



**Faculty of Resource Science and Technology**

***Melia azedarach* Activated Carbon for Heavy Metals Removal: Isotherm,  
Kinetic and Response Surface Methodology Study**

**Muhammad Imran Shaukat**

**Doctor of Philosophy  
2023**

*Melia azedarach* Activated Carbon for Heavy Metals Removal: Isotherm,  
Kinetic and Response Surface Methodology Study

Muhammad Imran Shaukat

A thesis submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

(Environmental Chemistry)

Faculty of Resource Science and Technology

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SARAWAK

2023

## DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Malaysia Sarawak. Except where due acknowledgements have been made, the work is that of the author alone. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

.....

Signature



Name: Muhammad Imran Shaukat

Matric No.: 18010054

Faculty of Engineering

Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

Date : 06.04.2023

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise be to Allah, the Almighty, who has showered me with innumerable benefits to complete this project and thesis.

To my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rafeah Wahid and co-supervisor Prof. Dr. Zainab Ngaini, for the guidance, support and advice during my time as their student. This thesis would not be possible without their superb mentoring and constant support.

I would want to express my gratitude to Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS) for allowing me to pursue this PhD research. The Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education and Universiti Malaysia Sarawak provided me with financial support [Grant No.: F07/PRGS /1907/2019]. I am grateful to the Centre for Graduate Studies for their counsel and help during my time at Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.

Thank you to my brothers, Mian Anwar and Muhammad Adnan, for their assistance in collecting and pre-treating the biomass. Thanks for your technical and administrative support, Mr Raymond, Ms Fatimawati and Ms Leida. Thank you to Mr Tomy, Mr Wahap, Mr Shafri, Mr Leo and Mr Amirul for assisting me with AAS, FTIR, FESEM-EDX, CHNS and BET instrumental analysis. Thank you, Ms Hanani, Mr Saffrullah and Ms Deborah at Environmental Laboratory 2, for their peer support, as well as scientific discussions.

My profound gratitude to my mother, Mrs Nasreen Akhtar, for her emotional support to my family during my studies. Also, my heartfelt thanks to first mentor, my father, the late Mr Shaikat Ali, whose wise words have guided me throughout my life. Finally, I would want

to thank my wife, Ms. Shagufta Gulnaz as well as my children Aamir Latif, Ali Shan, Usman Haider and Areesh Zahra, for their patience and support throughout my PhD journey.

## ABSTRACT

Excessive heavy metals discharge into the environment has become a great concern worldwide and needs an effective long-term solution. *Melia azedarach* tree is a member of the *Meliaceae* family and is used as a source of hard wood; however, the leaves and twigs are burnt due to lack of industrial applications. In this study, biomass from *Melia azedarach* leaves and twigs was used to prepare activated carbons via molten salt synthesis with  $\text{ZnCl}_2$  as activator, for the removal of  $\text{Cu(II)}$ ,  $\text{Pb(II)}$  and  $\text{Ni(II)}$  ions from aqueous medium. Both activated carbons were characterised, evaluated for batch adsorption and fitness with the kinetic and isotherm models. The central composite design (CCD) was applied to optimise the removal of  $\text{Cu(II)}$ ,  $\text{Pb(II)}$  and  $\text{Ni(II)}$  by relating the mutual interactions of the factors including adsorbent dosage, initial metal concentration and contact time. The surface area of activated carbon from *Melia azedarach* leaves ( $121.592 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) and twig ( $91.423 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) was substantially larger than the feedstock leaves ( $1.02 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) and twigs ( $0.485 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ). The batch adsorption from both activated carbons for  $\text{Pb(II)}$  and  $\text{Ni(II)}$  removal followed the Freundlich isotherm, while  $\text{Cu(II)}$  adsorption followed the Temkin isotherm. Applying central composite design in response surface methodology, the optimised removal efficiency for  $\text{Cu(II)}$ ,  $\text{Pb(II)}$ , and  $\text{Ni(II)}$  using *Melia azedarach* leaves activated carbon as adsorbent was determined to be 98.63%, 99.52% and 88.18% respectively while optimised adsorption capacity was found to be  $192.12 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$ ,  $170.94 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$ ,  $160.77 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$ . On the other hand, the optimised removal efficiency for  $\text{Cu(II)}$ ,  $\text{Pb(II)}$ , and  $\text{Ni(II)}$  using *Melia azedarach* twigs activated carbon as adsorbent was found to be 99.66%, 95.05% and 97.53% respectively while optimised adsorption capacity was determined to be  $172.32 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$ ,  $254.59 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$ ,  $232.16 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$ , optimised through central composite design in response surface methodology. The activated carbon derived from *Melia azedarach* biomass has demonstrated the capacity

