RSC Advances

This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. This *Accepted Manuscript* will be replaced by the edited, formatted and paginated article as soon as this is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the Information for Authors.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard Terms & Conditions and the Ethical quidelines still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

www.rsc.org/advances

- **Granular activated carbon supported iron as heterogeneous persulfate catalyst**
- **for the pretreatment of mature landfill leachate**
- 3 Zhijun Li^{a, b}, Qi Yang ^{a, b, *}, Yu Zhong ^{a, b}, Xiaoming Li^{a, b, *}, Li Zhou^{a, b}, Xin Li^{a, b},
- 4 Guangming $\text{Zeng}^{a, b}$
- 5^a College of Environmental Science and Engineering, Hunan University, Changsha
- 410082, P.R. China
- ^b Key Laboratory of Environmental Biology and Pollution Control (Hunan
- University), Ministry of Education, Changsha 410082, P.R. China
- Author information
- First author: E-mail: lizjun12@hnu.edu.cn (Zhijun Li)
- * Corresponding author: E-mail: Yangqi@hnu.edu.cn (Qi Yang), xmli@hnu.edu.cn
- (Xiaoming Li)
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Abstract

Keywords: Landfill leachate, Heterogeneous persulfate oxidation, Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalysts, Recycle

1. Introduction

Sanitary landfill is the main municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal method in China. With the explosive growth of urbanization and population, billions of tons of MSW are dumped in landfills in China every year. Meanwhile, a great deal of leachates are generated, the emission standards of landfill leachate are also becoming more and more severe. Once untreated leachate let out, it could percolate the soil, infiltrate the ground water and mix with surface waters and contribute to the pollution 52 of soil, ground and surface water $\frac{1}{1}$. Fresh landfills leachate can be well treated by biological treatment because of the good biodegradability. But according to previous 54 research², biological oxygen demand/chemical oxygen demand (BOD/COD) ratio declined as sanitary landfill age increased. Especially, when landfills are put into use more than 10 years, the BOD /COD ratio is lower than 0.1, implying the poor biodegradability. Therefore biological treatment is not appropriate for mature landfill leachate treatment. In order to effectively deal with such leachate, many 59 physical/chemical treatment methods are applied. $3,4,5,6$

Advanced oxidation processes (AOPs) are the most common physical/chemical treatment technologies, which include Fenton oxidation, Fenton-like oxidation, photochemical oxidation, wet catalytic oxidation, chemical oxidation, ozone oxidation and electrochemical oxidation. In recent years more and more researchers focus on 64 persulfate oxidation technology^{7,8}, but there is a problem in persulfate degradation of organic matters needed to solve. Persulfate is very stable and reaction with organics is very slow at room temperature. To improve the degradation efficiency of organic

RSC Advances Page 4 of 34

67 matters, it is necessary to activate the persulfate. During activated process, a new 68 substance sulfate radicals $(SO_4^-$, $E_0=2.5-3.1V)^9$ are generated, which are the stronger 69 oxidants than hydroxyl radicals $(\text{O}-\Theta)$, E₀=2.8V) and can degrade most of the organics. 70 Research shows that persulfate can be activated by the photocatalysis, thermocatalysis

71 and transition metal 10 . The mechanisms of activated process is as follows. 11

$$
S_2O_8^{2-} + heat/UV \rightarrow 2SO_4^{-} \bullet \tag{1.1}
$$

73
$$
S_2O_8^{2-}+Me^{n+}\to Me^{(n+1)+}+SO_4^{2-}+SO_4^{-}
$$
 (1.2)

74 Microwave catalyzes persulfate oxidation of landfill leachate had been studied and 75 achieved good results. ⁸ Persulfate oxidation technique is also used for the 76 degradation of Orange G and diethyl phthalate 12 , carbamazepine 13 and other 77 recalcitrant organic matters. $14-16$ But researches on Fe(II) activated persulfate 78 oxidation of landfill leachate are few.

