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Abstract:

In this work, the indirect oxidation of two azo dyes (Colour Index Reactive Orange 4 and 13)
was performed in an electrochemical batch cell in the presence of chloride as an
electrolyte. The effect of different operational parameters on the electrochemical treatment
was tested. Kinetics plots consisting of two linear portions were obtained in some
experiments. The rate constants and the breaking point between the two linear portions
were modelled to evaluate the influence of dye concentration, conductivity and pH. Good
correlation between the experimental and the modelled constants and breaking points was
observed. Models showed that the dye concentration is the most significant factor in the
electrochemical treatment of both dyes, although conductivity and pH were also significant
either individually or in interaction with other factors.
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1. Introduction

Dyes are an important class of organic macromolecules playing an integral part of our lives. They are used in numerous industries such as textile, leather, paper, rubber, plastics, cosmetics, pharmaceutical and food [1]. Textile dyes are registered and classified according to a colour index which depends on their molecular structure, source, colour and/or method of application. Taking into account the structure of their chromophores, dyes can be mainly classified as azo, acridine arylmethane, anthraquinone, nitro, xanthenes, quinine–amine, etc. [2]. Azo dyes are the most widely used dye class, with more than 60% of the total dye production worldwide [3]. These dyes can be fragmented by reductive cleavage of the azo group to generate harmful aromatic amines. Some dyes and aromatic amines have been classified as carcinogenic and genotoxic by the International Agency for Research on Cancer [4]. The presence of toxic and carcinogenic products in textile dyeing effluents is a problem added because of the high colouration inherent in this type of effluents [5,6].

Dyes are also classified according to their application methods. In this respect, the main dye classes are acid, basic, direct, disperse, reactive, sulphur and vat. Among them, the reactive ones are the most widely used in the dyeing of cotton and other cellulosic fibres as they provide high washing fastness and brilliant colours. Reactive dyes represent 25% of the total dye world market [7]. However, these dyes have a relatively low degree of fixation (70-90%) [8]. As the unfixed dyes are hydrolysed and cannot be reused, substantial amounts of unfastened dyes are released in the wastewater. In addition, the reactive dye effluents have high salinity due to the significant amount of electrolyte, generally NaCl, added in the dyeing process to increase the dye fixation. About 50–80 g·L\(^{-1}\) of salt is added during the reactive dyeing [9].

The degradation rate of residual reactive dyes by conventional biological treatment is very poor, as they are recalcitrant and have low biodegradability [10]. As biological treatments are not able to remove colour properly, the application of specific treatments is required in
order to accomplish current water discharge regulations. There are different techniques to
achieve colour removal, among them the most used are: adsorption methods [11,12],
membrane filtration [13,14], coagulation and electrocoagulation processes [15,16].

In recent years it has been a growing interest in the use of advanced oxidation methods [17–
21]. The Fenton process has shown to be effective in the degradation of both soluble and
insoluble dyes. However, this method produces an iron sludge and it can only be applied at
pH about 3 [22,23]. The use of AOPs with ultrasound irradiation for the degradation of textile
dyes has been also investigated. This combination, especially with Fenton process, has
shown an increase in the efficiency of dyes degradation [23,24]. On the other hand,
electrochemical techniques are able to effectively decolourize dyes. They offer advantages
in the treatment of highly coloured textile wastewater including use of the salt already
present in the effluents as an electrolyte, absence of any deliberately added organic or
inorganic compounds, non-generation of additional wastes and the possible reuse of the
treated effluents [25–27]. The UV irradiation during the electrolysis enhances the dye
degradation [7,28].

Dye oxidation can occur directly on the electrode surface but it mostly takes place by action
of molecules formed at the anode. This process is generally known as indirect oxidation. In
this respect, reactive oxygen species such hydroxyl radical (•OH), hydrogen peroxide and
ozone can be generated from water by discharge at the anode [29,30].

In addition, in the case of reactive dyebaths, the chloride ions used as dyeing electrolyte play
an important role in improving the efficiency of the electrochemical treatment due to the
generation of chlorine oxidants (Cl2, OCl− and chlorine radicals) [31,32].

