

List of Figures

Figure 1: Classification of pharmaceutical compounds with their examples	2
Figure 2 : Schematic view of the batch experimental setup for EO of DCF	31
Figure 3: Schematic view of the batch experimental setup for EC/PMS of IBU	32
Figure 4: Schematic view of the continuous flow experimental setup for EC/PMS of IBU	32
Figure 5: Outline of the experimental work carried out in the present study	33
Figure 6: Design of experimental run for RSM.....	37
Figure 7: Formation of reactive chlorine species along the time.....	39
Figure 8: Area covered under chromatogram along the time (a) for immediate analysis without quenching, (b) analysis after quenching with sodium sulfite, (c) analysis after quenching with sodium nitrite, (d) analysis after 24 h refrigeration at 4 °C, (e) analysis after quenching with methanol	41
Figure 9: HPLC chromatograms for 10 min reaction time, dotted line represents result after quenching and solid black line represents immediate result without quenching (a) solid black line - for immediate analysis without quenching, (b) dotted pink line - analysis after quenching with sodium sulfite, (c) dotted blue line - analysis after quenching with sodium nitrite, (d) dotted green line - analysis after 24 h refrigeration at 4 °C, (e) thin orange line - analysis after quenching with methanol (sample: methanol = 1:1) overlaid on solid black line – 1:1 diluted sample with distilled water	44
Figure 10: Time course profiles for EO of DCF in ROC, [DCF] ₀ = 10 ppm, anode: Ti/Ru-Sn-Sb-O _x , cathode: steel, and varying current densities (a) J=5 mA/cm ² , (b) J=7.5 mA/cm ² , and (c) J=10 mA/cm ²	46
Figure 11: Effect of sulfate to chloride ratio on EO of DCF and its Intermediate products, [DCF] ₀ = 10 mg/L, J = 7.5 mA/cm ² , total salt concentration = 1000 mg/L, anode: Ti/Ru-Sn-Sb-O _x ,	

cathode: steel, (a) $[\text{NaCl}] = 1000 \text{ mg/L}$ and $\text{S:C} = 0 : 1$, (b) $[\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4]:[\text{NaCl}] = 350 : 650$ and $\text{S:C} = 0.6 : 1$, (c) $[\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4]:[\text{NaCl}] = 460 : 540$ and $\text{S:C} = 0.85 : 1$, (d) $[\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4]:[\text{NaCl}] = 500 : 500$ and $\text{S:C} = 1.1 : 1$, (e) $[\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4]:[\text{NaCl}] = 550 : 450$ and $\text{S:C} = 1.35 : 1$, (f) $[\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4]:[\text{NaCl}] = 600 : 400$ and $\text{S:C} = 1.6 : 1$, (g) $[\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4] = 1000 \text{ mg/L}$ and $\text{S:C} = 1 : 0$.
 48

Figure 12: Time course profile for DCF in various S:C composition, $J = 7.5 \text{ mA/cm}^2$, Ti/Ru-Sn-Sb- O_x anode, steel cathode, solution volume = 1 L, $[\text{DCF}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ 49

Figure 13: $\ln(C/C_0)$ versus time plot for DCF in various S:C composition, $J = 7.5 \text{ mA/cm}^2$, Ti/Ru-Sn-Sb- O_x anode, steel cathode, solution volume = 1 L, $[\text{DCF}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ 49

Figure 14: Reaction rate constants for pseudo first order reaction kinetics along with overall (DCF and Intermediate products) % removal for various S:C ratios 50

Figure 15: (a) Time course profile for DCF, (b) Total HPLC area of Intermediate products, using EO with three different electrodes, matrix = ROC, $J = 5 \text{ mA/cm}^2$, steel cathode, solution volume = 1 L, $[\text{DCF}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$, $\text{pH} = 7.8$ 52

Figure 16: %Germination and %Phytotoxicity for mung seeds in distilled water, ROC, initial sample (ROC spiked with 10 mg/L DCF), and treated sample by EO for 120 minutes 54

Figure 17: IBU removal in ROC matrix under different systems. Experimental conditions: $[\text{IBU}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$, $[\text{PMS}]_0 = 500 \text{ mg/L}$, total $[\text{Fe}^{2+}] = 99.12 \text{ mg/L}$, current density = 2.5 mA/cm^2 , $\text{pH}_0 = 7.5$ 55

Figure 18: Comparison of different systems on the basis of reaction rate. Experimental conditions: $[\text{IBU}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$, $[\text{PMS}]_0 = 500 \text{ mg/L}$, $[\text{Fe}^{2+}] = 99 \text{ mg/L}$, current density = 2.5 mA/cm^2 , $\text{pH}_0 = 7.5$ 57

Figure 19: Effect of radical quenchers on IBU degradation. Experimental conditions: ROC, $[\text{IBU}]_0 = 10 \text{ mg/L}$ (0.05 mM), $[\text{PMS}]_0 = 500 \text{ mg/L}$, current density = 2.5 mA/cm^2 , $\text{pH}_0 = 7.5$ 58

Figure 20: Pareto chart of the effect of current density, pH, PMS, and interactions of $\text{pH} \times \text{PMS}$ and $\text{PMS} \times \text{current density}$ 60

Figure 21: Predicted versus actual IBU removal rate constants	62
Figure 22: Effect of pH on IBU removal rate constant for various combinations of current densities and [PMS] ₀ . Experimental conditions: ROC, [IBU] ₀ = 10 mg/L.	64
Figure 23: Effect of initial PMS concentration on IBU removal rate constant for various combinations of pH and current densities. Experimental conditions: ROC, [IBU] ₀ = 10 mg/L.	65
Figure 24: Effect of current density on IBU removal rate constant for various combinations of pH and [PMS] ₀ . Experimental conditions: ROC, [IBU] ₀ = 10 mg/L.	66
Figure 25: Effect of flow (residence time - RT) on the performance of continuous EC/PMS process (a) Flow = 2 L/h, RT = 30 min, (b) Flow = 2.5 L/h, RT = 24 min, (c) Flow = 3 L/h, RT = 20 min, (d) Flow = 4 L/h, RT = 15 min.....	70
Figure 26: LC-MS spectrums of DCF (m/z 296), IP _{8.5} (m/z 310), and IP _{9.1} (m/z 314). (Colour coding: Black=Carbon, Grey=Hydrogen, Red=Oxygen, Green=Chlorine, Blue=Nitrogen).71	
Figure 27: LC-MS spectrums of IBU (m/z 206.3) and IP@ 260 nm (m/z 238). (Colour coding: Black=Carbon, Grey=Hydrogen, Red=Oxygen, Green=Chlorine, Blue=Nitrogen).....	72