Nitrate reduction in real mine water using zero-valent iron (ZVI) and iron waste

Daniela V. Lopes¹, Mika Sillanpää^{1,2}, Christian Wolkersdorfer^{1,3}

 ¹Laboratory of Green Chemistry, Faculty of Technology, Lappeenranta University of Technology, Sammonkatu 12, 50130 Mikkeli, Filand, dvrlopes@gmail.com
 ²Department of Civil and Evironmental Engineering, Florida International University, Miami, FL 33174, USA, Mika.Sillanpaa@lut.fi
 ³Tshwane University of Technology (TUT), Faculty of Science, Department of Environmental Water and Earth Science, Private Bag X680, Pretoria 0001, South Africa, Christian@Wolkersdorfer.info

Abstract

Nitrate is present in blasting agents used by the mining industry and thus can contaminate mine water. Despite several methodologies that have been applied for the removal of nitrate, many approaches produce harmful by-products such as nitrite, and other technologies have disadvantages, such as the high energetic costs and high biomass production.

In this study, the three iron sources (ZVI) iron nanoparticles, iron powder and iron waste from a mold industry were used for the reduction of nitrates from mine water. By performing a pH and iron dosages optimization with iron powder, pH 2 showed to be the only pH capable of reducing nitrate from a range of 2 to 4. The use of 4 g/L and 20 g/L of iron nanoparticles and iron powder, respectively, reduced nitrate completely in 180 and 270 min. The iron waste tested reduced 53% and 44% for washed and unwashed iron surface of the waste, respectively, showing that the waste does not have many impurities that could affect the experiment. In spite of the surface area being determinant for choosing the load of iron and for showing the kinetics of the reaction, it proved that the type of by-product formed at the end of the chemical reduction of nitrate is not relevant. The main by-product generated was NH₄⁺ and < 7% of NO₂⁻ was produced.

The iron waste showed to be an interesting source of iron for this environmental application. This is true not only from an economical point of view but as a greener approach since a waste is used as a raw material instead of promoting the production of other materials for mine water remediation.

Key words: nitrate, zero-valent iron, iron waste, real mine water

Introduction

Eutrophication and Methemoglobinemia are some of the main concerns related to the existence of nitrogenous compounds in water (Rocca et al., 2007). Mine water has been polluted with nitrogenous species because the mining industry blasting agents composed of ammonium nitrate fuel oil (ANFO). Part of the detonated explosives is leached into the water, increasing the concentrations of nitrate, NO_3^- , and ammonia or ammonium, NH_3/NH_4^+ (Gusek and Figuera, 2009). Around 300 mg/L of NO_3^- can be found in mine waters; nevertheless there is a lack of regulations regarding mine water discharge into water courses (Häyrynen et al., 2009).

Nitrate removal technologies include biological approaches (Koren et al., 2000), ion exchange resins (Hekmatzadeh et al., 2013), membrane processes (Häyrynen et al., 2009) and more recently electrochemical methods (Govindan et al., 2015). However, these methods still have some drawbacks like the elevated biomass production in the biological methods, high costs and membrane fouling in membrane processes. The main difficulty regarding the electrochemical approach is related to the production of by-products such as nitrite, NO_2^- , with a high toxicity associated and some ammonia, NH_3 .

Iron in the metallic form, Fe^0 , very well known as zero-valent iron (ZVI), can be employed for the removal of various contaminants such as metals, dyes or chlorinated compounds. Permeable reactive

barriers (PRBs) are used for *in-situ* treatments with high efficiencies for pollutants removal. ZVI can be synthesized by chemical precipitation with NaBH₄ or by using polyphenols from prolyphenol rich media (e.g. tea extracts), between several other methodologies. This technology is simple and effective for several applications due to high reactivity in reducing species, like NO₃⁻.

The aim of the present study was to use three types of ZVI for the NO_3^- reduction of mine water: iron nanoparticles, iron powder and an iron waste from a mold industry. Thus, it will be ascertained if a waste can be used for the depollution of mine water contaminated with NO_3^- .