In this work, an electrochemical treatment in a batch cell using Ti/Pt anode was applied to
degrade two reactive azo dyes, Colour Index Reactive Orange 4 (RO4) and Colour Index
Reactive Orange 13 (RO13), in the presence of chloride ions to simulate the conditions of
exhausted reactive dyebaths. The relevance of this study is to optimize the most important
factors related with the electrochemical decolouration of the reactive dyes with the aim to
reduce the treatment time and the electrical consumption of the treatment. Consequently, the kinetics of decolouration for both dyes were studied. The kinetics constants were modelled to evaluate the influence of several factors (pH, conductivity, dye concentration and reactive group structure) characteristic of reactive dye effluents. As some results exhibit two different kinetics curves, this change in the kinetics behaviour was also modelled. Finally, the adjustment of the experimental results to the estimated models was studied.

Our previous studies indicated that decolouration kinetics is much higher than mineralization kinetics since the first one entails the chromophore group breakdown whereas the second one implies the complete degradation of the dye molecule [33]. For this reason, this work was only focused on the decolouration which implies partial dye mineralization.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Reagents and dye hydrolysis

Dyestuffs RO4 and RO13 for the experimental study were supplied by DyStar (Spain). As shown in Figure 1 both dyes have a similar chemical structure except the reactive group of dichlorotriazine in RO4 and monochlorotriazine in RO13.

![Figure 1. Chemical structure of dyes.](image)

For each dye, solutions at different concentrations (0.1, 1 and 2 g·L⁻¹) were prepared. To simulate industrial wastewater conditions, dyes were hydrolysed before the electrochemical
treatment. The dye hydrolysis was carried out by boiling the solutions at pH 12 (adjusted with NaOH) for 1 h. The solutions were allowed to cool to room temperature and finally, the pH and conductivity were adjusted with HCl and NaCl according to conditions fixed for each experiment (see section 2.2).

2.2. Experimental design

For each dye a factorial experimental design of 3 factors and 2 levels \( (2^3) \) with one central point was selected to study the influence of the 3 main system factors, namely, pH, conductivity (\( \mu \)) and dye concentration (\( C \)). The values fixed for these factors are indicated in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Values of pH, conductivity and dye concentration for each experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. num.</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Conductivity (( \mu )) (mS·cm(^{-1}))</th>
<th>dye concentration (( C )) (g·L(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Electrochemical treatment

The electrochemical treatment was performed in a batch electrochemical cell with 15 L poly(methylmethacrylate) vessel containing the electrodes located at the bottom. The cathode was constituted by a holed stainless steel plate with the borders rolled forming two hollow cylinders. The anode was constituted by two Ti/Pt bars placed inside the cylinders (anodic surface: 150 cm²).

The electrical source voltage was fixed at 7 V and, consequently, the current intensity (I) was variable (10A ≤ I ≤ 25A) according to the solution conductivity (10, 30 or 50 mS·cm⁻¹). The current supply was stopped when reaching 95% decolouration. The maximum treatment time was set to 120 minutes. The decolouration was monitored as a function of the specific applied charge Q (A·h·L⁻¹) that is a normalized parameter.

2.4. Kinetics studies

The electrochemical dye degradation follows a pseudo-first order reaction [25], in which the decolouration rate is related by the expression:

\[
\ln\left(\frac{C_Q}{C_0}\right) = k \cdot Q
\] (1)

where \(C_Q\) is the dye concentration (g·L⁻¹) at a specific applied charge \(Q\) (A·h·L⁻¹) and \(C_0\) the initial dye concentration (g·L⁻¹) and \(k\) is the decolouration kinetic rate (A⁻¹·h⁻¹·L⁻¹).

Decolouration was calculated in % from absorbance measurements carried out with an UV-visible spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV-2401PC) at 488 nm for both dyes. This wavelength corresponds to the maximum absorption of the visible spectrum registered for each dye.
3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Kinetics study of the decolouration process

Based on Eq. (1), the kinetics decolouration plots obtained for RO4 and RO13 are shown in Figure 2. Kinetics plot (a) and (b) correspond to those obtained using 2 g·L⁻¹ of dyes (except trial IX where 1 g·L⁻¹ of dyes was used). Kinetics plot (c) and (d) correspond to those obtained using 0.1 g·L⁻¹ of dyes. In general, kinetics curves exhibit two different slopes (except trials VII and VIII). The first slope is always lower than the second one. Taking into account this behaviour, two different kinetics constants (k₁ and k₂) were adjusted in most of experiments whereas only one kinetics curve is observed for both dyes in trials VII and VIII (low dye concentration and high conductivity).

