Treatment of sewage wastewater by electrocoagulation with high cell current densities (605 A/m², 908 A/m², 1211 A/m², 1513 A/m² and 1816 A/m²) using stainless steel, iron and aluminum electrodes were studied. High current densities applied were very effective for the removal of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid in 0.5 h. In the electrocoagulation of sewage wastewater, the effect of electrode material, current densities, electrocoagulation time, inter-electrode distance and initial pH were examined. The optimum operating range for each operating variable was experimentally determined in order to provide an economical and effective treatment for the sewage wastewater. Therefore, the optimum condition for this treatment is in 0.5 h, by using stainless steel electrode, at 1816 A/m², in pH 7 and 10 mm electrode distances. The optimum treatment condition reduced chemical oxygen demand by 98.07 %, biochemical oxygen demand by 98.07 % and suspended solid by 97.64 % and the anode loss during the experiment was $9.2 \times 10^2$ g.

Keywords: Electrocoagulation, Sewage wastewater, Chemical oxygen demand, Biochemical oxygen demand, Suspended solid.

**INTRODUCTION**

Sewage is the main point-source pollutant on a global scale\(^1\). Sewage, on the one hand, normally contained of biological, chemical and physical composition which is usually high in biochemical oxygen demand, chemical oxygen demand and suspended solid. So, direct discharge of raw or improper treated sewage into the water body is one of the main sources of pollution on a global scale\(^1\). There are two main objectives of wastewater treatment, one is protecting the environment and the other one is conserving fresh water resources\(^2\). These days, various physicochemical and biological technique have been employed to treat sewage water such as aerobic and anaerobic biological treatment, membrane filtration, adsorption, chemical coagulation and many others methods. Although the treatment techniques that mentioned above can be applied as the efficient methods, either they took a long period of time or needed a large amount of chemical substance, both ways are less effective in treating sewage water where it requires a short time treatment and an environmental compatibility with free chemical effect. Simple, affordable and efficient sewage wastewater treatment systems are urgently needed in developing countries because most of the conventional technologies currently in use in industrialized nations are too expensive and complex\(^3\).

Electrocoagulation is one of the simple methods to treat wastewater efficiently\(^4\). This electrochemical treatment seems to be a promising treatment method due to its high effectiveness, its lower maintenance cost, less need for labor and rapid achievement of results\(^5\). In the past few decades, several workers shown that the electrocoagulation is a promising treatment method and effectively potential to treat verity type of wastewaters including dyes wastewater\(^6,8\), tannery wastewater\(^9\), restaurant wastewater\(^8\), palm oil mill effluent\(^9\), food wastewater\(^2\), potato chip manufacturing wastewater\(^4\), urban wastewater\(^4\) and removing heavy metals\(^10-19\).

Electrocoagulation treatment methods offer an alternative to the use of chemical coagulant such as metal salts or polymers for breaking the pollutants because during the electrocoagulation process, the electrode can generate coagulated species and metal hydroxides that destabilize and aggregate the suspended particles and precipitate. The hydrogen gas released from cathode would also help to float the flocculated particles out of the water\(^20\).

**EXPERIMENTAL**

Sample collection and characterization: Sewage wastewater was obtained from the first untreated pond at Indah Water Konsortium (IWK) which located at Indera Mahkota, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia. The composition of wastewater then characterized to identify the pH, suspended solids, chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand.

Experimental device: The batch experimental setup is schematically shown in Fig. 1. The electrochemical unit consists of an electrocoagulation cell, a D.C power supply and
the electrodes (stainless steel, aluminum and iron). There are two monopolar electrodes having same dimension (120 mm × 100 mm × 2 mm) as an anode and a cathode which spacing of 10, 20, 30 and 40 mm (depending on experiment) between each other. The total effective electrode was $1.652 \times 10^{-2} \text{m}^2$. In order to maintain an unchanged composition and avoid the association of the flocs in the solution, the stirrer was turned on and set at 80 rpm. All the electrodes were washed with dilute HCl before every experiments conducted. Every experiment was performed at the room temperature.

![Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of experimental setup](image)

The experiments were carried out in a batch mode. For each experiment, a sewage wastewater sample of 1 liter was collected in the electrochemical cell with two electrodes dipped into the sample. Six different of high current densities; 605, 908, 1211, 1513 and 1816 A/m$^2$ were applied. In each current density applied, contact time of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 were used. Therefore, a total of 17 experiments were carried out to determine the effect of electrode material, current densities, electrocoagulation time, inter-electrode distance and initial pH. After the experiment, the treated sample was then kept undisturbed for 20 min in order to allow the flocks to settle. Subsequently, after settling the sample of supernatant was collected to perform the analysis of suspended solid, chemical oxygen demand and biochemical oxygen demand.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Characteristic of sewage wastewater:** Table-1 shows the characteristic of the sewage wastewater sample used before the treatment. As observed, the average chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid concentration is in medium concentration which is 466, 259 and 297 mg/L, respectively and the value of pH is 7.6.

| Parameter                  | Value |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Chemical oxygen demand (mg/L) | 466   |
| Biochemical oxygen demand (mg/L) | 259   |
| Suspended solid (mg/L)     | 297   |
| pH                         | 7.6   |

**Effect of electrode material:** Electrode assembles as the heart of the electrocoagulation process. Therefore, the appropriate selection of its materials is highly concerned. In this experiment, the stainless steel, iron and aluminum electrode were used as these types of electrode are proven effective to treat wastewater. The experiment was first running in 0.5 h at 1816 A/m$^2$ current density by using different types of electrode to obtain the best electrode in sewage wastewater treatment. Fig. 2 compares the treatment efficiency for these three kinds of electrodes under the same current density.

![Fig. 2. Effect of electrode material with current density 1816 A/m², time 0.5 h, pH 7, interelectrode distance 10 mm](image)

The results indicated that for sewage wastewater, the stainless steel electrode was more effective than the iron and aluminum electrode, which can reduce chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid by 98.07, 98.07 and 95.69 % 0.5 h of treatment. While, by using iron as the electrode, percentage of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid removal is 96.14, 96.14 and 92.55 %, which a little bit lower than stainless steel. Besides, by using iron electrodes, the treating solution begins to change into greenish color after 5 min and then switch into brownish color a few minutes later during treatment. The green color must be due to Fe$^{3+}$ and the brown color is Fe(III). Fe(II) can be easily oxidized into Fe(III). Fe(III) usually exist in the form of Fe(OH)$_3$ which is fine particles and hard to precipitate. So iron electrode is not suitable to be used in this process. By using aluminum as electrode, the percentage of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid removal is 97.64, 96.14 and 94.9 %, respectively. Although the treatment by aluminum electrode is almost about the same as the stainless steel electrode, it also not suitable in this experiments because aluminum electrode leave a thick turbidly sludge in the solution. Therefore, all subsequent experiments were carried out with stainless steel electrode.

**Effect of current density:** In all the electrocoagulation process, current density is the most important parameter in controlling the reaction rate. Rising current density resulted to an increase in the removal efficiency of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand, suspended solid. Fig. 3 shows the removal efficiency of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid against current density applied to the stainless steel electrodes in the electrocoagulation process. When the current density increases, the efficiency of ion production in anode and cathode also increase, leading to the
flock production increment. So that, 96, 98.3 and 97.6% of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid percentage of removal was obtained by using 1816 A/m² during 0.5 h of electrocoagulation process compared to the 92.2, 94.6 and 94% of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid respectively using only 605 A/m². The optimum of current density of 1816 A/m² was used for this treatment in 0.5 h.

Effect of electrolysis time: As shown in Fig. 4, as the time of electrolysis increase comparable changes in the removal efficiency of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid are observed. Reactive time also influence the treatment efficiency of electrocoagulation process because the more time consume, the more production rate of hydroxyl and metal ion are produced on the electrodes.

Electrode consumptions are proportional to the operating time. Fig. 5 showed the electrode consumption increased almost steadily every minute. Increasing in time from 5 to 30 min resulted to a decreasing weight of cathode from 88.432 to 88.356 g stainless steel anode which is increment average of anode consumption is about 15 mg/L sewage wastewater every 5 min. Therefore, this result indicates that retention time is very important parameter because it affects the economic applicability of electrocoagulation process in treatment of sewage wastewater.

Effect of interelectrode distance: The effect of interelectrode distance does not show a significant result in this experiment. However, as shown in Fig. 6, when inter electrode distance increases, the efficiency of chemical oxygen demand, biochemical oxygen demand and suspended solid removal decrease slightly because the rate of electron transfer is become slower. Variations of the percentage removal with inter electrode distance is shown in Fig. 6.

Fig. 6 suggested that the removal efficiency slightly decreases when electrode distance increases. For chemical oxygen demand, removal efficiency decreases from 98.07% at 10 mm electrode distances to 96.35% at 40 mm electrode distances. For biochemical oxygen demand, the removal efficiency is almost the same as chemical oxygen demand which is from 98.07% at 10 mm to 96.53% at 40 mm electrode distance. For suspended solid, the removal efficiency decreases from 97.64% at 10 mm to 95.62% at 40 mm electrode distances. The increase of inter electrode distance make the cell potential (V) increases which also increases the resistance
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