to be a value-added product as an adsorbent capable of adsorbing heavy metals from aqueous medium.

**Keywords:** Agricultural and horticultural wastes, biomass utilisation, green adsorbents, response surface methodology, water pollution

**Melia azedarach Karbon Teraktif untuk Penyingkiran Logam Berat: Kajian Metodologi Permukaan Isoterma, Kinetik dan Gerak Balas**

**ABSTRAK**

*Pelepasan logam berat yang semakin meningkat ke alam sekitar telah menjadi kebimbangan besar yang memerlukan penyelesaian yang boleh dipercayai dan jangka panjang. Berikutan sintesis garam lebur dengan  $ZnCl_2$  sebagai pengaktif, biojisim daripada daun dan ranting Melia azedarach digunakan untuk menyediakan karbon teraktif untuk penyingkiran ion  $Cu(II)$ ,  $Pb(II)$ , dan  $Ni(II)$  daripada medium akuas. Kedua-dua karbon teraktif telah dicirikan, dinilai untuk penjerapan kelompok, dan kesesuaian dengan model kinetik dan isoterma. Reka bentuk komposit pusat (CCD) digunakan untuk mengoptimumkan penjerapan kelompok dengan mengaitkan interaksi bersama faktor termasuk dos penjerap, kepekatan logam awal dan masa sentuhan. Luas permukaan karbon teraktif daun Melia azedarach ( $121.592 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) dan ranting ( $91.423 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) jauh lebih besar daripada daun ( $1.02 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) dan bahan suapan ranting ( $0.485 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ). Penjerapan kelompok oleh kedua-dua karbon teraktif untuk penyingkiran  $Pb(II)$  dan  $Ni(II)$  mengikuti isoterma Freundlich, tetapi penjerapan  $Cu(II)$  mengikuti isoterma Temkin. Pada pembolehubah proses yang dioptimumkan, penyingkiran optimum  $Cu(II)$  99.50%,  $Pb(II)$  ialah 100%, dan  $Ni(II)$  ialah 89.17% oleh karbon teraktif daun Melia azedarach. Manakala kapasiti penjerapan optimumnya didapati ialah  $189.44 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$  untuk  $Cu(II)$ ,  $171.83 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$  untuk  $Pb(II)$  dan  $158.56 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$  untuk  $Ni(II)$ . Dengan karbon teraktif ranting Melia azedarach, penyingkiran optimum ialah 99.50%  $Cu(II)$ , 100%  $Pb(II)$ , dan 89.17%  $Ni(II)$ . Manakala kapasiti penjerapan optimum ranting Melia azedarach didapati  $189.44 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$  untuk  $Cu(II)$ ,  $171.83 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$  untuk  $Pb(II)$  dan  $158.56 \text{ mgg}^{-1}$  untuk  $Ni(II)$ . Kajian ini penting kerana karbon teraktif yang diperolehi daripada biojisim Melia azedarach telah menunjukkan kapasiti untuk menjadi*



*produk nilai tambah sebagai penjerap yang mampu menyerap logam berat daripada medium akueus.*

*. **Kata kunci:** Sisa pertanian, penggunaan biojisim, penjerap hijau, metodologi permukaan tindak balas, pencemaran air*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Study Background	1
1.2 <i>Melia azedarach</i>	3
1.3 Problem Statement	4
1.4 Objectives	8
1.5 Chapter Summary	8
1.6 Chapter Summary	10
<b>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 <i>Melia azedarach</i> Biomass	11