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** Kinetic decolouration rates for dyes RO4 and RO13. (a) and (b) higher dye concentrations (2 g·L⁻¹ for all experiments, except 1 g·L⁻¹ for trial IX); (c) and (d) dye concentration 0.1 g·L⁻¹.
In Table 2 are presented the kinetics constants (k₁ and k₂) calculated from the slopes of the plots in Figure 2. The breaking point (Qₜ), which corresponds to specific applied charge in the intersection of the two kinetics curves, is also presented.

Table 2. Experimental kinetics constants (k₁ and k₂) and specific applied charge at Qₜ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. num.</th>
<th>RO4</th>
<th>RO13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k₁</td>
<td>k₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A⁻¹·h⁻¹·L⁻¹)</td>
<td>(A⁻¹·h⁻¹·L⁻¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.6472</td>
<td>0.9601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>2.0689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.4823</td>
<td>1.2475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.0829</td>
<td>1.6737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4.7819</td>
<td>6.5492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4.9275</td>
<td>6.4995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>5.4539</td>
<td>5.4539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1.9294</td>
<td>4.1791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Tables 1 and 2, for a fixed dye concentration, the higher conductivity solutions are decoloured faster than the lower ones. The major content of salts increases the
electron transfer through the solution. The only exception is $k_2$ of experiments VI and VIII, where the pH effect or other factor interactions are probably more significant.

In addition, Figure 2 and Table 2 evidence that the decolouration kinetics is faster for diluted dye solution. For several experiments, two different decolouration kinetics rates were obtained, mainly in the case of the concentrated dye solutions. Up to 50% decolouration, the reaction occurs more slowly ($k_1$) and from this point, the kinetics become faster ($k_2$). It can be noted that some diluted dye solutions also showed two kinetics curves (low conductivity trials V and VII), although the two slopes are very similar. However, only one kinetics constant is observed at low dye concentration and high conductivity trials (VII and VIII). Kinetics constants $k_1$ and $k_2$ are modelled in section 3.2.

The different decolouration rates observed along the experiments can be attributed to a change in the mechanism of the dye oxidation. In order to verify whether the amount of oxidant species could cause this change in the mechanism, $Q_{11}$'s are also modeled in Section 3.3.

### 3.2 Modeling of decolouration kinetics constants

Kinetics constants $k_1$ and $k_2$ were modeled with respect to control factors: dye concentration, conductivity and pH ($\mu$, $C$ and $pH$). It was firstly necessary to elucidate if RO4 and RO13 showed significant differences and should be modeled together or separately.

A combined statistical study, which provided information on whether factors affect equally both dyes, was carried out. With this purpose, a special dummy variable, $DV$, was defined as follows: the value −1 was assigned to RO4 and +1 to RO13. For the combined dyes study, the $k_1$ and $k_2$ initial models were set, according to regression analysis, by means of the Eq. (2).

$$
\hat{k} = \beta_0 + \beta_C \cdot C + \beta_{pH} \cdot pH + \beta_\mu \cdot \mu + \beta_{C \cdot pH} \cdot C \cdot pH + \beta_{C \cdot \mu} \cdot C \cdot \mu + \beta_{pH \cdot \mu} \cdot pH \cdot \mu + \beta_\mu \cdot \mu^2 + \beta_{DV} \cdot DV
+ \beta_{pH \cdot DV} \cdot pH \cdot DV + \beta_{\mu \cdot DV} \cdot \mu \cdot DV + \beta_{C \cdot DV} \cdot C \cdot DV
$$

(2)
All $\beta$ coefficients were calculated using Microsoft Office Excel 2013. Coefficients with p-value > 0.05 were considered not significant and the corresponding terms were removed step by step. Then the model was recalculated with only the significant terms (stepwise regression). Results are shown in Table 3 and Table 4.

