## ECP 2024 Conference

# The 3rd International Electronic Conference on Processes 29–31 May 2024 | Online

### Adsorbents Derived from Plant Sources for Caffeine Removal: Current Research and Future Outlook

Rich Jhon Paul Latiza, Adam Mustafa, Keno Delos Reyes, Kharl Laurence Nebres, Rugi Vicente Rubi Chemical Engineering Department, College of Engineering, Adamson University, 900 San Marcelino St. Ermita Manila, Philippines

#### **INTRODUCTION & AIM**

Pharmaceutical and personal care products (PPCPs), like caffeine, are emerging contaminants in water bodies, posing risks to human and environmental health. Caffeine, found in coffee, tea, and cacao, boosts alertness by blocking adenosine receptors but is not fully metabolized, leading to its presence in wastewater and aquatic ecosystems. This contamination disrupts marine and coastal species' growth, reproduction, and metabolism. Conventional wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) struggle to remove caffeine, necessitating alternative methods. Adsorption using activated carbon (AC) is effective but costly, prompting exploration of cheaper, sustainable plant-based adsorbents. This study evaluates plant-based adsorbents for caffeine removal, focusing on specific surface area, adsorbent dosage, pH level, maximum adsorption capacity, adsorption isotherms, and kinetics.

#### METHOD

#### **RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

**Table 1.** Summary of properties of different adsorbents derived from plant sources and parameters of the adsorption process.

| Adsorbent             | SSA       | Dosage | pН  | MAC         | Adsorption | Adsorption |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------|-----|-------------|------------|------------|
|                       | (m²/g)    | (g/L)  |     | (mg/g)      | Isotherm   | Kinetics   |
| Orange Peel           | 0.801     | 3.5    | 6.9 | 15.188      | LM         | PFO        |
| Banana Peel           | 0.079     | 9.5    | 6.9 | 6.761       | LM/SP      | PFO        |
| Orange Peel Composite | 14.282    | 2.5    | 6.9 | 25.604      | LM/SP      | PFO        |
| Banana Peel Composite | 8.140     | 5.5    | 6.9 | 11.668      | LM         | PSO        |
| KAC                   | 420.46    | 1      | 7   | 391         | FL         | PSO        |
| CAC                   | 53.92     | 1      | 7   | 139.61      | FL         | PSO        |
| CH-KAC                | 1082.41   | 1      | 7   | 121.9       | LM         | PSO        |
| CH-CAC                | 240.79    | 1      | 7   | 39.53       | LM         | PSO        |
| CA-SA 400/10          | 1150.3459 | 1      | 7   | 176.8       | n/a        | PSO        |
| Pineapple ACF         | 1031      | 1      | 5.8 | 152.18      | LM         | PSO        |
| Peanut shell AC       | 790       | 0.05   | 5   | 0.63 mmol/g | LM         | n/a        |
| Peanut shell AC       | 790       | 0.05   | 7   | 1.11 mmol/g | LM         | n/a        |
| GS                    | 6.23      | 25     | 2   | 89.194      | SP         | N/A        |
| MGS                   | 4.21      | 15     | 2   | 129.568     | SP         | N/A        |
| GSAC                  | 1099.86   | 1      | 4.0 | 916.679     | SP         | N/A        |
| NS900                 | 167.71    | 0.25   | 7   | 9.24        | LM         | PSO        |
| WP900                 | 156.08    | 0.25   | 7   | 11.85       | LM         | PSO        |
| SAC                   | 754       | 0.6    | 6   | 221.61      | LM         | PSO        |
| ABC                   | 740       | 1      | 6   | 117.8       | LM         | PSO        |
| TWBC-SA               | 576       | 1      | 3.5 | 15.4        | FL         | ELV        |
| TWPC-800              | 2260.82   | 2.5    | n/a | 491.37      | LM         | PSO        |
| CW-C-1-800            | 1212      | 0.2    | 5   | 274.2       | LM         | PFO/PSO    |
| MBC1                  | 474       | 1      | n/a | 45          | SP         | PSO        |
| ACP                   | 1242      | 1      | n/a | 259         | SP         | PSO        |
| MNC                   | 1019      | 1      | n/a | 168         | SP         | PSO        |
| GBC300                | 1.02      | 1      | 4.5 | n/a         | FL/TK      | ELV/FTP    |
| GBC500                | 76.30     | 1      | 4.5 | n/a         | FL/TK      | ELV/FTP    |
| <b>GBC700</b>         | 216.40    | 1      | 4.5 | 16.26       | FL/TK      | ELV/FTP    |
| Pi/1:1/800/2          | 945       | 6 mg   | 5   | 500         | LM         | PSO        |
| Pi/1:3/800/2          | 1509      | 6 mg   | 5   | 476.2       | LM         | PSO        |
| YC                    | 823       | 0.6    | n/a | 130         | SP         | PSO        |
| NP-YC                 | 644       | 0.6    | n/a | 139         | SP         | PSO        |
| OLC                   | n/a       | 1.67   | 4   | 59.88       | LM         | PSO        |