2.2	Heavy Metals Pollutions	12
2.2.1	Cu(II)	14
2.2.2	Pb(II)	14
2.2.3	Ni(II)	15
2.3	Heavy Metals Removal Techniques	16
2.4	Adsorption	18
2.4.1	Classification of Adsorption Process	18
2.4.2	Adsorption Mechanism	20
2.5	Adsorption Kinetics	22
2.5.1	Pseudo-First-Order (PFO) Equation	22
2.5.2	Pseudo-Second-Order (PSO) Equation	23
2.5.3	Elovich Equation	24
2.5.4	Intra-Particle Diffusion and Film Diffusion	25
2.6	Adsorption Isotherms	29
2.6.1	Langmuir Isotherm	29
2.6.2	Freundlich Isotherm	31
2.6.3	Temkin Isotherm:	32
2.6.4	Redlich-Peterson Isotherm	33
2.6.5	Error Functional Analysis for Linear Models	37
2.7	Factor Affecting Adsorption of Heavy Metals:	37

2.7.1	Sorbent Dosage	37
2.7.2	Effect of Initial Metal Concentration	43
2.8	Effect of pH	49
2.9	Effect of Contact Time	56
2.10	Effect of Temperature	62
2.11	Desorption and Regeneration	68
2.12	Adsorbents	68
2.12.1	Adsorbents Classification	69
2.12.2	Natural Adsorbents and Precursors	72
2.12.3	Activated Natural Adsorbents	74
2.13	Activated Carbon	75
2.14	Molten Salt Synthesis	77
2.15	<i>Melia azedarach</i> Tree and Botanical Background	78
2.15.1	<i>Melia azedarach</i> Leaves	79
2.16	Response Surface Methodology	79
2.17	Conclusion	81
<b>CHAPTER 3 SYNTHESIS AND PHYSIOCHEMICAL</b>		
<b>CHARACTERISATION OF ACTIVATED CARBON FROM</b>		
<b><i>Melia azedarach</i> LEAVES AND TWIGS</b>		<b>83</b>
3.1	Overview	83
3.2	Materials and Methods	86

3.2.1	Materials	86
3.2.2	Molten Salt Synthesis	88
3.2.3	Physiochemical Characterisation	88
3.2.3.1	Proximate Analyses	88
3.2.3.2	Elemental Analyses	90
3.2.3.3	Surface Morphology Analysis	91
3.2.3.4	Surface Area and Pore Analyses	91
3.2.3.5	Functional Groups Analysis	91
3.3	Results and Discussion	92
3.3.1	Mechanism of pore activation via $ZnCl_2$	92
3.3.2	Proximate Analyses	93
3.3.3	Elemental analysis	96
3.3.4	Surface Morphology Analysis	97
3.3.5	EDX Analysis	100
3.3.6	Pore Structure Analyses	102
3.3.7	Functional groups Analyses	105
3.4	Conclusion	108
<b>CHAPTER 4 HEAVY METALS REMOVAL BY ACTIVATED CARBON</b>		
<b>BASED ON <i>Melia azedarach</i> LEAVES AND TWIGS:</b>		
<b>ADSORPTION ISOTHERM AND KINETICS STUDY</b>		
		<b>109</b>
4.1	Introduction	109

4.2	Materials and Methods	112
4.2.1	Adsorbent	112
4.2.2	Preparation of Stock Solution for Adsorption Study	112
4.2.3	Adsorption Study	113
4.3	Results and Discussion	115
4.3.1	Effect of Contact Time	115
4.3.2	Effect of Initial Concentration	124
4.3.3	Adsorption Isotherms	128
4.3.4	Adsorption Kinetics	137
4.3.5	FTIR Analysis after Heavy Metals Adsorption	146
4.3.6	Adsorption Mechanism	148
4.4	Conclusion	150
<b>CHAPTER 5 OPTIMISATION OF Cu(II), Pb(II) AND Ni(II) ADSORPTION</b>		
<b>BY <i>Melia azedarach</i> ACTIVATED CARBON: A RESPONSE</b>		
<b>SURFACE METHODOLOGY APPROACH</b>		<b>151</b>
5.1	Introduction	151
5.2	Materials and Methods	154
5.2.1	Materials	154
5.2.2	RSM Adsorption Experiment	154
5.3	Result and Discussion	156
5.3.1	Cu(II) ions Adsorption by LAC and TAC	156

