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ABSTRACT

The physicochemical analysis of surface water of Mooi and Vaal rivers network indicated that the concentration of iron was far above the required limit by the South Africa water regulation. In this study, brewing waste was used as biosorbent for the removal of iron from synthetic solution to develop strategies for remediation of Mooi and Vaal rivers network pollution. X-ray diffraction (XRD), Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) and scanning electron microscope (SEM), were used for the characterisation of the sorbent. BET was calculated using nitrogen and carbon dioxide adsorption data. Batch tests were conducted to evaluate the influence of sorbent concentration and pre-treatment on the iron removal. The brewing waste showed a removal percentage of 93% with residual iron concentration of 2.6 mg L$^{-1}$ while the acid pre-treated brewing waste indicated 98% removal and 0.6 mg L$^{-1}$ residual iron concentration. The adsorption equilibrium, based on correlation coefficients, was best described by Dubinin-Radushkevich and Langmuir, for raw and acid pre-treated brewing waste, respectively. The kinetic data were best described by pseudo-first-order with correlation coefficients ($R^2$) of 0.9898 and 0.9968 for both raw and acid pre-treated brewing waste, respectively. The mass transfer coefficient indicates the intraparticle diffusion controls the rate of sorption of iron in this study.
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INTRODUCTION

The increasing rate of industrialisation in many developing countries has led to diverse challenges in water management particularly in mineral processing industry. Since the inception of 21st century, communities have started experiencing water crisis due to poor water management, population growth and industrialisation. Mining activity is responsible for most of the toxic industrial wastewater due to direct discharge of partially treated wastewater into fresh water bodies, and could leach into the water table thereby contaminating the groundwater. Hence, the need for proper treatment of wastewater before it is discharged into the environment. This will protect the environment and secures public health.

South Africa is well known for its abundance of mineral resources. It is considered as the 5th largest mining sector in terms of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) contribution [1].

A recent study on the surface water in the vicinity of Potchefstroom, South Africa showed the proliferation of diverse contaminants above the government required limit [2]. The concentration of iron was found to be 36 mg L$^{-1}$ contrary to the South African national standard for drinking water [3] –2.0 mg L$^{-1}$ and guidelines for drinking water quality by World Health Organisation [4] –0.1 mg L$^{-1}$. This high concentration of iron in the surface water makes it unfit for both human and animal consumption.

Several conventional methods for removal of pollutants from water includes sedimentation, coagulation and flocculation, ion-exchange, filtration, membrane filtration and reverse osmosis, amongst other technologies [5,6]. However, these methods often generate large amount of waste products that requires further treatment before disposal, high energy consumption, including cost implication when treating large volume of wastewater containing low concentrations of pol-
lutants make them unsuitable on a large scale [7]. Biosorption has been shown as a potential alternative to the conventional methods of removing heavy metals from wastewater due to its robustness and environmental benignity [8]. Biological materials are known to have affinity for heavy metals owing to their metal binding capacities [7]. Thus, the application of food industry residues like sorghum beer processing waste; which is available in large volume is a promising biosorbent for the removal of heavy metals such as iron. Generally, brewing waste consists of cell wall debris, plumule, malt bark, coagulated protein, including high fibre content which are often use for animal nutrition [9]. In South Africa, sorghum beer industry has experienced significant increase in participation especially in the last decade resulting in major rise of the residue [10]. The availability of these brewing waste in South Africa could therefore provide a potential low cost solution for the treatment of polluted water.

Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate the sorption capacity of sorghum brewing waste for the removal of iron from synthetic solution prepared based on the results from the physicochemical analysis of the surface water in the vicinity of Potchefstroom. X-ray Diffraction (XRD), Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) and scanning electron microscopy (SEM), as well as nitrogen and carbon dioxide, Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface area analyses were used for the characterisation of the sorbent.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemicals and reagents
Iron (II) sulphate heptahydrate (FeSO₄·7H₂O, ≥98.0%) was used for preparation of 40 mg Fe²⁺ L⁻¹, in distilled water. This solution was designated work-solution. The work-solution pH was adjusted using 1 mol L⁻¹ HCl and 1 mol L⁻¹ NaOH. All reagents were of analytical grade and were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Modderfontein, South Africa).