### Table 3. Results of Regression for $\tilde{k}_1$.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.9716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>0.9440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R square</td>
<td>0.9207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.8918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA OF REGRESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>160.8479</td>
<td>32.1696</td>
<td>40.4529</td>
<td>4.2031E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5428</td>
<td>0.7952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>170.3907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefs</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>t stat</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.8805</td>
<td>0.5361</td>
<td>10.9699</td>
<td>1.3058E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-3.9511</td>
<td>0.8153</td>
<td>-4.8462</td>
<td>4.0084E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C·pH</td>
<td>0.3087</td>
<td>0.0987</td>
<td>3.1263</td>
<td>8.7516E-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows that \( k_1 \) is independent on the dye, as the terms containing the dummy variable (DV) are not significant. Therefore, both dyes have the same behaviour at the beginning of the decolouration process. Results of regression analysis infer the \( k_1 \) model (\( \hat{k}_1 \)), as can be seen in Eq. (3).

\[
\hat{k}_1 = 5.8805 - 3.9511 \cdot C + 0.3087 \cdot C \cdot pH - 0.0348 \cdot C \cdot \mu - 0.0203 \cdot pH \cdot \mu + 0.0037 \cdot \mu^2 \quad (3)
\]

In this model, \( \hat{k}_1 \) depends on the dye concentration (C), the pH and the conductivity (\( \mu \)). The influence of \( d \) is both as individual factor and as an interaction with pH and conductivity. In addition, the conductivity also interacts with pH and presents a clear quadratic effect as individual factor. As the same model for \( \hat{k}_1 \) is applicable to the two dyes, it can be inferred that the reactive group is not relevant in this reaction step: the differences in their chemical structure do not have any influence in the initial decolouration process, before \( Q_0 \).

The influence of factors is shown in Figure 3 which corresponds to the response surfaces of \( \hat{k}_1 \) obtained from Eq. (3).
Figure 3. Response surfaces of $\hat{k}_1$ respect to the factors (conductivity and dye concentration) at pH = 5 and pH = 9.

As expected from the model equation, complex surface responses are obtained and it is difficult to evaluate graphically the influence on each factor. However, it can be seen that the kinetics behaviour is very dependent on the pH. At pH 5, higher conductivity and lower dye concentration provide faster decolouration whereas the effect of these factors is less remarkable at pH 9.

The $\hat{k}_2$ model was also obtained from Eq. (2). Results of regression are displayed in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Results of Regression for $\hat{k}_2$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA OF REGRESSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast with $k_1$, the dummy variable DV is present in the $k_2$ equation (Eq. (4))

$$k_2 = 6.7354 - 2.7367\cdot C + 0.1331\cdot \mu - 0.0147\cdot pH\cdot \mu + 0.0178\cdot \mu\cdot DV$$  (4)

The term $\mu\cdot DV$ in Eq. (4) indicates that the influence of conductivity is different for both dyes.

As a result, the following equations (Eq. (5) and (6)) are obtained:

RO4:  $k_2 = 6.7354 - 2.7367\cdot C + 0.1153\cdot \mu - 0.0147\cdot pH\cdot \mu$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

RO13: $k_2 = 6.7354 - 2.7367\cdot C + 0.1509\cdot \mu - 0.0147\cdot pH\cdot \mu$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

As can be seen, $k_2$ expressions are simpler than $k_1$. Both $k_2$, only show influence of dye concentration and conductivity as individual terms. The interaction of pH and $\mu$ was also found.

Moreover, it can be noted that both $k_2$ are very similar. There is only a slight difference in the individual conductivity term ($\mu$) whereas the rest of coefficients are identical. Surface responses at pH 5 and pH 9, obtained from Eq. (5) and Eq. (6), are plotted in Figure 4.
Figure 4. Response surfaces of $k_2$ with respect to the conductivity and dye concentration for dyes RO4 and RO13 at pH = 5 and pH = 9.

It can be seen that, for both dyes, the effect of conductivity on $k_2$ is rather small at pH 9 whereas a marked increase of $\mu$ influence is observed at pH 5.