5.3.1.1 Cu(II) ions Adsorption by LAC	156
5.3.1.2 Cu(II) ions Adsorption by TAC	166
5.3.2 Pb(II) ions adsorption by LAC and TAC	174
5.3.2.1 Pb(II) ions adsorption by LAC	174
5.3.2.2 Pb(II) ions adsorption by TAC	183
5.3.3 Ni(II) ions adsorption by LAC and TAC	192
5.3.3.1 Ni(II) ions adsorption by LAC	192
5.3.3.2 Ni(II) ions adsorption by TAC	201
5.4 Conclusion	210
<b>CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>211</b>
6.1 Conclusion	211
6.2 Recommendations	214
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>216</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>246</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table 2.1: Permissible limits of heavy metals in drinking water	15
Table 2.2: Comparison of physisorption and chemisorption processes (Králík, 2014)	18
Table 2.3: Kinetic model fitness for heavy metals adsorption by various biomass-based adsorbents with chemical/thermal treatment	27
Table 2.4: Isotherm models fitness of heavy metals adsorption by different biomass-based adsorbents with chemical/thermal treatment	35
Table 2.5: Effect of Adsorbent dosage on Adsorption Efficiency using modified adsorbents	39
Table 2.6: Effect of initial metal concentration sorption by modified adsorbents	44
Table 2.7: Effect of solution pH on Adsorption of Cu(II), Pb(II) and Ni(II) by modified adsorbents	50
Table 2.8: Effect of contact time on Adsorption of Cu(II), Pb(II) and Ni(II) by modified adsorbents	57
Table 2.9: Effect of Temperature on Adsorption of Cu(II), Pb(II) and Ni(II) by modified adsorbents	63
Table 3.1: Physicochemical properties of feedstock and activated carbon	94
Table 3.2: EDX analysis of elements % mass of RLP, RTP, LAC and TAC	101
Table 3.3: Surface area, pore volume and diameter of feedstock and activated carbon	104
Table 4.1: Comparative effectiveness of LAC and TAC adsorbents	122
Table 4.2: Isotherm models parameters for heavy metals adsorption by LAC and TAC	135
Table 4.3: Kinetic models parameters for heavy metals adsorption by LAC and TAC	144
Table 5.1: Range of factors for heavy metals adsorption via CCD	155
Table 5.2: Experimental conditions for heavy metals adsorption via CCD	155
Table 5.3: Experimental and predicted results for Cu(II) adsorption by LAC	157



Table 5.4:	Model fitness sumamry for both the responses in Cu(II) adsorption by LAC	160
Table 5.5:	ANOVA results for Cu(II) removal efficiency by LAC	161
Table 5.6:	ANOVA results for Cu(II) Adsorption capacity by LAC	162
Table 5.7:	Experimental and predicted Cu(II) adsorption by TAC	166
Table 5.8:	Model fitness sumamry for both the responses in Cu(II) adsorption by TAC	168
Table 5.9:	ANOVA results for Cu(II) removal efficiency by TAC	169
Table 5.10:	ANOVA results for Cu(II) Adsorption capacity of TAC	170
Table 5.11:	Experimental and predicted results for Pb(II) adsorption by LAC	174
Table 5.12:	Model fitness summary for both the responses in Pb(II) adsorption by LAC	177
Table 5.13:	ANOVA results for Pb(II) removal efficiency of LAC	178
Table 5.14:	ANOVA results for Pb(II) adsorption capacity by LAC	179
Table 5.15:	Experimental and predicted results for Pb(II) adsorption by TAC	183
Table 5.16:	Model fitness sumamry for both the responses in Pb(II) adsorption by TAC	185
Table 5.17:	ANOVA results for Pb(II) removal efficiency of TAC	186
Table 5.18:	ANOVA results for adsorption capacity of Pb(II) by TAC	188
Table 5.19:	Experimental and predicted results for Ni(II) adsorption by LAC	193
Table 5.20:	Model fitness sumamry for both the responses in Ni(II) adsorption by LAC	194
Table 5.21:	ANOVA results for adsorption capacity of Ni(II) by LAC	195
Table 5.22:	ANOVA results for adsorption capacity of Ni(II) by LAC	197
Table 5.23:	Experimental and predicted results for Ni(II) adsorption by TAC	202
Table 5.24:	Model fitness sumamry for both the responses in Ni(II) adsorption by TAC	204
Table 5.25:	ANOVA results for adsorption capacity of Ni(II) by TAC	205
Table 5.26:	ANOVA results for adsorption capacity of Ni(II) by TAC	206