Methods

Samples were taken from a phosphate mine located in the center of Finland. The water was analyzed on site regarding pH (intelliCALTM pHC101 probe), redox potential (intelliCALTM REDOX MTC101 probe) and electrical conductivity (intelliCALTM CDC401 probe); all measured with a Hach HQ40d handheld device. Other parameters were measured in a commercial laboratory, Ramboll Analytics (Table 1). Three types of ZVI were used for NO₃⁻ reduction: commercial iron nanoparticles used as a slurry (Nanofer Star product; Feⁿ) from NanoIron, s.r.o.; iron powder, -325 mesh (Fe^p) and iron waste from a mold industry (Fe^w). Parameters such as pH and ZVI dosage were optimized using Fe^p as a first approach. Thus, the experiments were performed in a 500 mL closed reactor under stirring conditions with an incubator shaker (IKA KS 4000 I control) where mine water was previously degassed with N₂. Initial pH ranges tested were 2, 3 and 4, and Fe^p was tested in different dosages (0.8 g – 8 g), during 3 h of reaction time, where samples were taken during time and filtered (cellulose acetate membrane, 0.2 µm). The other two types of ZVI were used as a final step for comparison purposes.

The three sources of iron were analyzed for their BET surface area (Brunauer-Emmett-Teller specific surface area) by a Micromeritics, Gemini V device. Iron nanoparticles were observed by transmission electron microscopy (TEM), with a HT7700 120 kV High-Contrast/High-Resolution Digital TEM. The nanoparticles were sonicated for 30 min after the addition of ethanol and 1-buthanol before being placed in the TEM grid.

Parameter	Result	Parameter	Result	Parameter	Result
$\mathrm{pH}_{\mathrm{field}}$	7.80	Mg ²⁺	19	Hg	< 0.0001
EC (µS/cm)	1057	Ca ²⁺	100	Со	0.00077
Redox (mV)	427	\mathbf{K}^+	65	Cr	< 0.001
Fe _{Total}	0.036	Na ⁺	76	Cu	< 0.001
N _{Total}	36	Cl	30	Pb	< 0.0005
$\mathrm{NH_4^+}$	0.00645	F	1.10	Mn	0.015
NO ₃ -	160	Al	< 0.01	Ni	< 0.001
NO ₂ -	0.067	As	< 0.001	Si	5.60
PO4 ³⁻	0.030	Ва	0.091	Zn	< 0.005
SO4 ²⁻	200	Cs	< 0.001	U	0.0068

 Table 1 Parameters analyzed in the mine water (October 2014). Values measured in mg/L and redox potential was corrected to the SHE. EC: electrical conductivity.

pH optimization

An initial pH range of 2 - 4 was chosen to react with Fe^p, since it has been proven that acidic cleaning of the ZVI surface avoids an oxide layer to be formed around the metallic Fe⁰-core. When the pH increases, the oxide coating formed is no longer dissolved and the shell of oxides will remain on the surface of ZVI, decreasing the efficiency of the chemical reduction (Huang and Zhang, 2004; Yang and Lee, 2005). After the pH adjustment, this parameter was not controlled any more. The pH showed to be a critical parameter, since the reduction of NO₃⁻ requires very acid conditions of pH 2 (Figure 1) in order to obtain a decrease of NO₃⁻ from 160 mg/L to 86.5 mg/L during the firsts 5 min of reaction. After 180 min, the efficiency of NO₃⁻-reduction reached 0.4 mg/L (99.7% of reduction). However, at the initial pH values of 3 and 4, the effect of pH on the NO₃⁻-reduction was almost negligible. This result might possibly be associated with the fast increase of pH during the reaction, due to the production of OH⁻-ions (Eq. 1), also promoting the formation of FeO in the surface of the ZVI (Choe et al., 2004; Yang and Lee, 2005), since the pH increased up to 7.3 and 9.0 when the initial one was at 3 and 4, respectively.



$$4 \text{ Fe}^{0} + \text{NO}_{3}^{-} + 7 \text{ H}_{2}\text{O} \rightarrow 4 \text{ Fe}^{2+} + \text{NH}_{4}^{+} + 10 \text{ OH}^{-}$$
(1)

Figure 1 Influence of pH in nitrate reduction in mine water (4 g/L of Fe^p, pH range tested: 2, 3 and 4).

