

34 The rate of HAs removal with ozone, at pH 5.5, was nearly the same with or
35 without Mn₂O₃ (Figure 9). Although, Mn₂O₃ did not remove HAs by adsorption, it
36 presented higher catalytic activity than α -Al₂O₃, to decompose ozone in the aqueous
37 phase. In contrast, the removal of HAs with ozone was significantly enhanced by the
38 presence α -Al₂O₃, as a result of the higher rate of HAs adsorption and catalytic
39 decomposition of O₃ on the solid surface. The heterogeneous reaction of HAs with
40 ROS generated at the surface of α -Al₂O₃ plays a key role in the removal process. The
41 kinetics data were fitted by pseudo-first-order model, and the reaction rate constants
42 are shown in Table 3 as function of pH, together with the catalytic rate constant ratio (k_{1-}
43 $k_{\text{HAcatal}}/k_{1-\text{HA}}$), which is defined as a ratio of the pseudo-first-order rate constant for HA
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

degradation by catalytic ozonation ($k_{1-HAcat}$) and the pseudo-first-order rate constant for HA degradation by non-catalytic ozonation (k_{1-HA}).




Figure 9 – Kinetics of humic acids ozonation and humic acid adsorption on Mn_2O_3 or $\alpha-Al_2O_3$ nanoparticles in the presence or absence of ozone (pH = 5.5; T = 25 °C; $[HA]_0 = 50 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$; flow rate of ozone = $0.063 \text{ m}^3 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

Table 3 – Pseudo-first-order specific rate constant for humic acid degradation by non-catalytic (k_{1-HA}) and catalytic ozonation ($k_{1-HAcat}$) at different pHs and catalyst dosages (T = 25 °C; flow rate of ozone = $0.063 \text{ m}^3 \text{ h}^{-1}$; $[HA]_0 = 50 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$).

pH	Catalyst	Catalyst dosage (g L ⁻¹)	Pseudo-first-order specific rate constant, min ⁻¹	R ²	$k_{1-HAcat}/k_{1-HA}$
4.0	-	-	$0.056 \pm 0.009^*$	0.925	-
4.2	-	-	$0.092 \pm 0.012^*$	0.951	-
	$\alpha-Al_2O_3$	0.1	$0.122 \pm 0.023^{**}$	0.901	1.326
5.5	-	-	$0.114 \pm 0.006^*$	0.991	-
	Mn_2O_3	0.1	$0.123 \pm 0.008^{**}$	0.986	1.079
		0.5	$0.129 \pm 0.020^{**}$	0.933	1.132
	$\alpha-Al_2O_3$	0.1	$0.220 \pm 0.042^{**}$	0.895	1.930
0.5		$0.262 \pm 0.035^{**}$	0.949	2.298	
5.9	-	-	$0.080 \pm 0.009^*$	0.963	-

	Mn ₂ O ₃	0.1	0.125 ± 0.017**	0.949	1.562
7.0	-	-	0.115 ± 0.005*	0.994	-
10.0	-	-	0.134 ± 0.016*	0.954	-

* non-catalytic ozonation, k_{1-HA} ; ** catalytic ozonation, k_{1-HA})

At pH > pH_{pzc} (5.5 > 4.2), the negatively charged surface of the α -Al₂O₃ nanoparticles enabled the adsorption of larger fraction of HAs, therefore, the catalytic rate constant ratio ($k_{1-HAcat}/k_{1-HA}$) decreased from 1.930 to 1.326. Moreover, the catalytic effect of Mn₂O₃ on the HAs removal at pH 5.5 was not observed, and no significant difference between the HAs removal with or without Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles was found ($k_{1-HAcat}/k_{1-HA} \sim 1$). As discussed earlier, the repulsive forces between the positively charged Mn₂O₃ surface and the protonated HAs molecules at pH 5.5 argue against a catalytic effect. So, similar mechanisms are involved on the HAs removal by ozone in the presence or in the absence of Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles. However, at the pH_{pzc} of Mn₂O₃ particles (5.9), the catalytic effect becomes significant ($k_{1-HAcat}/k_{1-HA} = 1.562$) due to the more favorable conditions for HAs adsorption and the high rate of ozone decomposition on the catalyst surface. As shown in Figure 6b, the α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles are effective catalysts for the decomposition of ozone (Reactions 9-13). The lower catalytic activity of α -Al₂O₃ in comparison to Mn₂O₃ does not limit the ability of α -Al₂O₃ to catalytically decompose HAs. The apparent higher HAs decomposition rate observed with α -Al₂O₃ should also be ascribed to the much larger surface area (Table 1) and favorable rate of HAs adsorption, although this last factor can be manipulated by an appropriate selection of pH.