## LIST OF FIGURES

	<b>Page</b>
Figure 1.1: Chapter wise thesis organisation	10
Figure 2.1: Comparison of a) physisorption, b) chemisorption (Nandiyanto et al., 2020)	20
Figure 2.2: Visual illustration of different adsorption mechanisms	21
Figure 2.3: Classification of Adsorbents (Crini et al., 2019)	71
Figure 3.1: <i>Melia azedarach</i> (a) leaves, (b) twigs, (c) leaves powder and (d) twigs powder	87
Figure 3.2: Elemental analysis of the raw samples (RLP and RTP) and activated carbon (LAC and TAC)	96
Figure 3.3: FESEM images of <i>Melia azedarach</i> (a) leaves powder (RLP); (b) twigs powder (RTP); (c) leaves activated carbon (LAC); and (d) twigs activated carbon (TAC) , at 1000X magnification and 10 $\mu\text{m}$ spatial resolution	98
Figure 3.4: FESEM images of activated carbon(a) LAC A/Pb(II) adsorption; (b) TAC A/Pb(II); (c) LAC A/Cu(II) adsorption; (d) TAC A/Cu(II) adsorption; (e) LAC A/Ni(II) adsorption and (f) TAC A/Ni(II) adsorption at 1000X magnification and 10 $\mu\text{m}$ spatial resolution	100
Figure 3.5: N <sub>2</sub> Adsorption-desorption isotherm curves for a) LAC ; b) TAC	103
Figure 3.6: FTIR Spectra: a) <i>Melia azedarach</i> leaves raw powder (RLP) and b) activated carbon (LAC)	106
Figure 3.7: FTIR Spectra: a) <i>Melia azedarach</i> leaves raw powder (RTP) and b) activated carbon (TAC)	107
Figure 4.1: Effect of contact time on Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II) ions adsorption by LAC from aqueous solutions; in terms of a) % removal and b) adsorption capacity at 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage, pH 5, 26 °C temperature, 50 mgL <sup>-1</sup> initial concentration and 150 rpm stirring rate	117
Figure 4.2: Effect of contact time on Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II) ions adsorption by TAC from aqueous solutions; in terms of a) % removal and b) adsorption capacity at 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage, pH 5, 26 °C temperature, 50 mgL <sup>-1</sup> initial concentration and 150 rpm stirring rate	118