 $AOPs$ can be classified as homogeneous or heterogeneous. ¹⁷ Compared to 80 homogeneous catalysts, heterogeneous catalysts 18 have many advantages, such as 81 high activity, resistance to poisoning and long-term stability at high temperature, 82 mechanical stability and resistance to attrition, non-selectivity in most cases, and 83 physical and chemical stability under wide range of condition. Besides, heterogeneous 84 catalysts have another advantage, easily separating from the aqueous solution. 17

Fluorescence excitation-emission matrix (EEM) spectroscopy has become an important analysis method to characterize complex environmental samples. The advantages of EEM fluorescence spectroscopy are that the fluorescence enables rapid, non-invasive and accurate characterisation of different organic matter fractions from

Page 5 of 34 RSC Advances

2. Material and methods

2.1 Chemicals and landfill leachate

All chemicals used in this study were of analytical grade. Sodium persulfate (Na2S2O8, 98%), Silver sulfate (Ag2SO4, 99.7%), KI (99%), NaOH (96%), $C_4H_4KNaO_6.4H_2O$ (99%) and Hgl_2 (99.7%) were purchased from Sinopharm Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd (Shanghai, China). GACs were purchased from the Aladdin chemistry Co., Ltd (Shanghai, China). Ferrous sulfate heptahydrate 105 (FeSO₄·7H₂O, 99%), Ammonium iron (II) sulfate ((NH₄)₂Fe(SO₄)₂, 99.5%) were purchased from Tianjin HengXing Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd. (Tianjin, China). 107 Potassium dichromate ($K_2Cr_2O_7$, 99.8%) were purchased from Tianjin Fengchuan Chemical Reagent Technologies Co., Ltd (Tianjin, China). H2SO4 (98%) were purchased from Zhuzhou XingKong Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd.

Landfill leachate used in this study was collected from Changsha municipal solid

RSC Advances Page 6 of 34

RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript

111 waste disposal site, Hei mi feng, Changsha, China. The site has been in operation 112 since 2003.¹⁹ The leachate collected was transferred to laboratory immediately and 113 stored in a refrigerator at 4℃. The main physico-chemical characteristics of the raw 114 landfill leachate were presented in Table 1. According to the landfill leachate 115 classification of previous researchers $^{2, 20}$, the leachate belongs to mature leachate for 116 lower BOD₅/COD ratio(<0.12). ²⁰

117 **2.2 Preparation of catalysts**

The catalysts, Fe(Ⅱ)-GACs, were prepared according to the method developed 119 by Laiju et al 21 with some necessary modifications. At first, GACs washed by 10% (v/v) H₂SO₄ for 3 times and then cleaned by ultrapure water. After filtration, GACs were dried in oven at 65℃ for 2h. Then the pretreated GACs were added to a beaker including 50 mL ferrous ion solution with a certain concentration in an ultrasonic cleaner (100W, 20kHz, 25℃) for 30 min in order to make the ferrous ion even load in GACs. After dried in vacuum drying oven (DZ-2BCII TAISITE, China) at 65℃ for 2h, the newly formed Fe(Ⅱ)-GACs were calcined in a tube furnace (SK-G06123K, Tianjin Zhonghuan, China) with programmed gradually warming up 127 to a certain temperature in N_2 atmosphere for 4h. Finally, the samples naturally cooled 128 down to ambient temperature in N_2 atmosphere and were stored in sealed vacuum drier for further experiments.

130 **2.3 Heterogeneous persulfate oxidation experiments**

131 Heterogeneous persulfate oxidation experiments were conducted in 500 mL glass 132 beaker on a rotary shaker as the batch model. 1.0 g Fe(II)-GAC catalyst and a certain

Page 7 of 34 RSC Advances

133 quality of $Na₂S₂O₈$ were simultaneously added to 100 mL landfill leachate. The temperature and rotary shaker speed were controlled at 25℃ and 250 r/min, 135 respectively. The initial pH of leachate was adjusted by 1.0 mol/L H_2SO_4 and 1.0 mol/L NaOH and pH was detected using a pH meter (pHS-3C model, Leici, China). The sample taken at a constant time interval was filtered using a syringe filter with 0.22-µm micropore filter membrane (LC+PVDF membrane, ANPEL Laboratory Technologies Inc., China) and further analyzed. COD was measured by microwave digestion method. The removal efficiency, R (%), of COD was calculated by the following equation:

142
$$
R(\%) = \frac{c_0 - c_t}{c_0} \times 100\%
$$
 (1.3)

143 Where C_0 (mg/L) was the initial concentration of COD for leachate, and C_t (mg/L) stood for the concentration of COD at t min.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Effect of calcination temperature