Optimization of the ZVI dosage

Dosages of 2, 4, 10 and 20 g/L of Fe^p were used for the NO₃⁻-reduction in mine water for 270 min (Figure 2). The use of higher dosages of ZVI in an acid medium at pH 2 showed to have lower NO₃⁻- concentrations at the end of the reduction reaction. An almost complete reduction (99.9% of NO₃⁻- reduction) was obtained with 10 g/L after 180 min and 20 g/L after 270 min. On the contrary, with 2 g/L, less ZVI was accessible for the chemical reduction, leading to 34.0 mg/L of NO₃⁻ (78.8% of NO₃⁻-reduction).



Figure 2 Influence of the Fe^p dosage in mine water at pH 2.

Feⁿ and Fe^w as alternative metallic iron sources

Feⁿ morphology was observed by TEM (Figure 3a), where the nanoparticles showed to be rearranged in chains with spherical clusters, with a diameter range of 73.2 - 169.0 nm. The average diameter of Feⁿ was 119.4 nm, but despite the high aggregation of the nanoparticles, several studies seem to indicate that it does not decrease their reactivity as the high porosity is not affected (Hwang et al., 2011). Feⁿ proved to have a higher surface area (27.7 m²/g) when compared with Fe^p (0.3 m²/g). Thus, the dosage used for the NO₃⁻-reduction at pH 2 for 180 min with Feⁿ was lower (2 and 4 g/L) than the one used with Fe^p (Figure 3b). Using 2 g/L and 4 g/L of Feⁿ is enough to obtain concentrations of NO₃⁻ of 73.0 mg/L and 2.60 mg/L, respectively, in 90 min. At 180 min, all NO₃⁻ was completely reduced with 2 and 4 g/L of Feⁿ.



Figure 3 Iron nanoparticles, Fe^n : a) TEM image; b) NO₃⁻ reduction with Feⁿ (2 and 4 g/L, pH 2).

The same reaction was performed with Fe^w; this time with higher dosages of ZVI due to the low surface area ($\approx 0 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$): 4, 10 and 20 g/L at pH 2 for 48 h, both with washed and unwashed Fe^w (Figure 4). After 1440 min (24 h) reaction time, 20 g/L was the best dosage of unwashed Fe^w achieved 95.0 mg/L of NO₃⁻. Similar results were obtained at 2880 min (48 h), with 93.5 mg/L of NO₃⁻ (41.6% of reduction), indicating that the reaction kinetic is slower compared to Feⁿ or Fe^p. By doing a surface washing with oxalic acid (0.2 M), the surface of the Fe^w did not appear to have major impurities that prejudiced the chemical reduction since the value obtained with the surface washing, was 75.3 mg/L of NO₃⁻, representing a 52.9% reduction (11.3% of difference).



Figure 4 Use of iron waste (Fe^w) on NO_3^- reduction in different dosages at pH 2.

Nitrogen species analysis

During the NO₃⁻-reduction reaction with the three types of iron sources, the samples were analyzed regarding the production of total nitrogen (TN) and by-products in terms of NH₄⁺ and NO₂⁻. The N₂ (g) produced was estimated by a mass balance (Figure 5). Independently of the type of iron source used, the main by-product was NH₄⁺, and the NO₂⁻ concentrations were negligible (< 7% of N₂ content; < 2.4 mg N/L of NO₂⁻). The concentrations of N₂ estimated showed to be low, with a maximum of 13% (4.6 mg N/L), indicating that the production of N₂ and the by-products did not depend on the typology of the iron source used. This does not comply with the studies reported by Choe et al. (2000). These authors suggest that the size of the iron source is determinant to ascertain if N₂ or NH₄⁺ will be produced. They believe that nanoparticles and iron powder will produce, N₂ (g) and NH₄⁺ at the end of the chemical reductions of NO₃⁻, respectively. Yet, this could not be verified in the present study (Figure 5a and 5b), where practically only NH₄⁺ was formed with Feⁿ and Fe^p, where a maximum of N₂ (g) produced was around 12% for both Feⁿ and Fe^p (4.4 mg N/L and 4.6 mg N/L, respectively). Similar results were observed with Fe^w unwashed (Figure 5c) or washed (Figure 5d), and once again the surface cleaning showed not to be relevant. The maximum of N₂ (g) generated was 14.5% (5.2 mg N/L).



