

**APPLICATION OF COPPERAS AND SAGO
STARCH IN DOMESTIC WASTEWATER
TREATMENT BY COAGULATION
FLOCCULATION PROCESS**

WAN IZATUL SAADIAH BINTI WAN KAMAR

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2016

**APPLICATION OF COPPERAS AND SAGO STARCH IN
DOMESTIC WASTEWATER TREATMENT BY COAGULATION
FLOCCULATION PROCESS**

by

WAN IZATUL SAADIAH BINTI WAN KAMAR

**Thesis submitted in the fulfilment of the
requirement for the degree of
Masters of Science**

September 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to thank my beloved family who has continuously given their love and support to me through my research endeavour, especially to my mother who always pray for my success and my siblings for their full support. A very sincere appreciation to my lovely husband for allowing me to finish my lab work until late evening and always be patient and supports me in finishing my master's programme. Also to my baby, thanks for being a very behave and 'soleh' son.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Hamidi Abdul Aziz for his guidance, valuable suggestions and constructive comments which lead me to achieve my goals in this dissertation. Besides, my sincere thanks to all environment's laboratory assistants, Mr. Mohad Syukri bin Zambri, Mr. Muhamad Zaini bin Mohd. Zuki, Mrs. Shamsiah binti Mohamed Ali, Mr. Nabil bin Semail and Mr. Mohammed Nizam bin Mohd Kamal. Their kind support has helped me to complete my laboratory works smoothly. Then, I would like to thank to USM for all the facilities provided.

Lastly, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude for the enthusiastic help, encouragement, motivation and support from my dearest friends, Shaylinda, Fatihah, Aina, Muaz, Azliza, Azim and Izzati. Thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF PLATES	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
ABTSTRAK	xix
ABTRACT	xxi
 CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of study	1
1.2 Problem statement	3
1.3 Research objectives	5
1.4 Scope of study	6
1.5 Thesis layout	7
 CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Wastewater	8
2.2 Domestic wastewater	9

2.3	Coagulation flocculation	13
2.4	Type of coagulants	16
2.4.1	Inorganic coagulant	18
2.4.2	Copperas	20
2.4.3	Organic/natural coagulant	22
2.4.4	Coagulant from plant origin	25
2.4.5	Sago starch	29
2.4.5.a)	Sago as starch	29
2.4.5.b)	Properties of sago starch	33
2.5	Coagulation mechanism	35
2.6	Influencing factors	39
2.6.1	pH	40
2.6.2	Coagulant dose	40
2.7	Optimization of jar test condition	42
2.8	Zeta Potential	44
2.9	Summary of literature review	45

CHAPTER THREE : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Research framework	46
3.2	Instrumentations, chemicals and reagents	47
3.3	Juru Raw Sewage Treatment Plant (JRSTP)	48
3.4	Sampling of domestic wastewater and storage	51
3.5	Copperas (CPP)	53
3.6	Preparation of coagulant and coagulant aid	54
3.6.1	Copperas' solution	54

3.6.2	Analytical ferrous sulphate's solution	56
3.6.3	Sago starch	56
3.7	Jar test coagulation and performance study	58
3.7.1	Coagulation by CPP and AFS	61
3.7.2	Coagulation by sago starch	62
3.8	Analytical Procedure	
3.8.1	Removal efficiency	63
3.8.2	pH (Method No: 302)	64
3.8.3	Colour (Method 2120C)	64
3.8.4	Suspended solids (Method 8006)	64
3.8.5	Ammoniacal nitrogen (Method 8038)	65
3.8.6	Phosphorus (Method 8048)	65
3.8.7	Turbidity (Method 2130B)	66
3.8.8	Chemical Oxygen Demand, (Method 8000)	66
3.8.9	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, TKN (4500-Norg B)	66
3.8.10	Zeta potential (Malvern Zetasizer Nano ZS)	67
3.8.11	Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR)	68
3.8.12	Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscopy (FESEM)	68
3.8.13	Alkalinity	68
3.8.14	Hardness	69
3.8.15	Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	69
3.8.16	Elemental Analysis	70

CHAPTER FOUR : RESULTS AND DISCUSION

4.1	Introduction	71
-----	--------------	----

4.2	Raw domestic wastewater characterization	71
4.3	Characterization of coagulant	
4.3.1	Copperas (CPP) and Analytical Ferrous Sulfate (AFS)	77
4.3.1.a)	Functional group	77
4.3.1.b)	Elemental analysis	78
4.3.1.c)	Morphology and composition	79
4.3.1.d)	Zeta potential	81
4.3.2	Sago starch (SG)	83
4.3.2.a)	Functional group	83
4.3.2.b)	Elemental analysis	84
4.3.2.c)	Morphology and composition	85
4.3.2.d)	Zeta potential	86
4.4	Selecting sago starch as coagulant	87
4.5	Performance of coagulation flocculation treatment	90
4.5.1	Copperas (CPP)	90
4.5.1.a)	Effect of pH	90
4.5.1.b)	Effect of coagulant dose	92
4.5.1.c)	Optimum condition of coagulation flocculation	94
4.5.1.d)	Sludge characterization	99
4.5.2	Analytical ferrous sulphate (AFS)	
4.5.2.a)	Effect of pH	101
4.5.2.b)	Effect of coagulant dose	103
4.5.2.c)	Optimum condition of coagulation flocculation	105
4.5.2.d)	Sludge characterization	111
4.5.2.e)	Comparison of CPP and AFS	113