Figure 4.3: Effect of initial concentration on Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II) ions adsorption by LAC from aqueous solutions; in terms of a) % removal and b) adsorption capacity at 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage, pH 5, 26 °C temperature, 120 contact time and 150 rpm stirring rate	125
Figure 4.4: Effect of initial concentration on Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II) ions adsorption by TAC from aqueous solutions; in terms of a) % removal and b) adsorption capacity at 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage, pH 5, 26 °C temperature, 120 min contact time and 150 rpm stirring rate	127
Figure 4.5: Mechanism of M(II) ions interaction with activated carbon at lower to higher initial concentration. M(II) represents Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II)	128
Figure 4.6: Langmuir isotherm plot for metal ions adsorption by a) LAC and b) TAC: at 5-50 ppm initial concentration, 25 °C temperature, 120 min time and 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage	130
Figure 4.7: Freundlich isotherm plot for metal ions adsorption by a) LAC and b) TAC: at 5-50 ppm initial concentration, 25 °C temperature, 120 min time and 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage	132
Figure 4.8: Temkin isotherm plot for metal ions adsorption by a) LAC and b) TAC: at 5-50 ppm initial concentration, 25 °C temperature, 120 min time and 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage	133
Figure 4.9: Redlich-Peterson isotherm plot for metal ions adsorption by a) LAC, b) TAC: at 5-50 ppm initial concentration, 25 °C temperature, 120 min time and 1 gL <sup>-1</sup> adsorbent dosage	134
Figure 4.10: Pseudo-first-order plot for adsorption of Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II) by a) LAC b) TAC	138
Figure 4.11: PSO plot for adsorption of Pb(II), Cu(II), and Ni(II) by a) LAC and b) TAC	139
Figure 4.12: Elovich Model plot for heavy metals adsorption by a) LAC and b) TAC	140
Figure 4.13: Weber-Morris Model plot for heavy metals adsorption by LAC a) before equilibrium b) after equilibrium	142
Figure 4.14: Weber-Morris model plot for heavy metals adsorption by TAC a) before equilibrium b) after equilibrium	143
Figure 4.15: FTIR Spectra of LAC, a) before adsorption, b) after Pb(II) adsorption, c) after Cu(II) adsorption and d) after Ni(II) adsorption	147
Figure 4.16: FTIR Spectra of TAC, a) before adsorption, b) after Pb(II) adsorption, c) after Cu(II) adsorption and d) after Ni(II) adsorption	148

Figure 5.1:	3D response surface graphs illustrating the interlinked effect of adsorbent dosage, initial concentration and contact time on Cu(II) removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of LAC	165
Figure 5.2:	3D response surface graphs illustrating the interlinked effect of adsorbent dosage, initial concentration and contact time on Cu(II) removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of TAC	173
Figure 5.3:	Response surface graphs illustrating the interlinked effect of adsorbent dosage, initial concentration and contact time on Pb(II) removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of LAC	182
Figure 5.4:	3D response surface graphs illustrating the interlinked effect of adsorbent dosage, initial concentration and contact time on Pb(II) removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of TAC	191
Figure 5.5:	3D response surface graphs illustrating the interlinked effect of adsorbent dosage, initial concentration and contact time on Ni(II) removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of LAC	200
Figure 5.6:	3D response surface graphs illustrating the interlinked effect of adsorbent dosage, initial concentration and contact time on Ni(II) removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of TAC	209

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Activated carbon
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
BET	Brunauer-Emmett-Teller
CCD	Central composite design
CGS	Centre for Graduate Studies
CHNS	Carbon, Hydrogen, Nitrogen, Sulphur
DOE	Design of Experiment
EDX	Energy Dispersive X-Ray
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAAS	Flame atomic absorption spectrometer
FESEM	Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscope
FTIR	Fourier Transform Infrared
LAC	Leaves Activated Carbon
HM	Heavy Metal
IUPAC	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry
MSS	Molten Salt Synthesis
RLP	Raw leaves powder
RMSE	Root Mean square error
RTP	Raw twigs powder
TAC	Twig Activated Carbon
UNIMAS	Universiti Malaysia Sarawak
2FI	Two Factor interaction

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Study Background

Heavy metals contamination of the surface and groundwater has rapidly become an environmentally growing worldwide issue and threatening to human health (Razak et al., 2020). Sources of heavy metals contamination in the environment include industries like metallurgies, ceramics (Ngaini et al., 2021), paints, adhesives (Ghasemi et al., 2020), electroplating, mining, battery manufacturing (Wang & Wang, 2018), printing, fuels (Venkateswarlu et al., 2019), petroleum refineries, computer and television screens, roof and stained glass windows production (Kaya et al., 2020) and pesticides (Ullah et al., 2020). In addition to these, coal combustion and household wastes (Sen et al., 2018), typically contain significant amounts of metals with the potential to be poisonous, demanding extensive waste treatment (Adenuga et al., 2019).