Research shows that calcination temperature significantly affects the physicochemical properties and the phase composition of catalysts, which further 149 affect the catalytic performance. $22, 23$ Before heterogeneous persulfate oxidation experiments, the optimum calcination temperature for the preparation of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalyst was demonstrated. The samples calcined at 350, 450 and 550℃ respectively were characterized by inductively coupled plasma (ICP, Spectro Blue Sop, German) and emission scanning electron microscope (ESEM, FEI Quanta 200, Chech). The percentage composition of iron ion and the ESEM images of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalysts

RSC Advances Page 8 of 34

RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript

calcined at different temperature were presented in Table 2 and Fig. 1. From Table 2, it is obviously found that the iron ion content of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalysts calcined at 550℃ is more than that of 350℃and 450℃. ESEM images displays that the surface of calcined catalysts formed a rougher layer than the uncalcined catalysts, and the higher the calcination temperature is, the rougher the surface of catalysts becomes. It indicated that the physicochemical properties of catalyst occur the remarkable change 161 after calcination, further resulted in the absorption capacity of catalysts increased. BET (Nova, Quantachrome, USA) analysis shows that the surface area of catalysts 163 increases from 522.45 m²/g (before calcination) to 630.54m²/g (after calcination at 550℃) and the rate of increase is approximately 20%.

The catalysts calcined at different temperature were used to activate the persulfate for the mature landfill leachate treatment and the results presented in Fig.2. With the increasing calcination temperature, the removal efficiency of COD improves 168 accordingly. When the calcination temperature is 550° C, the removal rate reaches the maximum (59.3%). Özdemir et al. reported that high calcination temperatures 170 enhanced interaction of metal oxide with support. So the higher calcination temperature not only is in favor of the physicochemical properties of support (GAC), but also enhances the immobilization of Fe(Ⅱ). In subsequent experiments, the Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC calcined at 550℃ will be chosen as the catalyst.

3.2 Effects of persulfate concentration

To evaluate the effect of persulfate concentration, 0.238, 2.38, 4.76, 11.9 and 176 23.8g Na₂S₂O₈ was added into 100 mL landfill leachate with 1g Fe(II)-GAC catalyst,

187 **3.3 Influence of ferrous concentration**

188 Fe²⁺ can active persulfate generated sulfate free radical (Eq. 1.4) but excess Fe²⁺ 189 also can react with sulfate free radical (Eq. 1.5). 11

190
$$
Slow: S_2O_8^{2-}+Fe^{2+} \rightarrow Fe^{3+}+SO_4^{2-}+SO_4^{-}
$$
 (1.4)

191 Fast:
$$
SO_4^{-\bullet} + Fe^{2+} \rightarrow Fe^{3+} + SO_4^{2-}
$$
 (1.5)

192 Integrated two equations is:

193
$$
S_2O_8^{2-} + 2Fe^{2+} \rightarrow 2Fe^{3+} + 2SO_4^{2-}
$$
 (1.6)

194 It can be seen from the Eq.1.6, excessive Fe^{2+} will reduce the utilization of sulfate free radical. Thereby the controlling of ferric dosage is very important in persulfate oxidation process. In this study, we maintained the fixed amount of catalyst (1g/100 mL) in heterogeneous persulfate oxidation experiments. So the amount of immobilized Fe(Ⅱ) on GAC determined the ferric dosage. Before Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC was

RSC Advances Page 10 of 34

RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript RSC Advances Accepted Manuscript

calcined in tube furnace, GAC was immersed in 50 mL ferrous solution with the concentrations of 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5 and 1.0 mol/L under ultrasonic treatment (100W, 20kHz, 25℃). These catalysts calcined at 550℃were sent to ICP analysis and the iron content in catalyst (w/w, %) was listed in Table 3. Obviously, high ferrous concentration caused more immobilization of Fe(Ⅱ) on GAC. The highest iron content in Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC reached 3.98% when the ferrous concentration was 1.0 mol/L. Fig. 4 shows the COD removal with different ferrous concentration. Similar to previous researches, the change of COD removal efficiency was not linear increase 207 with the Fe²⁺ dosage. When Fe²⁺ dosage was moderate $127mg/L$ (Fe²⁺/S₂O₈²⁻ = 254 mg/mol), the removal rate of COD was the highest (66.8%). The results demonstrated 209 that Fe^{2+} has a great influence on persulfate of generating sulfate free radicals, which 210 too much or less Fe^{2+} is negative to produce sulfate free radicals. ^{9, 27}