The main mechanism for HAs removal in the presence α -Al₂O₃ nanoparticles can be proposed as the simultaneous adsorption of both HAs and O₃, the reaction of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

ozone from the bulk solution and the catalytic decomposition of HAs on the solid surface by ROS, through complex series-parallel reactions.

To support this hypothesis, consecutive reusing cycles of the $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ catalyst were performed. Each run lasted 60 minutes and the catalyst was reused without any regeneration or specific treatment. A progressive decrease of the pseudo-first-order rate constants (Figure 10) was observed over 4 cycles, indicating a partial saturation of the surface solid by HAs adsorption. This effect maybe associated with a progressive decrease of the amount of free adsorption sites by irreversible chemisorption of HAs and/or its degradation byproducts, which decreases the adsorption capacity for ozone.





Figure 10 – Pseudo-first-order rate constant for humic acid removal cycling experiments using $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ ($T = 25\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$; flow rate of ozone = $0.063\text{ m}^3\text{ h}^{-1}$; $[\text{HA}]_0 = 50\text{ mg L}^{-1}$, $[\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3] = 0.5\text{ g L}^{-1}$, $\text{pH} = 5.5$).

FTIR analysis of the $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ catalysts before and after the cyclic tests (Figure 11) was performed to investigate the mechanism of catalyst deactivation. The

1 absorption band at 500-600 cm^{-1} of $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ (Figure 11a) is due to Al-O stretching
2 vibration and appears in all samples containing $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$: after HAs adsorption (Figure
3
4
5 11d), after the first cycle (Figure 11b) and after the fourth cycle (Figure 11c). The
6
7 typical FTIR spectrum of pure HAs (Figure 11, trace e) presents a broad absorption
8
9 peak at 3500–3400 cm^{-1} attributed to C=C stretching in the aromatic rings and O-H
10
11 stretching in the alcohols and phenols, and a comparatively sharp absorption peak at
12
13 1618 cm^{-1} arising from the skeletal vibration of C=C in the aromatic rings or C=O
14
15 stretching in quinones. A similar spectrum was obtained after HAs adsorption on the $\alpha\text{-}$
16
17 Al_2O_3 surface (Figure 11, trace d), although the peaks in the range 600 – 1000 cm^{-1}
18
19 decreased after consecutive cycles (Figures 11c) with a tendency to match the patterns
20
21 of the the fresh $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ sample (Figure 11a). This behavior could be related to the
22
23 continuous renewal of the catalyst surface due to the reaction catalytic decomposition of
24
25 ozone on the surface of the catalyst and reaction of ROS with HAs on the solid surface
26
27 and/or desorption of HAs.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



1 **Figure 11** - FTIR vibrational absorption spectra for (a) α -Al₂O₃; (b) and (c) α - Al₂O₃
2 after 1 and 4 cycles, respectively; (d) α -Al₂O₃ after adsorption of HAs and (e) pure
3 HAs. Adsorption in the presence or absence of ozone conditions: T = 25 °C;
4
5 flow rate of ozone = 0.063 m³ h⁻¹; [HA]₀ = 50 mg L⁻¹, [Al₂O₃]=0.5 g L⁻¹, pH = 5.5.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **4. Conclusions**