Preparation and characterisation of biosorbent
Sorghum brewing waste (BW) was collected in a nearby brewing in Potchefstroom, South Africa. The High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) analysis of the BW showed that the waste is composed of hydrocarbon (6.27%), fat (1.58%) and protein (0.41%). The BW was washed in tap water in batch mode several times with constant manual stirring to remove possible impurities. Afterwards, the BW was washed with distilled water three times in batch mode and dried in an oven at 80°C for 24 h to remove excess water. Half of the BW was pre-treated by 2 mol L⁻¹ H₂SO₄ in order to remove sugars and protein from the structure and possibly increase the surface area of the biomaterial. This pre-treated BW was denoted PBW. The dried samples were pulverised into particle size between 0.85 to 1.18 mm prior to usage.

The Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface area and pore size distribution of the samples were calculated using the nitrogen and carbon dioxide adsorption isotherm for mesopores and micropores measurement, respectively on a Micromeritics ASAP 2020 surface area and porosity analyser using a previously described approach, except that the samples were degassed under vacuum at 60°C for 48 hours [11]. The density measurements were done in a Quantachrome Steropycnometer, using helium gas at an outlet pressure of 134 kPa in a 10 cm³ sample cell. Before actual measurement, samples were dried in oven at 105°C for 12 h for complete removal of moisture and any volatile compounds. The surface structure and morphology were characterised by VEGA3 Scanning Electron Microscopy (TESCAN, Brno, The Czech Republic) at different magnifications. Cary 630 Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, USA) was used to determine the main functional groups present on the surface of the samples before and after the biosorption process, including the Supernova XRD (Agilent Technologies) examination, for structural and compositional changes in physical properties of the sorbent.

Biosorption experiments
Batch experiments were carried out in 250 mL Erlenmeyer flasks, where 50 mL of the work-solution was in contact with sorbents in mass ranging from 0.2 to 1.0 g (dry weight). After adding the sorbent, the pH was adjusted to 5 ± 0.2 using 1 mol L⁻¹ HCl and 1 mol L⁻¹ NaOH. The flasks were agitated for 2 h at 30 ± 0.2°C on an orbital shaker at 150 rpm. After this, the solutions were filtered through 0.45 μm filter paper and the final pH was measured. The residual concentration of Fe (II) were quantified by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (ICP-OES) (Agilent Technologies). All experiments were performed in triplicate. The batch kinetic experiments for the removal of Fe (II) were performed in three replicates. 500 mL Erlenmeyer flasks containing 200 mL work-solution and 1 g of sorbent. The flasks were agitated for 10 h at 30 ± 0.2°C on a shaking incubator at 150 rpm. Samples were taken at intervals, filtered and analysed for the residual concentration of Fe (II) using ICP-OES. A blank sample without adsorbent was used as control in all cases.
Theory

The amount of metal sorbed per gram of sorbent and the percentage removal were estimated using the equations below:

$$q_e = \left( C_o - C_e \right) \frac{V}{m}$$  
\hspace{1cm} (1)

$$\text{Removal} (\%) = \frac{C_o - C_e}{C_o} \times 100$$  
\hspace{1cm} (2)

where $C_o$ and $C_e$ are the metal ions concentrations in mg L$^{-1}$ initially and at equilibrium, respectively, $q_e$ is the equilibrium adsorption capacity (mg g$^{-1}$), $m$ is the dry weight of biosorbent (g), and $V$ is the work-solution volume (mL).

Sorption isotherm

Different isotherm models have been used to describe sorption equilibrium for wastewater treatment. Langmuir, Freundlich, Flory-Huggins, and Dubinin-Radushkevich isotherm models are being used for the present work.

Langmuir isotherm model

The Langmuir isotherm describes the monolayer adsorption onto a homogeneous surface without interaction between sorbed molecules [12]. The linear form of Langmuir isotherms is written as

$$\frac{C_e}{q_e} = \frac{1}{K_L q_m} + \frac{1}{q_m}$$
\hspace{1cm} (3)

where $q_m$ is the monolayer biosorption capacity on biosorbent (mg g$^{-1}$) and $K_L$ is the Langmuir constant (L mg$^{-1}$). The values of $K_L$ and $q_m$ can be determined from linear plot of $C_e/q_e$ and $C_e$. The Langmuir isotherm parameters can be used to predict the affinity of the sorbent for the sorbate using the dimensionless separation factor $R_L$ as expressed in the equation below [13].

$$R_L = \frac{1}{1 + K_L C_o}$$
\hspace{1cm} (4)

The value of separation factor is between 0 and 1 for favourable adsorption while $R_L > 1$ represents unfavourable adsorption, $R_L = 1$ represents linear adsorption, and $R_L = 0$ represents irreversible adsorption process.