3.4 Influence of initial pH

212 It is well known that pH can remarkably affect the Fe(II) activated persulfate 213 oxidation of refractory organic contaminants.⁷ The effect of initial pH on the removal of COD by Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC activated persulfate oxidation at room temperature is shown Fig. 5. When the initial pH fluctuated between 3 and 11, the COD removal efficiency decreased with the increasing pH. It is interesting that the COD removal exhibits higher performance at pH 11. However, the maximum COD removal of 76.3% was achieved at pH 3**.** It can be explained by following equations, namely, persulfate is activated effectively by Fe(Ⅱ) and generated more sulfate radicals under acidic 220 conditions. 11

Page 11 of 34 RSC Advances

221
$$
S_2O_8^{2+} + H^+ \rightarrow HS_2O_4
$$
 (1.7)

$$
HS_2O_4^- \to SO_4^- \bullet + SO_4^{2-} + H^+ \tag{1.8}
$$

223 SO₄^{-•} formed can produce a rapid attack on any oxidizable agents including 224 organic contaminants.²⁸ But too more H^+ will inhibit the formation of sulfate radicals 225 (Eq. 1.8). Also, the presence of $SO_4\bullet$ in aqueous solution can result in radical 226 interconversion reactions to produce the hydroxyl radical $(\text{O}-\text{OH}, \text{E}_0=2.8\text{V})$ in accordance with the Eqs. 1.9 and 1.10. $^{28, 29}$ That is why the removal COD also keeps 228 high level under the alkaline condition $(pH=11)$.

$$
\text{All pHs:} \qquad \text{SO}_4^{-} \bullet + \text{H}_2\text{O} \to \text{SO}_4^{2-} + \bullet \text{OH} + \text{H}^+ \tag{1.9}
$$

230 Alkaline pH:
$$
SO_4^{-\bullet}+OH \rightarrow SO_4^{2\circ}+OH
$$
 (1.10)

231 pH plays a more complex role in persulfate oxidation of contaminants. $^{28, 30, 31}$ In 232 previous researches, the highest COD removal in persulfate oxidation of landfill 233 leachate was achieved at pH $3³¹$, but the optimal TCE degradation by persulfate 234 oxidation occurred at near neutral pH (i.e., pH 7) 28 , meanwhile the maximum 235 degradation rate of sulfamethazine (SMZ) induced by persulfate oxidation appeared at 236 pH 9. ³⁰ Reaction mechanisms of SO₄[•] and HO• with organic compounds could be 237 quite different. The reaction between SO_4^- and organic compounds is primarily 238 through electron transfer, H-atom abstraction and addition-elimination, whereas HO• 239 reacts with organic compounds preferentially via the addition of C=C double bonds 240 and abstracting H from C-H, N-H, or O-H bonds. $^{11, 30}$ Therefore, pH affects the 241 persulfate oxidation by altering the predominant oxidizing species in solution, further 242 bringing about different mechanism for pollutants degradation. Furthermore, pH also

243 can change the speciation of target pollutants.

3.5 Optimum synthetic experiment

Based on the experimental results above, we carried out the optimum synthetic experiment of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalytic persulfate oxidation for mature landfill leachate 247 treatment at pH 3, Fe^{2+} dosage 127mg/L ($Fe^{2+}/S_2O_8^{2-}$ =254 mg/mol) and persulfate 248 concentration 0.5 mol/L (i.e. $S_2O_8^{2}$:12COD₀=1.08). The COD removal rate achieves to 87.8% under optimal conditions. Compared with heat-activated persulfate oxidation for landfill leachate treatment, the optimal COD removal rate 91% is higher 251 than in this study at $S_2O_8^{2}$:12COD₀=2, 50°C and pH 4⁷, but more persulfate and energy consumption occurred in this process to achieve similar performance. Under the similar reaction conditions, the maximum removal rates of COD were 66.0, 59.3 254 and 87.8% at the reaction time of 120 min in Fe^{2+}/PS , PS/GAC and PS/Fe(II)-GAC 255 system, respectively (Fig. 6(a)). High correlation coefficient (R^2) suggests that COD degradation in all catalytic system could be well expressed by the pseudo-first-order kinetics within first 30min (Fig. 6(b)). The rate constant (*k*) for the PS/Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 258 system is 0.0596 min⁻¹, which is 2.18 and 2.41 times than that of Fe^{2+}/PS and PS/GAC system. These results suggested that Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalytic combined the catalysis of Fe(Ⅱ) and adsorption of GAC and enhanced the persulfate oxidation of landfill leachate.