13
14 This study investigated the mechanisms of reaction of ozone with HAs in the
15 presence of α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles. The adsorption of HAs, ozone
16 decomposition and the surface reactions are all important factors that control the
17 effective removal of HAs. The results revealed that Mn₂O₃ decomposed ozone more
18 effectively than α -Al₂O₃, but the low surface area and unfavorable adsorption
19 conditions for HAs resulted in slower HAs removal than α -Al₂O₃. pH plays a key role
20 in the catalytic action of both α -Al₂O₃ and Mn₂O₃ nanoparticles. At the natural pH of
21 HAs aqueous solution (pH 5.5) Mn₂O₃ did not exhibited catalytic action during the
22 ozonation of HAs, while a significant catalytic effect was observed with α -Al₂O₃. The
23 mechanism of the HAs removal on α -Al₂O₃ nanoparticles proceeds through adsorption
24 of HAs on the alumina surface, the attack by ozone from either the bulk solution or by
25 the ROS on the catalyst surface and the catalytic decomposition of humic acid on the
26 solid surface. This study, however, showed that the catalytic action of Mn₂O₃ for the
27 removal of NOM by ozonation can be best revealed at pH higher than 5.9, the PZC of
28 Mn₂O₃, and by synthesizing nanoparticles with larger specific surface areas.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 **Notably**, the α -Al₂O₃ dosage (0.1 – 0.5 g L⁻¹) required to remove HAs in the
53 presence of ozone was significantly lower than in other studies, employing granular
54 activated carbon and iron coated zeolite (up to 2 g L⁻¹) or γ -alumina (30 g L⁻¹ – 50 g L⁻¹).
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The results of this study demonstrated the need of performing in-depth mechanistic
2 studies on the treatment of contaminated water by catalytic ozonation with metal oxides,
3 since NOM is indigenous to most natural water and plays a key role in the removal of
4 other dissolved contaminants of emerging concern.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 The authors acknowledge CAPES for a scholarship and CNPq for financial
12 support. The authors would like to thank the LCME-UFSC for technical support
13 provided during the electron microscopy work.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **References**

- 22
23
24
25 [1] C. Trellu, Y. Péchaud, N. Oturan, E. Mousset, D. Huguenot, E.D. van
26 Hullebusch, et al., Comparative study on the removal of humic acids from
27 drinking water by anodic oxidation and electro-Fenton processes: Mineralization
28 efficiency and modelling, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 194 (2016) 32–41.
29 doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2016.04.039.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 [2] D. Gümüş, F. Akbal, A comparative study of ozonation, iron coated zeolite
39 catalyzed ozonation and granular activated carbon catalyzed ozonation of humic
40 acid, *Chemosphere.* 174 (2017) 218–231.
41 doi:10.1016/J.CHEMOSPHERE.2017.01.106.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 [3] S.W. Krasner, W.A. Mitch, D.L. McCurry, D. Hanigan, P. Westerhoff,
50 Formation, precursors, control, and occurrence of nitrosamines in drinking water:
51 A review, *Water Res.* 47 (2013) 4433–4450.
52 doi:10.1016/J.WATRES.2013.04.050.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 [4] M.J. McGuire, R.G. Meadow, AWWARF trihalomethane survey., *J. / Am. Water*
61
62
63
64
65

Work. Assoc. 80 (1988) 61–68.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [5] R. Rosal, A. Rodríguez, M. Zerhouni, Enhancement of gas–liquid mass transfer during the unsteady-state catalytic decomposition of ozone in water, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 305 (2006) 169–175. doi:10.1016/J.APCATA.2006.02.059.
- [6] B. Seredyńska-Sobecka, M. Tomaszewska, A.W. Morawski, Removal of humic acids by the ozonation–biofiltration process, *Desalination*. 198 (2006) 265–273. doi:10.1016/J.DESAL.2006.01.027.
- [7] T. Ratpukdi, S. Siripattanakul, E. Khan, Mineralization and biodegradability enhancement of natural organic matter by ozone–VUV in comparison with ozone, VUV, ozone–UV, and UV: Effects of pH and ozone dose, *Water Res.* 44 (2010) 3531–3543. doi:10.1016/J.WATRES.2010.03.034.
- [8] M.R. Assalin, N. Dúran, Novas tendências para aplicação de ozônio no tratamento de resíduos : ozonização catalítica, *Revista Analytica*. 26 (2007) 76–86.
- [9] A. Ikhlaiq, D.R. Brown, B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, Catalytic ozonation for the removal of organic contaminants in water on alumina, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 165 (2015) 408–418. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2014.10.010.
- [10] P.C.C. Faria, J.J.M. Órfão, M.F.R. Pereira, Activated carbon catalytic ozonation of oxamic and oxalic acids, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 79 (2008) 237–243. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2007.10.021.
- [11] B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, U. Raczky-Stanisławiak, J. Świetlik, J. Nawrocki, Catalytic ozonation of natural organic matter on alumina, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*