Freundlich isotherm model

The Freundlich isotherm describes sorption equilibrium on a heterogeneous surfaces and the linear form is represented as

$$\log q_e = \log K_F + \frac{1}{n} \log C_e$$
\hspace{1cm} (5)

where $n$ is the sorption intensity of the sorbent and $K_F$ is the Freundlich constant. $K_F$ and $1/n$ are evaluated from the intercept and slope of the plot of $\log q_e$ versus $\log C_e$, respectively.

Flory-Huggins isotherm model

The Flory-Huggins model is used to estimate the number of metal ions occupying sorption sites. The linear form is written as [14]:

$$\log \frac{\phi}{C_o} = \log K_{FH} + n \log (1 - \phi)$$
\hspace{1cm} (6)

where $\phi = (1 - C_e / C_o)$ is the degree of coverage, $n$ is the number of metal ions occupying sorption sites and $K_{FH}$ is the Flory-Huggins constant. $K_{FH}$ and $n$ are determined from the intercept and slope of the plot of $\log \frac{\phi}{C_o}$ versus $\log (1 - \phi)$, respectively.

Dubinin-Radushkevich isotherm model

The Dubinin-Radushkevich (D-R) isotherm assumes the characteristics of the sorption curve is related to the porosity of the biosorbent. This model allows for the estimation of mean energy of sorption. The linear form is written as [15]:

$$\ln q_e = \ln Q_D - 2B_DRT \ln \left(1 + 1 / C_e \right)$$
\hspace{1cm} (7)

where $Q_D$ is the maximum biosorption capacity (mol g$^{-1}$), $B_D$ is the D-R model constant (kJ mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$), $T$ is the absolute temperature (K) and $R$ is the gas constant (kJ mol$^{-1}$). The value of $B_D$ and $Q_D$ is estimated from the slope and intercept of the plot $\ln q_e$ versus $\ln (1 + 1 / C_e)$, respectively. The mean energy of sorption $E$ (kJ mol$^{-1}$) is evaluated from the relation [16]:

$$E = 1 / \sqrt{2B_D}$$
\hspace{1cm} (8)
**Sorption kinetics**
In order to predict the sorption kinetic models of Fe (II), pseudo-first-order and pseudo-second-order kinetic models were applied to the data.

**Pseudo-first-order kinetic model**
The linearised form of pseudo-first-order equation can be written as [17]:

$$\log\left(q_e - q_t\right) = \log\left(q_e\right) - \frac{k_1}{2.303}t$$  \(9\)

where \(q_t\) is the amount of metal uptake per mass of sorbent at any time (mg g\(^{-1}\)) and \(k_1\) is the rate constant (min\(^{-1}\)) which can be calculated from the slope of the plot of \(\log\left(q_e - q_t\right)\) versus time.

**Pseudo-second-order kinetic model**
The pseudo-second-order kinetic model is represented as follows [12,18]:

$$\frac{t}{q_t} = \frac{1}{k_2q_e^2} + \frac{t}{q_e}$$  \(10\)

where \(h = k_2q_e^2\) is the initial sorption rate and \(k_2\) is the rate constant. \(k_2\) and \(h\) can be determined by plotting \(t/q_t\) against \(t\).

**Mass transfer analysis**
The uptake of pollutant from the sorbate (liquid phase) to the sorbent (solid phase) is carried out by transfer of mass from former to the latter. According to the McKay et al. model, three steps are involved in the sorption process, namely [19]:

1. Mass transfer of the sorbate from the liquid phase onto the solid surface;
2. Sorption of solute onto the surface sites; and
3. Internal diffusion of solute via either a pore diffusion model or homogeneous solid-phase diffusion model.