Figure 5 Nitrogen species during NO₃⁻ reduction with the three iron sources at pH 2: a) $Fe^p(20 \text{ g/L})$; b) $Fe^n(4 \text{ g/L})$; c) unwashed $Fe^w(20 \text{ g/L})$; d) washed $Fe^w(20 \text{ g/L})$.

Conclusions

Zero-valent iron was used for nitrate reduction in real mine water by comparing three types of iron sources: iron nanoparticles, iron powder and iron waste. The reduction of nitrate was possible at a very acid medium with pH 2, but no alterations on the nitrate levels were observed at pH 3 or 4 possibly due to a rapid formation of iron oxides, avoiding the contact of the metallic core (Fe⁰) with the pollutant. The dosages of iron needed for the chemical reduction were investigated, where higher loads of iron can reduce more NO_3^- from the water, depending only on the surface area of each type of iron.

Iron nanoparticles (4 g/L) with a surface area of 27.7 m²/g, were the most effective in less time, having a complete reduction of nitrate in 180 min. On the other hand, iron powder (20 g/L), with a surface area of 0.3 m²/g, had a complete nitrate reduction in 270 min. The iron waste (20 g/L) had lower efficiency results and kinetics due to the extremely low surface area around 0 m²/g. However, in two days, a maximum of 53% of reduction was obtained with washed waste particles, which brings economic benefits by using a waste as a raw material for this kind of environmental applications.

Nitrogenous species produced during the reactions were investigated, where it was concluded that the main by-product is NH_4^+ and the production of by-products is independent of the typology of the iron source used.

The nitrate reduction studied with an iron waste is a good option to be tested in an acid mine water since the optimum pH tested was pH 2. Further studies need to concentrate on reducing the reaction time as the relatively high reaction times are not yet feasible for an industrial use of this methodology.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) for the financial support under the project iMineWa. We acknowledge as well Jouni Torssonen from Yara Oy in Finland for the kindly provide of mine water samples.

References

- Choe S, Chang Y-Y, Hwang K-Y, Khim J (2000) Kinetics of reductive denitrification by nanoscale zero-valent iron. Chemosphere 41: 1307-1311.
- Choe S, Liljestrand HM, Khim J (2004) Nitrate reduction by zero-valent iron under different pH regimes. Appl. Geochem. 19: 335-342.
- Govindan K., Noel M, Mohan R (2015) Removal of nitrate ion from water by electrochemical approaches. J. Water Process Eng. 6: 58-63.
- Gusek JJ, Figuera LA (2009) Mitigation of Metal Mining Influenced Water. SME, Littleton, pp. 1-164.
- Hekmatzadeh AA, Karimi-Jashni A, Talebbeydokhti N, Kløve B (2013) Adsorption kinetics of nitrate ions on ion exchange resin. Desalination 326: 125-134.
- Hwang Y-H, Kim D-G, Shin H-S (2011) Mechanism study of nitrate reduction by nano zero valent iron. J. Hazard. Mater. 185: 1513-1521.
- Häyrynen K, Pongrácz E, Väisänen V, Pap N, Mänttäri M, Langwaldt J, Keiski RL (2009) Concentration of ammonium and nitrate from mine water by reverse osmosis and nanofiltration. Desalination 240: 280-289.
- Huang YH, Zhang TC (2004) Effects of low pH on nitrate reduction by iron powder. Water Res. 38: 2631-2642.
- Koren DW.,Gould WD, Bédard P (2000) Biological removal of ammonia and nitrate from simulated mine and mill effluents. Hydrometallurgy 56: 127-144.
- Rocca CD, Belgiorno V, Meriç S. (2007) Heterotrophic/autotrophic denitrification (HAD) of drinking water: prospective use for permeable reactive barrier. Desalination 210: 194-204.
- Yang GCC, Lee H-L (2005) Chemical reduction of nitrate by nanosized iron: kinetics and pathways. Water Res. 39: 884-894.