To evaluate the adjustment of the obtained models, the experimental kinetics constants ($k_1$ and $k_2$) were compared in Figure 5 with the ones calculated from models ($\tilde{k}_1$ and $\tilde{k}_2$).
Figure 5. Comparison of experimental kinetic constants and modeled constants (a) $k_1$ and $\tilde{k}_1$ (b) $k_2$ and $\tilde{k}_2$.

As can be seen in Figure 5 a good correlation between the modeled and the experimental constants was generally observed. In some particular points (such as I and IV) there is a lower correlation degree for $k_1$. These points correspond to the slowest kinetics, which can probably occur through a different mechanism of reaction.

3.3 Modeling of specific applied charge at the breaking point $Q_B$

As indicated, the breaking point ($Q_B$) corresponds to specific applied charge in the intersection of the two kinetics curves. On the basis of the initial model indicated in section 3.2 (Eq. (2)), the $Q_B$ values were modelled. Results of stepwise regression for $\tilde{Q}_B$ are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of Regression for $\tilde{Q}_B$

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.9923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>0.9846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R square</td>
<td>0.9750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The presence of the term $\mu \cdot DV$ in Table 5 evidences a different effect of the conductivity on $Q_B$ for each dye. This implies that, as in the case of $k_2$, the $\tilde{Q}_B$ must be different for RO4 and RO13 (Eq. (7) and (8)).

\begin{align*}
\text{RO4:} \quad \tilde{Q}_B &= -0.0517 - 0.0404 \cdot C \cdot pH + 0.0397 \cdot \mu + 0.0683 \cdot C \cdot \mu - 0.0030 \cdot \mu^2 \quad (7) \\
\text{RO13:} \quad \tilde{Q}_B &= -0.0517 - 0.0404 \cdot C \cdot pH + 0.0451 \cdot \mu + 0.0683 \cdot C \cdot \mu - 0.0030 \cdot \mu^2 \quad (8)
\end{align*}
From Eq. (7) and (8) it can be stated that \( Q_B \) decreases when pH increases due to the effect of the interaction of dye concentration and pH, term \( C \cdot pH \) with negative coefficient. This effect is more significant for high dye concentration.

In addition, \( Q_B \) is highly influenced by the conductivity through a positive linear term, a negative quadratic term and a positive interaction with the dye concentration. It should be noted that the conductivity in this work is related to the NaCl concentration. The major dependence of \( Q_B \) on dye concentration and conductivity could be an expected result, as the dye electro-oxidation occurs through an indirect reaction with the oxidant species generated from the oxidation of chloride ions. Also the influence of pH is predictable due to its effect on equilibrium of the generated oxidant species.

Finally, the Figure 6 shows that a good correlation between \( \tilde{Q}_B \) and the experimental \( Q_B \) is generally observed.

**Figure 6.** Comparison between modeled and experimental \( Q_B \) values.

The relevance of \( Q_B \) in the progress of the decolouration evidences that there are different mechanisms of the decolouration reactions and that several factors are crucial in the progress of this type of reactions.
4. Conclusions

The decolouration kinetics curves of both reactive dyes, RO4 and RO13, based on pseudo-first order reactions were studied, according to specified conditions, using a $2^3$ experimental design with one central point. The experiments at low dye concentration and high conductivity exhibited only one kinetics constant, $k_1$, whereas the rest of experiments showed two different kinetics curves. In this case a breaking point was observed. This behaviour was attributed to a change in the decolouration mechanism.

The kinetics constants $k_1$ and $k_2$ were modeled and the corresponding surface responses were plotted. A unique model of $k_1$ was obtained for both dyes, whereas $k_2$ presented different models for RO4 and RO13 that show slight differences in the conductivity coefficient.

In the electrochemical decolouration of both dyes, the most influential factor in $k_1$ and $k_2$ models is the dye concentration. The other studied factors (conductivity and pH) are also significant, either individually or through different interactions.

Finally, the specific applied charges at the breaking point, $Q_b$, were also modeled. As expected, conductivity was found to be the main factor in the model equation as this parameter plays an important role in the generation of oxidant species during the electrochemical treatment.
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