In this study, step (2) was assumed quick enough with respect to other steps and thus it is not rate limiting in the kinetic study. The McKay et al. (1981) [19] model equation (11) below was used for the mass transfer analysis.

$$\ln\left(\frac{C_t}{C_o}\right) = \ln\left(\frac{mK}{1 + mK}\right) - \left(1 + \frac{mK}{mK}\right) \times \beta_L S \times t$$  \(11\)

where \(m\) is the mass of biosorbent per unit volume, \(K = K_{Lq}m\) from Langmuir constant, \(\beta_L\) (cm s\(^{-1}\)) is the mass transfer coefficient and \(S_s\) (cm\(^{-1}\)) is the outer specific surface of the biosorbent particles per unit volume of the particle-free slurry. The value of \(\beta_L\) can be calculated from the slope of the plot of \(ln(C_t / C_o - 1/(1+mK))\) versus t (min). The \(S_s\) is calculated from the equation [19]:

$$S_s = \frac{6m}{d \rho (1-\varepsilon)}$$  \(12\)

where \(d\) is the diameter (cm), \(\rho\) is the density (g cm\(^{-3}\)) and \(\varepsilon\) is the porosity of the biosorbent.

**Intraparticle diffusion model**
During batch operation, there was possibility of transport of sorbate species into the pores of brewing waste, which is often the rate controlling step. Intraparticle diffusion plot can be used to identify the mechanism involved in the adsorption process. The intraparticle diffusion model is given by the equation [12]:

$$q_t = k_{id}t^{0.5} + C$$  \(13\)

where \(C\) is the intercept and \(k_{id}\) is the intraparticle diffusion rate constant (mg g\(^{-1}\) min\(^{-0.5}\)) estimated from the slope of plot \(q_t\) versus \(t^{0.5}\).

**Elovich kinetic equation**
The Elovich equation is usually used to determine the kinetics of chemisorption of gases onto heterogeneous solids and lately, it has been used to describe the sorption of pollutants from aqueous solution [12,18]. The Elovich kinetic equation is written as:

$$\frac{dq_t}{dt} = \gamma \exp\left(-aq_t\right)$$  \(14\)

where \(q_t\) is the sorption capacity at time \(t\) (mg g\(^{-1}\)), \(\gamma\) is the initial adsorption rate (mg g\(^{-1}\) min\(^{-1}\)) and \(a\) is the desorption constant. To simplify equation (14), it is assumed that \(\gamma \gg 1\). And by integrating and applying boundary conditions \(q_t = 0\) at \(t = 0\) and \(q_t = q_t\) at \(t = t\), equation (14) becomes

$$q_t = \gamma \ln\left(a\gamma\right) + \gamma \ln\left(t\right)$$  \(15\)

The plot of \(q_t\) versus \(\ln(t)\) gives a straight line from which \(\gamma\) and \(a\) can be obtained from slope and interception, respectively.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Biosorbent characterisation

The pre-treatment resulted in increase in the density and mesopore surface area, including the pore volume of the sample as seen in Table 1. However, there was reduction in the micropore surface area. Generally, there are not many pores in brewing waste, which substantiate its low surface area as supported by previous findings [20,21]. Figure 1 shows the micrographs of biosorbents with rough surfaces and few number of pores for both BW and PBW, before and after biosorption. The cross section shows irregular hole distributions in BW and PBW. Figure IC and D show that the iron has occupied all the pores in both samples, including part of the rough surface of BW.

The FTIR spectra show the complex nature of brewing waste before and after biosorption process, a confirmation of several functional groups such as hydroxyl, amino and amide functional groups, including carboxyl; with potential to interact with metal ions (Fig. 2). The peak shows that the acid treatment results in changes in chemical structure of the brewing waste. It is observed that both spectra of BW and PBW have peaks at 1,278 and 1,651 cm⁻¹ corresponding to the carbonyl group (C=O) stretching vibration in aldehydes, ethers, ketones and carboxylic acids, including the carbonyl group in aromatic rings found in lignin [22,23].

Also, peaks at 2,923.89 and 2,853.64 cm⁻¹ conform to C-H stretching vibrations in aliphatic chains belonging to the cellulose, hemicellulose or lignin. The highest peak on both BW and PBW spectra was observed at 3,290.08 cm⁻¹ which is typical of N-H (3,300–3,350 cm⁻¹) and H-O (3,200–3,600 cm⁻¹) stretching vibration in aldehydes, ethers, ketones and carboxylic acids, including the carbonyl group in aromatic rings found in lignin [22,23].