3.6 Recycle and regeneration of Fe(Ⅱ**)-GAC catalysts**

Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalysts used was separated from solution by filtrating and cleaned with ultrapure water. Then the catalysts was dried in vacuum drying oven at 65℃ and

Page 13 of 34 RSC Advances

3.7 3D-EEM fluorescence spectra analysis

In this study, three-dimensional excitation and emission matrix (3D-EEM) fluorescence spectroscopy (F-4600, HITACHI, Japan) was applied to analysis the dissolved organic matter (DOM) in landfill leachate before and after persulfate oxidation. Fluorescence data were collected by scanning excitation wavelengths in the range from 300 to 700 nm in 5 nm steps, and detecting the emitted fluorescence in $\frac{5 \text{nm}}{200}$ shows between 300 and 700 nm. $\frac{32 \text{m}}{200}$ EEM fluorescence spectra are illustrated in Fig. 8.

RSC Advances Page 14 of 34

Generally, EEM fluorescence spectra exhibit increased intensities in particular regions and these fluorescence regions can be attributed to both natural fluorescence (humic- and fulvic-like), defined as peaks A and C and microbial derived organic matter (tryptophan- and tyrosine-like fluorescence, defined as peaks T and B) at 291 shorter emission wavelengths (Table 4). $33,34$

As shown in Fig. 8, the EEM fluorescence spectra peaks of landfill leachate before and after persulfate oxidation are mainly on Ex. 355-375nm/Em. 420-455nm. This demonstrated that the major constituent of landfill leachate is humic (highly 295 colored) and the spectra of leachate after treatment has no new peaks, indicating 296 that no new organics are generated in persulfate oxidation.³⁶ The color depth of the peaks demonstrated that the concentration of organics decreased after persulfate treatment and the humic-like organics were well decomposed with the increasing of persulfate concentration.

3.8 Cost of Fe(Ⅱ**)-GAC catalysts method**

According to optimal conditions of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalytic persulfate oxidation, 100mL landfill leachate treatment need about 1g GAC, 11.9g persulfate, 2.78g FeSO₄·7H₂O, 3mL H₂SO₄ and considering energy consumption. Based on the price in 304 China (GAC 150 US\$/t, FeSO₄·7H₂O 65 US\$/t, persulfate 130US\$/t and H₂SO₄ 90 US\$/t), the cost was estimated to about 82US\$ for 1000 gallons leachate. Compared 306 with the cost of other AOPs treatments US\$ 50 to US\$ 800 per 1000 gallons $4,37$, it demonstrated that Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalyst has a great potential in landfill leachate treatment.

Acknowledgements

This research was financially supported by the project of National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 5147870, 51378188), Doctoral Fund of Ministry of Education of China (20130161120021).

References

1. Y. Deng and J. D. Englehardt, *Water research*, 2006, **40**, 3683-3694.

RSC Advances Page 16 of 34

- 2. E. S. Chian and F. B. DeWalle, *Journal of the Environmental Engineering Division*, 1976, **102**, 411-431.
- 3. Z. H. Liu, Y. Kanjo and S. Mizutani, *Science of the Total Environment*, 2009, **407**, 731-748.
- 4. F. Tisa, A. A. Abdul Raman and W. M. Wan Daud, *Journal of environmental management*, 2014, **146**, 260-275.
- 5. J. L. de Morais and P. P. Zamora, *Journal of hazardous materials*, 2005, **123**, 181-186.
- 6. S. S. Abu Amr and H. A. Aziz, *Waste management*, 2012, **32**, 1693-1698.
- 7. Y. Deng and C. M. Ezyske, *Water research*, 2011, **45**, 6189-6194.
- 8. Y. C. Chou, S. L. Lo, J. Kuo and C. J. Yeh, *Journal of hazardous materials*,
- 2013, **246-247**, 79-86.
- 9. J. M. Monteagudo, A. Durán, R. González and A. J. Expósito, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 2015, **176-177**, 120-129.
- 10. C. Qi, X. Liu, C. Lin, X. Zhang, J. Ma, H. Tan and W. Ye, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2014, **249**, 6-14.
- 11. D. A. House, *Chemical reviews*, 1962, **62**, 185-203.
- 12. M. Pu, Y. Ma, J. Wan, Y. Wang, M. Huang and Y. Chen, *Journal of colloid and interface science*, 2014, **418**, 330-337.
- 13. Y. F. Rao, L. Qu, H. Yang and W. Chu, *Journal of hazardous materials*, 2014,
- **268**, 23-32.
- 14. S. Rodriguez, L. Vasquez, D. Costa, A. Romero and A. Santos, *Chemosphere*,