62 (2006) 345–358. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2005.09.002.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [12] A. Ikhlaz, D.R. Brown, B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, Mechanisms of catalytic ozonation: An investigation into superoxide ion radical and hydrogen peroxide formation during catalytic ozonation on alumina and zeolites in water, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 129 (2013) 437–449. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2012.09.038.
- [13] F. Nawaz, Y. Xie, J. Xiao, H. Cao, Z.A. Ghazi, Z. Guo, et al., The influence of the substituent on the phenol oxidation rate and reactive species in cubic MnO₂ catalytic ozonation, *Catal. Sci. Technol.* 6 (2016) 7875–7884. doi:10.1039/C6CY01542E.
- [14] R.C. Martins, R.M. Quinta-Ferreira, Catalytic ozonation of phenolic acids over a Mn–Ce–O catalyst, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 90 (2009) 268–277. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2009.03.023.
- [15] R.C. Martins, R.M. Quinta-Ferreira, Phenolic wastewaters depuration and biodegradability enhancement by ozone over active catalysts, *Desalination.* 270 (2011) 90–97. doi:10.1016/J.DESAL.2010.11.026.
- [16] F. Qi, B. Xu, Z. Chen, L. Zhang, P. Zhang, D. Sun, Mechanism investigation of catalyzed ozonation of 2-methylisoborneol in drinking water over aluminum (hydroxyl) oxides: Role of surface hydroxyl group, *Chem. Eng. J.* 165 (2010) 490–499. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2010.09.047.
- [17] J. Nawrocki, Catalytic ozonation in water: Controversies and questions. Discussion paper, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 142–143 (2013) 465–471. doi:10.1016/j.apcatb.2013.05.061.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [18] J. Nawrocki, L. Fijołek, Effect of aluminium oxide contaminants on the process of ozone decomposition in water, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 142–143 (2013) 533–537. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2013.05.069.
- [19] J. Nawrocki, B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, The efficiency and mechanisms of catalytic ozonation, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 99 (2010) 27–42. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2010.06.033.
- [20] O. Turkyay, H. Inan, A. Dimoglo, Experimental study of humic acid degradation and theoretical modelling of catalytic ozonation, *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 22 (2015) 202–210. doi:10.1007/s11356-014-3326-5.
- [21] K.C. Chen, Y.H. Wang, The effects of Fe-Mn oxide and $\text{TiO}_2/\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ on the formation of disinfection by-products in catalytic ozonation, *Chem. Eng. J.* 253 (2014) 84–92. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2014.04.111.
- [22] Q. Wang, Z. Yang, B. Chai, S. Cheng, X. Lu, X. Bai, Heterogeneous catalytic ozonation of natural organic matter with goethite, cerium oxide and magnesium oxide, *RSC Adv.* 6 (2016) 14730–14740. doi:10.1039/c5ra21674e.
- [23] T. Zhang, J. Lu, J. Ma, Z. Qiang, Comparative study of ozonation and synthetic goethite-catalyzed ozonation of individual NOM fractions isolated and fractionated from a filtered river water, *Water Res.* 42 (2008) 1563–1570. doi:10.1016/J.WATRES.2007.11.005.
- [24] A. Ikhlaiq, D.R. Brown, B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, Mechanisms of catalytic ozonation on alumina and zeolites in water: Formation of hydroxyl radicals, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 123–124 (2012) 94–106. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2012.04.015.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [25] F. Qi, Z. Chen, B. Xu, J. Shen, J. Ma, C. Joll, et al., Influence of surface texture and acid–base properties on ozone decomposition catalyzed by aluminum (hydroxyl) oxides, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 84 (2008) 684–690. doi:10.1016/J.APCATB.2008.05.027.
- [26] F. Qi, B. Xu, Z. Chen, J. Ma, D. Sun, L. Zhang, Influence of aluminum oxides surface properties on catalyzed ozonation of 2,4,6-trichloroanisole, *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 66 (2009) 405–410. doi:10.1016/J.SEPPUR.2009.01.013.
- [27] American Public Health Association, American Water Works Association, Water Environment Federation, Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 19th ed., American Public Health Association, Washington DC, 1995.
- [28] D.E. Sullivan, J.A. Roth, Kinetics of ozone self-decomposition in aqueous solution, *AIChE Symp. Ser.* 76 (1979) 142–149.
- [29] F.J. Beltrán, *Ozone Reaction Kinetics for Water and Wastewater Systems*, CRC Press, 2003. doi:10.1201/9780203509173.
- [30] J.L. Sotelo, F.J. Beltran, F.J. Benitez, J. Beltran-heredia, *Ozone Decomposition in Water: Kinetic Study*, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 26 (1987) 39–43. doi:10.1021/ie00061a008.
- [31] T. Mizuno, H. Tsuno, H. Yamada, *Development of Ozone Self-Decomposition Model for Engineering Design*, *Ozone Sci. Eng.* 29 (2007) 55–63. doi:10.1080/01919510601115849.
- [32] J.A. Roth, D.E. Sullivan, *Solubility of ozone in water*, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Fundam.*