Heavy metals like copper, lead and nickel, can accumulate in living tissues through the food chain, which eventually: causing damage to biosphere (Razak et al., 2020). In humans, heavy metal poisoning can cause high blood pressure, nausea, vomiting, disorientation, liver failure, brain haemorrhage, heart and renal disorders (Amin et al., 2019). According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US-EPA), the maximum contamination level in drinking water for Pb(II) is  $0.05 \text{ mgL}^{-1}$  (Aboli et al., 2020) and  $0.25 \text{ mgL}^{-1}$  for Cu(II) (Razak et al., 2020). While, based on World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines, the limit for Ni(II) is  $0.02 \text{ mgL}^{-1}$  (Guo et al., 2020). In tandem to US-EPA guidelines, the permissible limits for Pb(II), Cu(II) and Ni(II) in wastewater are  $0.01 \text{ mgL}^{-1}$ ,

2.5 mgL<sup>-1</sup> and 2 mgL<sup>-1</sup> respectively (Biswas et al., 2019). In order to preserve a healthy ecosystem, it is necessary to treat the heavy metal contaminated wastewater, before being released into water bodies (Taşar & Özer, 2020).

Several techniques have been employed for the removal of heavy metals from wastewater from either via physical (i.e. evaporation-condensation, reverse osmosis, membrane filtration) or chemical methods (i.e. ion exchange, chemical precipitation, solvent extraction) (Ibrahim et al., 2020). These traditional methods, nevertheless, have significant drawbacks (Herrera-Barros et al., 2020) such as solvent extraction restrictions, higher preparation costs, several phases involved and poor quality discharge (Adenuga et al., 2019; Crini & Lichtfzouse, 2019). The coagulation and flocculation methods have several drawbacks, including insufficient heavy metal removal, high chemical use and increased sludge generation (Jin et al., 2020; Surendran & Baral., 2018).

Chemical methods which involve chemical precipitation is a slow process involving different chemicals in large quantities; and huge amounts of sludge that needs further treatment (Sen et al., 2018; Zamora-ledezma et al., 2021). While, ion-exchange process involves high capital involvement and high operation cost, suitable for low concentrations only, highly sensitive to effluents pH and requires physiochemical pre-treatment to avoid damage to beads of organic matters (Adenuga et al., 2019; Siong et al., 2021). Meanwhile, the physical approaches, which involve a process based on membrane-based technologies, has several limitations such as high energy requirements, higher operation and maintenance costs, and limited flowrates (Siong et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2018). Electrochemical technologies involves huge capital investments, high operation costs due to electricity

supply; and ineffective at lower metal ion concentrations (Chen et al., 2020; Zamora-ledezma et al., 2021).

Adsorption is one of the versatile and efficient approaches often employed for the treatment of heavy metal-contaminated wastewater due to its operational simplicity, sludge-free operation and adsorbent reusability in long-term applications (Cao et al., 2019). Commercial activated carbon has been utilised for decades due to its qualities including high surface area, adsorption capacity, ion selectivity, thermal stability, resistance to transportation losses, ease of activation and regeneration (Ghasemi et al., 2020). However, its high cost is the principal obstacle to the industrial application for wastewater treatment (Ansari et al., 2018). Therefore, it is worthwhile to conduct extensive research on the preparation of low-cost adsorbents with specific properties and their utilisation for the removal of various pollutants in aqueous media (Georgieva et al., 2020). Agricultural and horticulture waste materials render prospective adsorbents for heavy metals removal from wastewater and an economical alternate to comparatively expensive activated carbon with comparable qualities by utilising widely available free resources (Hashem et al., 2020). Adsorbents made from agricultural and horticulture wastes have been demonstrated to be fairly effective in extracting heavy metals from wastewater even at very low concentrations (Surendran & Baral, 2018).

## **1.2 *Melia azedarach***

*Melia azedarach* tree is found all over the world including Asia, Europe, north and south America however it is native to India, Pakistan, Australia and south east Asia (Majid et al., 2021). A few previous studies have utilised various parts of *Melia azedarach* biomass