The X-ray diffraction patterns (Fig. 3) of BW and PBW before and after biosorption process show similar characteristic major peak from 15° to 35° 2θ, an indication of the presence of amorphous silica which agrees with previous report on brewing waste [25,26]. The acid treatment of brewing waste caused an increase in intensity and subsequent high percentage of silica as proposed in previous study [27]. Other components such as ethy-dimethylamino-methyl-carboxylate, benzo-alpha-pyrene, poly (ethylene terephthalate) and heneicosane, including p-diethylaminophenyl, were found to be significantly low. The XRD confirms the crystallinity of the iron on brewing waste.

Effect of biosorbent dosage

Several factors such as temperature, pH, initial metal ions concentration and biomass concentration; are known to affect the biosorption process. In order to mimic conditions in the surface water sample, temperature, pH and metal ion concentration in solution were kept constant, only the effect of biosorbent dosage on the biosorption process was examined and the results shown in Fig. 4. The increase in iron removal is proportional to the biosorbent dosage until it reaches 12 g L⁻¹ of PBW. This performance can be attributed to higher mesopores surface area and accessibility of more active sites for sorption [20].

In addition, when biomass concentration is low, the metal ion can reach the cellular part, which in turns facilitate the metal ion concentration gradient [22]. Thus, an increase in biosorbent dosage decreases the amount of metal ion sorbed per unit mass (q), leading to the reduction in removal efficiency. However, for BW there was a steady increase in Fe (II) sorbed until it reached 16 g L⁻¹ when it could no longer sorb the metal ion. The highest Fe (II) removal was 75% and 98% for BW and PBW, respectively. The lower removal
efficiency in BW could be attributed to the lower surface area and higher biosorbent dosage. Comparatively, different efficiency of Fe (II) removal have been reported for several adsorbent. For instance, rice husk ash – 70% [28], maize cob – 48% [29], coconut coir fibre – 59% [30], dried biomass of activated sludge – 95% [31], cucumis melo rind – 98% [23]. Generally, the physical nature and pre-treatment method plays a major role in the variation of metal ion adsorbed. Furthermore, high biosorbent dosage are known to cause cell agglomeration and subsequent reduction in intercellular distance, which guarantees an excellent electrostatic interaction between the cells during biosorption [32]. Another factor of great importance in biosorption of metal ion is pH. The solution pH directly affect the competitive ability of hydrogen ions with metal ions for the active sites on the biosorbent surface [33]. It was observed that the decrease in pH is proportional to the increase in biosorbent dosage. At low pH, the adsorption of metal ion is low due to hydrogen ion competition and lower surface area of BW, thus the lower removal efficiency of Fe (II) at the later stage of the biosorption process [34,35].

**Sorption isotherms**

The adsorption isotherms parameters are shown in Table 2. The biosorption of Fe (II) in this study is well described by linear form of D-R isotherm model on BW with $R^2$ value

---

**Fig. 1** Scanning electron micrograph image before adsorption; BW (A) and PBW (B) and after adsorption BW (C) and PBW (D).
of 0.997 while linearised Langmuir isotherm model fitted well on PBW with $R^2$ value of 0.975, which supported the monolayer sorption. The Langmuir model is based on the assumptions that: (1) the adsorption is limited to the formation of a monolayer, (2) all binding sites possess an equal affinity for the adsorbate, (3) the number of adsorbed species does not exceed the total number of surface sites, and (4) there is a finite number of uniform adsorption between adsorbed species [36]. These assumptions may not be true for most complex systems involving biological materials. Nonetheless, the separation factor for both BW and PBW is between 0 and 1, which is an indication of a favourable biosorption process [34]. Also, Table 2 shows that both BW and PBW have similar affinity for Fe (II) but BW has higher Fe (II)