20 (1981) 137–140. doi:10.1021/i100002a004.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [33] P.-C. Li, C.-C. Hu, H. Noda, H. Habazaki, Synthesis and characterization of carbon black/manganese oxide air cathodes for zinc–air batteries: Effects of the crystalline structure of manganese oxides, *J. Power Sources*. 298 (2015) 102–113. doi:10.1016/J.JPOWSOUR.2015.08.051.
- [34] E.P. Barrett, L.G. Joyner, P.P. Halenda, The Determination of Pore Volume and Area Distributions in Porous Substances. I. Computations from Nitrogen Isotherms, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 73 (1951) 373–380. doi:10.1021/ja01145a126.
- [35] J. Haber, Manual on catalyst characterization (Recommendations 1991), *Pure Appl. Chem.* 63 (1991) 1227–1246. doi:10.1351/pac199163091227.
- [36] K.S.W. Sing, Reporting physisorption data for gas/solid systems with special reference to the determination of surface area and porosity (Provisional), *Pure Appl. Chem.* 54 (1982) 2201–2218. doi:10.1351/pac198254112201.
- [37] A.W. Burton, K. Ong, T. Rea, I.Y. Chan, On the estimation of average crystallite size of zeolites from the Scherrer equation: A critical evaluation of its application to zeolites with one-dimensional pore systems, *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.* 117 (2009) 75–90. doi:10.1016/J.MICROMESO.2008.06.010.
- [38] N. Salahudeen, A.S. Ahmed, A.H. Al-Muhtaseb, M. Dauda, S.M. Waziri, B.Y. Jibril, et al., Synthesis, characterization and adsorption study of nano-sized activated alumina synthesized from kaolin using novel method, *Powder Technol.* 280 (2015) 266–272. doi:10.1016/J.POWTEC.2015.04.024.
- [39] B.C. Sekhar, N. Kalaiselvi, Pristine hollow microspheres of Mn_2O_3 as a potential

anode for lithium-ion batteries, *CrystEngComm*. 17 (2015) 5038–5045.

doi:10.1039/C5CE00465A.