Page 17 of 34 RSC Advances

- 2014, **101**, 86-92.
- 15. J. Yan, L. Han, W. Gao, S. Xue and M. Chen, *Bioresource technology*, 2014, **175C**, 269-274.
- 16. S. Yang, P. Wang, X. Yang, G. Wei, W. Zhang and L. Shan, *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 2009, **21**, 1175-1180.
- 17. J. M. Poyatos, M. M. Muñio, M. C. Almecija, J. C. Torres, E. Hontoria and F. Osorio, *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*, 2009, **205**, 187-204.
- 18. K. Pirkanniemi and M. Sillanp, *Chemosphere*, 2002, **48**, 1047–1060.
- 19. X. Liu, X.-M. Li, Q. Yang, X. Yue, T.-T. Shen, W. Zheng, K. Luo, Y.-H. Sun and G.-M. Zeng, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2012, **200-202**, 39-51.
- 20. S. Renou, J. G. Givaudan, S. Poulain, F. Dirassouyan and P. Moulin, *Journal of hazardous materials*, 2008, **150**, 468-493.
- 21. A. R. Laiju, T. Sivasankar and P. V. Nidheesh, *Environmental Science & Pollution Research International*, 2014, **21**, 10900-10907.
- 22. N. Rahemi, M. Haghighi, A. A. Babaluo, M. F. Jafari and S. Allahyari, *Catalysis Science & Technology*, 2013, **12**, 3183-3191.
- 23. C. Ding, W. Liu, J. Wang, P. Liu, K. Zhang, X. Gao, G. Ding, S. Liu, Y. Han and X. Ma, *Fuel*, 2015, **162**, 148-154.
- 24. C. Zhang, M. Zhou, G. Ren, X. Yu, L. Ma, J. Yang and F. Yu, *Water research*, 2015, **70**, 414-424.
- 25. H. Özdemir, M. A. F. Öksüzömer and M. A. Gürkaynak, *International Journal*
- *of Hydrogen Energy*, 2010, **35**, 12147-12160.
- 26. I. Epold, M. Trapido and N. Dulova, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2015, **279**, 452-462.
- 27. H. Zhong, M. L. Brusseau, Y. Wang, N. Yan, L. Quig and G. R. Johnson, *Water research*, 2015, **83**, 104-111.
- 28. C. Liang, Z. S. Wang and C. J. Bruell, *Chemosphere*, 2007, **66**, 106-113.
- 29. C. Liang and H. W. Su, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 2009, **48**, 5558-5562.
- 30. Y. Fan, Y. Ji, D. Kong, J. Lu and Q. Zhou, *Journal of hazardous materials*, 2015, **300**, 39-47.
- 31. H. Zhang, Z. Wang, C. Liu, Y. Guo, N. Shan, C. Meng and L. Sun, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2014, **250**, 76-82.
- 32. K. Luo, Q. Yang, X. M. Li, H. B. Chen, X. Liu, G. J. Yang and G. M. Zeng, *Chemosphere*, 2013, **91**, 579-585.
- 33. P. G. Coble, *Marine chemistry*, 1996, **51**, 325-346.
- 34. M. Bieroza, A. Baker and J. Bridgeman, *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 2012, **7**, e22-e31.
- 35. S. Sanguanpak, C. Chiemchaisri, W. Chiemchaisri and K. Yamamoto, *International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation*, 2015, **102**, 64-72.
- 36. W. Can, H. Yao-Kun, Z. Qing and J. Min, *Chemical Engineering Journal*,
- 2014, **243**, 1-6.
- 37. N. N. Mahamuni and Y. G. Adewuyi, *Ultrasonics sonochemistry*, 2010, **17**, 990-1003.