Fig. 2 FTIR spectra of brewing waste before (A) and after (B) adsorption of iron.
maximum uptake capacity ($q_m = 1.769$ mg g$^{-1}$). The observed decrease in brewing metal uptake capacity resulting from acid pre-treatment could be as a result of structural and/or chemical changes interfering in quantity and availability of biosorbent biding sites. Meanwhile, acid pre-treatment of banana trunk fibers resulted in improved uptake of Fe(II) from 2.42 to 2.45 mg g$^{-1}$ described by Freundlich isotherm model [37]. The Freundlich isotherm model is a demonstration of multilayer sorption process with an adsorption intensity ($1/n$) less than 1 for both BW and PBW, which suggests the physical adsorption of Fe (II) on the brewing waste [20,28]. In summary, both Langmuir and Freundlich models fitted well the experimental biosorption equilibrium data, similar to the earlier report of biosorption of Fe (II) on brewing waste [20]. The D-R model was included to elucidate the adsorption energy. The high $Q_D$ in PBW indicates high sorption capacity compared with BW. The mean sorption energy $E$ gives information about biosorption mechanism. If $E < 8$ kJ mol$^{-1}$, the biosorption process is physically driven, if $E$ value is between 8 kJ mol$^{-1}$ and 16 kJ mol$^{-1}$, the biosorption process

Fig. 3 XRD spectra of brewing waste before (A) and after (B) adsorption of iron.
is chemically driven, and if $E > 16 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$, diffusion has more significance in the biosorption process [34]. The mean sorption energy for BW and PBW indicates diffusion is most prominent in the biosorption of Fe (II) on brewing waste.

Statistically, at 95% confidence level, the T test showed that there was no significant difference between the experimental data and model parameters of Langmuir and Freundlich, although the $R^2$ values differ for both BW and PBW. Meanwhile, experimental data of Flory-Huggins and Dubinin-Radushkevich models, fitted best on BW with deviation of

**Fig. 4** Removal of iron for (A) different concentration of biosorbent; $C_o = 40 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ and (B) final pH of the solution; $pH_{\text{initial}} = 5 \pm 0.2$. 
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2.2% and 1.6%, respectively. IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software v24.0 was deployed for the statistical analyses.

**Biosorption kinetics**

Figure 5 shows the removal of Fe (II) over time by 5 g L\(^{-1}\) brewing waste. The Fe (II) removal increases steadily in the first few hours, reaching equilibrium at about 240 min of contact with BW and increased rapidly in the last 200 min of contact to a maximum removal of 93% of Fe (II). In the case of PBW, there was rapid increase in Fe (II) sorption at the initial stage up to 90 min until it reached equilibrium at approximately 120 min but became slow at the later stage until it attained maximum removal of 98% of Fe (II). Different equilibrium time have been reported for different biological materials for the removal of Fe (II) from aqueous solutions. Equilibration time of 120, 45, 60, 150 and 360 minutes were reported for removal of Fe (II) using rice husk ash, cucumis melo rind, orange peel, dried biomass of activated sludge and chitosan, respectively [23,28,31,34,38]. The higher adsorption rate in PBW could be due to the higher number of active sites at the beginning as shown by BET characterisation in Table 1. Statistically, there were no significant difference (p<0.05) between the sorption by BW and PBW.

The values of the model parameters for the pseudo-first-order and pseudo-second-order kinetics modelling of Fe (II) biosorption on BW and PBW are presented in Table 3. It was observed that the acid pre-treated brewing waste (PBW) \((R^2 = 0.997)\) gave a better fit than raw brewing waste (BW) \((R^2 = 0.990)\) in pseudo-first-order while BW \((R^2 = 0.966)\) is better fitted in pseudo-second-order than PBW \((R^2 = 0.936)\). In both cases, rate constants \((k_1\) and \(k_2\)) were calculated from the linearised form of their respective equations (9) and (10).

From pseudo-second-order, it could be assumed that the rate limiting step of Fe (II) unto brewing waste is chemisorption. Equilibrium concentration of Fe (II) predicted by pseudo-second-order kinetic model agrees well with the experimental value for PBW \((q_{exp} = 7.8\) mg g\(^{-1}\)) than BW \((q_{exp} = 7.4\) mg g\(^{-1}\)). Fontana et al. (2018) [20] had earlier reported similar trend on Fe (II) adsorption on brewing waste with high correlation coefficients on both pseudo-first-order and pseudo-second-order, which further confirms the potential of this industrial waste for Fe (II) biosorption [31].