A systematic literature review was conducted to identify research trends in caffeine adsorption using plant-derived adsorbents:

- Planning: Identified relevant keywords, selected publication dates, and used databases to filter papers automatically.
- Selection: Manually checked papers to ensure they met review criteria.
- Extraction: Employed data extraction and cross-referencing to identify patterns.
- Execution: Used the search equation "caffeine" AND "type" AND "adsorption isotherm" in ScienceDirect, interchanging "type" with terms like fruit, fiber, stalk, and others, resulting in 1946 studies.
- Filtering: Applied PRISMA guidelines, reducing 1946 studies to 66 after removing duplicates and examining titles.
- Eligibility: Assessed abstracts, leaving 17 papers for final analysis.

The review evaluated specific surface area (SSA), adsorbent dosage, pH level, maximum adsorption capacity (MAC), adsorption isotherms, and kinetics.



| igure  | 1. | Adapted | systems | and | methodologies: | (a) | Systematic | Literature | Review |  |
|--|----|---------|---------|-----|----------------|-----|------------|------------|--------|--|
| Adapted from Okoli (2015) [1]; (b) Adapted PRISMA Diagram from Page et al. (2021) [2]. |    |         |         |     |                |     |            |            |        |  |

#### **RESULTS & DISCUSSION**





**Figure 2.** Adsorbents MAC against different characteristics: **(a)** MAC vs SSA; **(b)** MAC vs Dosage; **(c)** MAC vs pH.

The study analyzed various parameters affecting caffeine adsorption using plant-derived adsorbents:

- The average SSA was 609.65 m<sup>2</sup>/g, with 15 adsorbents below 500 m<sup>2</sup>/g also showing lower MAC.
- The highest SSA and MAC were observed in TWPC-800 and GSAC, respectively, highlighting the complexity of factors affecting adsorption beyond SSA alone.
- The average adsorbent dosage was 2.67 g/L, with GSAC demonstrating high efficiency at 1 g/L.
- The optimal pH for adsorption was found to be around 5.57, although GSAC achieved the highest MAC at pH 4.
- Langmuir and Sips isotherms were flexible across adsorbents, with pseudo-secondorder kinetics describing most adsorption processes efficiently.
- GSAC, TWPC-800, and Pi/1:1/800/2, derived from grape stalks, tea wastes, and pines, respectively, showed promising results, indicating cost-effective and sustainable alternatives to commercial activated carbon.

These findings suggest potential for further research into similar natural adsorbents, advancing towards commercial application.

#### CONCLUSION

- Optimal adsorption typically requires a low dosage and acidic conditions, though these may vary by material.
- Langmuir and Sips isotherms, along with pseudo-second-order (PSO) kinetics, effectively describe the adsorption process.
- Promising results from grape stalks, tea wastes, and pines indicate the need for further research and upscaled experiments.
- Despite current study limitations, the trend towards naturally derived adsorbents for caffeine removal is expected to grow as methods improve.

#### REFERENCES

[1] Okoli, C. (2015). A Guide to Conducting a Standalone Systematic Literature Review. Communications of the Association for In-formation Systems, 37. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.03743

[2] Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Systematic Reviews, 10(1), 89. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4

### https://ecp2024.sciforum.net/