Figure caption

- **Fig. 1**. ESEM images of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC calcined at different temperature. Uncalcined (a), 350℃ (b), 450℃ (c) and 550℃ (d).
- **Fig. 2**. Influence of calcination temperature on persulfate oxidation of COD. Reaction
- 411 conditions: Fe(II)-GAC 10 g/L, persulfate concentration 0.1 mol/L, pH not adjusted.
- **Fig. 3**. COD removal under different persulfate concentrations. Reaction conditions:
- Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 10 g/L, landfill leachate 100 mL, pH not adjusted.
- **Fig. 4**. Effect of immersed ferrous concentration on the COD removal. Reaction
- conditions: Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 10 g/L, landfill leachate 100 mL, persulfate concentration 0.5mol/L, pH not adjusted.

Fig. 5. Effect of initial pH on the COD removal. Reaction conditions: Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 1.0 g/L, landfill leachate 100 mL, persulfate concentration 0.1mol/L, temperature 25℃.

- **Fig. 6**. (a) Comparison of COD removal by persulfate oxidation with different 421 catalysts (pH 3, Fe^{2+} dosage 127mg/L, persulfate concentration 0.5 mol/L). (b) Pseudo-first-order kinetic curves for COD degradation.
- **Fig. 7**. Recycle and regeneration of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC catalysts.
- **Fig. 8**. 3DEEM fluorescence spectra of (a) raw landfill leachate (peak Ex.375 nm/Em.455 nm), (b) leachate treated with 0.2 mol/L persulfate (peak Ex.360 nm/Em.435 nm), (c) leachate treated with 0.5 mol/L persulfate (peak Ex.355 nm/Em.425 nm) and (d) leachate treated with 1.0 mol/L persulfate (peak Ex.360 nm/Em.420 nm).

Table 1. Characteristics of raw landfill leachate.

a. no any treatment

Page 23 of 34 RSC Advances

Table 4. Excitation and emission wavelength pairs for principal peak fluorescence intensities.

Fig. 1. ESEM images of Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC calcined at different temperature. Uncalcined (a), 350℃ (b), 450℃ (c) and 550℃ (d).

Fig. 2. Influence of calcination temperature on persulfate oxidation of COD. Reaction conditions: Fe(II)-GAC 10 g/L, persulfate concentration 0.1 mol/L, pH not adjusted.

Fig. 3. COD removal under different persulfate concentrations. Reaction conditions: Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 10 g/L, landfill leachate 100 mL, pH not adjusted.

Fig. 4. Effect of immersed ferrous concentration on the COD removal. Reaction conditions: Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 10 g/L, landfill leachate 100 mL, persulfate concentration 0.5 mol/L, pH not adjusted.

Fig. 5. Effect of initial pH on the COD removal. Reaction conditions: Fe(Ⅱ)-GAC 10 g/L, landfill leachate 100 mL, persulfate concentration 0.1mol/L, temperature 25℃.

Fig. 6. (a) Comparison of COD removal by persulfate oxidation with different catalysts (pH 3, Fe^{2+}) dosage 127mg/L, persulfate concentration 0.5 mol/L). (b) Pseudo-first-order kinetic curves for COD degradation.

Fig. 7. Recycle and regeneration of Fe(II)-GAC catalysts.

Fig. 8. 3DEEM fluorescence spectra of (a) raw landfill leachate (peak Ex.375 nm/Em.455 nm), (b) leachate treated with 0.2 mol/L persulfate (peak Ex.360 nm/Em.435 nm), (c) leachate treated with 0.5 mol/L persulfate (peak Ex.355 nm/Em.425 nm) and (d) leachate treated with 1.0 mol/L persulfate (peak Ex.360 nm/Em.420 nm).

Highlights:

- Fe(II) loaded in granular activated carbon as persulfate catalyst was first applied to landfill leachate.
- The optimum conditions for COD removal of mature landfill leachate were determined.
- The recycle experiments of the Fe(Ⅱ)-loaded GAC catalysts were conducted.
- Fluorescence excitation-emission matrix (EEM) spectroscopy was applied to explain the

degradation mechanism of landfill leachate.