- [40] M.K. Trivedi, G. Nayak, S. Patil, R.M. Tallapragada, O. Latiyal, Evaluation of Biofield Treatment on Physical, Atomic and Structural Characteristics of Manganese (II, III) Oxide, *J. Mater. Sci. Eng.* 04 (2015) 1–6. doi:10.4172/2169-0022.1000177.
- [41] P.K. Kiyohara, H.S. Santos, A.C.V. Coelho, P. de S. Santos, Structure, surface area and morphology of aluminas from thermal decomposition of $\text{Al}(\text{OH})(\text{CH}_3\text{COO})_2$ crystals, *An. Acad. Bras. Cienc.* 72 (2000) 471–495. doi:10.1590/S0001-37652000000400003.
- [42] H.S. Kim, N.-K. Park, T.J. Lee, M.-H. Um, M. Kang, Preparation of Nanosized $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ Particles Using a Microwave Pretreatment at Mild Temperature, *Adv. Mater. Sci. Eng.* 2012 (2012) 1–6. doi:10.1155/2012/920105.
- [43] Y. Hu, H. Qian, C. Guo, T. Mei, Decoration of ZnO nanocrystals on the surface of shuttle-shaped Mn_2O_3 and its magnetic-optical properties, *CrystEngComm*. 12 (2010) 2687. doi:10.1039/b924820j.
- [44] S. Zhan, D. Zhu, M. Qiu, H. Yu, Y. Li, Highly efficient removal of NO with ordered mesoporous manganese oxide at low temperature, *RSC Adv.* 5 (2015) 29353–29361. doi:10.1039/C4RA17300G.
- [45] S.C. Reiff, J.A. LaVerne, Radiolysis of water with aluminum oxide surfaces, *Radiat. Phys. Chem.* 131 (2017) 46–50. doi:10.1016/J.RADPHYSICHEM.2016.10.022.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [46] J. Oh, S. Shin, J. Park, G. Ham, H. Jeon, Characteristics of Al₂O₃/ZrO₂ laminated films deposited by ozone-based atomic layer deposition for organic device encapsulation, *Thin Solid Films*. 599 (2016) 119–124.
doi:10.1016/J.TSF.2015.12.044.
- [47] A.P.S.L. Centurião, V.Z. Baldissarelli, G. Scaratti, S.M. de Amorim, R.F.P.M. Moreira, Enhanced ozonation degradation of petroleum refinery wastewater in the presence of oxide nanocatalysts, *Environ. Technol.* (2018) 1–11.
doi:10.1080/09593330.2017.1420103.
- [48] M.C. Biesinger, B.P. Payne, A.P. Grosvenor, L.W.M. Lau, A.R. Gerson, R.S.C. Smart, Resolving surface chemical states in XPS analysis of first row transition metals, oxides and hydroxides: Cr, Mn, Fe, Co and Ni, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 257 (2011) 2717–2730. doi:10.1016/J.APSUSC.2010.10.051.
- [49] H. Zhu, Z. Shen, Q. Tang, W. Ji, L. Jia, Degradation mechanism study of organic pollutants in ozonation process by QSAR analysis, *Chem. Eng. J.* 255 (2014) 431–436. doi:10.1016/J.CEJ.2014.05.073.
- [50] M. Ernst, F. Lurot, J.-C. Schrotter, Catalytic ozonation of refractory organic model compounds in aqueous solution by aluminum oxide, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.* 47 (2004) 15–25. doi:10.1016/S0926-3373(03)00290-X.
- [51] W. Li, G. V. Gibbs, S.T. Oyama, Mechanism of ozone decomposition on a manganese oxide catalyst. 1. In situ Raman spectroscopy and Ab initio molecular orbital calculations, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 120 (1998) 9041–9046.
doi:10.1021/ja981441+.
- [52] M.E. Lovato, C.A. Martín, A.E. Cassano, A reaction kinetic model for ozone

decomposition in aqueous media valid for neutral and acidic pH, Chem. Eng. J.
146 (2009) 486–497. doi:10.1016/J.CEJ.2008.11.001.

- [53] Am Water Works Res F, Ozone in Water Treatment: Application and
Engineering, 1 st, CRC Press, 1991.
- [54] W. Li, S.T. Oyama, Mechanism of ozone decomposition on a manganese oxide
catalyst 2. Steady-state and transient kinetic studies, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 120
(1998) 9047–9052. doi:10.1021/ja9814422.
- [55] H. Miao, W. Tao, Ozonation of humic acid in water, J. Chem. Technol.
Biotechnol. 83 (2008) 336–344. doi:10.1002/jctb.1816.
- [56] N. Janot, P.E. Reiller, X. Zheng, J.P. Croué, M.F. Benedetti, Characterization of
humic acid reactivity modifications due to adsorption onto α -Al₂O₃, Water Res.
46 (2012) 731–740. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2011.11.042.
- [57] T. Tanaka, Functional groups and reactivity of size-fractionated Aldrich humic
acid, Thermochim. Acta. 532 (2012) 60–64. doi:10.1016/J.TCA.2011.12.004.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Supplementary Material_revised

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: Sup Material_Rev.docx](#)