The constants \(\gamma\) (initial sorption rate) and \(a\) (desorption capacity) obtained from slope and intercept of the linearised Elovich equation plot for Fe (II) sorption on for BW and PBW is shown in Table 3. The model fits fairly well with the experimental data with a better correlation coefficient \((R^2 = 0.881)\) and initial sorption rate \((\gamma = 2.6\) mg g\(^{-1}\) min\(^{-1}\)) for PBW. This good fit has been confirmed in study by [31] and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isotherm parameters</th>
<th>BW</th>
<th>PBW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Langmuir</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q_m)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K_L)</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R_L)</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freundlich</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/n)</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K_F)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flory-Huggins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K_{FH})</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dubinin-Radushkevich</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q_D)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B_D)</td>
<td>7.69 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.13 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2** Coefficients of isotherm models for iron removal. [Contact time = 10 h, pH = 5\(\pm0.2\), 30 °C, 150 rpm]
which reaffirms that the Fe (II) adsorption on brewing waste is heterogeneous to a great extent. Proper understanding of mass transfer mechanisms would aid effective design of the adsorption system. The first portion with higher slope, often represent the external surface biosorption stage, the second stage corresponds to the gradual biosorption stage where intraparticle diffusion is rate controlling, and lastly, the third stage represents the equilibrium where the intraparticle diffusion slows down as a result of low solute concentration in the solution [22]. The intraparticle diffusion rate constants were calculated from the slope of the second phase of the plots of intraparticle diffusion of Fe (II) sorption on BW and PBW and are presented in Table 3. The intercept, which corresponds to the thickness

\[ C_0 = 40 \text{ mg L}^{-1}, \; \text{pH}_{\text{initial}} = 5 \pm 0.2, \; 30 ^\circ \text{C}, \; 150 \text{ rpm}, \; \text{biosorbent dosage} = 5 \text{ g L}^{-1} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 5} \; \text{Fe (II) biosorption over time on brewing waste (BW) and pre-treated brewing waste (PBW).} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinetic parameter</th>
<th>BW</th>
<th>PBW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo first-order model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_1 ) (min(^{-1}))</td>
<td>7.00 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>9.90 \times 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q_e ) (mg g(^{-1}))</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo second-order model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2 ) (g mg(^{-1}) min(^{-1}))</td>
<td>2.90 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>5.60 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( q_e ) (mg g(^{-1}))</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elovich model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma ) (mg g(^{-1}) min(^{-1}))</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a ) (mg g(^{-1}) min(^{-1}))</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraparticle diffusion model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{id} ) (mg g(^{-1}) min(^{-0.5}))</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass transfer model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_L ) (cm s(^{-1}))</td>
<td>1.38 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>1.80 \times 10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_L ) (cm(^{-1}))</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the boundary layer was estimated as 1.889 mg g\(^{-1}\) and 0.82 mg g\(^{-1}\) for BW and PBW, respectively. This implies that surface sorption contributed more to the rate controlling step in BW than in PBW, as shown by previous study on biosorption of Fe (II) [20,34].

The values of mass transfer coefficients (\(\beta_L\)) derived from slope and intercept of the mass transfer plot for Fe (II) sorption on BW and PBW using equation (11) are presented in Table 3. The correlation coefficients were almost similar for both adsorbent; BW (\(R^2 = 0.936\)) and PBW (\(R^2 = 0.931\)). The mass transfer coefficients obtained shows that the rate of mass transfer from the work-solution to the brewing waste surface was quite fast, and thus cannot be considered as the rate limiting step. The deviation of some points on the plot from linearity indicates varying extent of mass transfer in the initial and final stages of the biosorption process [39].

### CONCLUSION

Sorghum brewing waste was characterised to study its application in biosorption of Fe (II) in aqueous solution, for implementation in the remediation of surface water pollution in the vicinity of Potchefstroom. The study illustrates the importance of adsorption diffusion, reaction kinetics and mass transfer models in the sorption of Fe (II) on to the studied biosorbent. The specific surface area (mesopores) and total pore volume of the biosorbent improved with the acid pre-treatment. The acid pre-treated brewing waste was able to reduce the iron concentration to acceptable standard. The sorption isotherms based on correlation coefficient is best fitted with D-R model and Langmuir model for BW and PBW, respectively. The kinetic parameters fitted to five kinetic models were better described by pseudo-first-order and pseudo-second-order, as evident from the correlation coefficients. The mass transfer from the work-solution to the surface of the brewing waste particles was fast and cannot be rate limiting step. However, the intraparticle diffusion was very low and thus rate limiting step, and therefore controls the biosorption of Fe (II) in this study.
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