4.5.3 Sago starch	
4.5.3.a) Effect of pH	114
4.5.3.b) Effect of coagulant dose	116
4.5.3.c) Optimum condition of coagulation flocculation	118
4.5.3.d) Sludge characterization	125
4.5.4 Comparison of coagulation performance	126

CHAPTER FIVE : CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Conclusion	132
5.2 Recommendation	134

REFERENCES	135
-------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A (Characteristics of raw and treated domestic wastewater)

Appendix B (Performance of CPP, AFS and SG towards domestic wastewater by coagulation flocculation process)

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1 Composition of human urine and faeces.	10
Table 2.2 The advantages and disadvantages of inorganic coagulants	19
Table 2.3 Research summaries of fruit waste used as plant based coagulant	27
Table 2.4 Properties of sago starch	33
Table 2.5 Study of water treatment using sago starch	35
Table 2.6 Characteristics of coagulant mechanism by metallic coagulant	38
Table 3.1 Instruments used in current research study	47
Table 3.2 Reagent and chemical used in current study	48
Table 3.3 Design sewage flow	50
Table 3.4 Design of sewage	50
Table 3.5 Dose of CPP and amount to be added during the experiment	56
Table 3.6 Dose of SG and amount to be added during the experiment	58
Table 4.1 The sewage characteristics of Juru Regional Sewage Treatment Plant.	73
Table 4.2 Comparison of functional group of CPP and AFS as coagulant.	78

Table 4.3	Elements of AFS and CPP by CHNS test.	78
Table 4.4	Percentage composition elements of CPP and AFS by EDX test.	81
Table 4.5	Comparison of Zeta potential of CPP and AFS as coagulants	82
Table 4.6	Summary of FTIR result for SG.	84
Table 4.7	Composition of nitrogen, carbon, hydrogen and sulphur in SG as coagulant	84
Table 4.8	Percentage of SG's composition	86
Table 4.9	Comparison of removals at the control condition (C) and after (A) applying 10mg/L of CPP as coagulant at pH 4-pH 9. The conditions of both experiments apply 200 rpm of 3 mins of rapid mixing, 40 rpm of 30 mins of slow mixing and 30 mins of settlement.	92
Table 4.10	Comparison of removal between initial, I (pH 9, 10 mg/L CPP dose) and optimum pH and dose, O (pH9, 150 mg/L CPP dose). Both experiments apply 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settlement.	94
Table 4.11	Comparison of initial and optimum conditions of CPP through coagulation/flocculation treatment.	97
Table 4.12	Comparison of the treatment performance between before and after optimization.	97
Table 4.13	Changes of FTIR spectrum after CPP applied as coagulant in domestic wastewater treatment by coagulation/flocculation.	100
Table 4.14	Comparison of removals at the control condition (C) and after (A) applying 10 mg/L of AFS as coagulant at pH 4-pH 9. The conditions of both experiments apply 200 rpm of 3mins rapid mixing, 40 rpm of 30 mins of slow mixing and 30 mins of settlement.	103

Table 4.15	Comparison of removal between initial, I (pH 9, 10 mg/L AFS dose) and optimum pH and dose, O (pH 9, 180 mg/L AFS dose). Both experiments applied 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settlement.	104
Table 4.16	Comparison between initial and optimization condition of AFS coagulant in coagulation, flocculation and settling duration.	110
Table 4.17	Summary of removals obtained from the optimization stages and its percentage of increasing.	110
Table 4.18	Summary of FTIR result from Figure 4.27 for AFS and its sludge at optimum condition of the treatment.	111
Table 4.19	Performance of CPP and AFS	114
Table 4.20	Comparison of removals at the control condition (C) and after (A) applying 5000 mg/L of SG as coagulant at pH 4-pH 9. The conditions of both experiments apply 200 rpm of 3 mins rapid mixing, 40 rpm of 30 mins of slow mixing and 30 mins of settlement.	116
Table 4.21	Comparison of removal between initial, I (pH7, 5000mg/L SG dose) and optimum pH and dose, O (pH 7, 2000 mg/L SG dose). Both experiments applied 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settlement.	118
Table 4.22	The condition of initial and optimization of coagulation, flocculation and settling time duration for SG as coagulant.	123
Table 4.23	Summary of removals obtained from the optimization stages and its percentage of increasing for SG as coagulant.	123
Table 4.24	Summary of SG and its floc at the optimum condition.	125
Table 4.25	Optimization condition of CPP, AFS and SG as coagulants towards domestic wastewater	129

Table 4.26	Comparison of sludge's functional group of CPP, AFS and SG via FTIR test	130
------------	--	-----

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1 Factors hindering the commercialization of natural coagulation	24
Figure 2.2 Advantages natural coagulants over chemical coagulants.	25
Figure 2.3 Application of sago palm	30
Figure 2.4 Production process of sago starch	31
Figure 2.5 Sago logs arriving a starch factory in Mukah, Sarawak, Malaysia	31
Figure 2.6 Image of sago starch trough SEM with 1500x magnification	34
Figure 2.7 Reaction schematic of coagulants.	36
Figure 2.8 Mechanism of coagulation process	36
Figure 2.9 Steps of coagulation process	43
Figure 3.1 Research flowchart.	46
Figure 3.2 Flow of the raw sewage treatment process at Juru RSTP.	50
Figure 3.3 Schematic diagram of jar test experiments series.	60
Figure 3.4 Schematic diagram of jar test procedure for CPP and AFS	62
Figure 3.5 Schematic diagram of jar test procedure for SG.	62
Figure 4.1 IEP for raw domestic wastewater at pH 2.2.	76

Figure 4.2	a) Images of CPP by SEM test, b) Image of AFS as coagulants via SEM test.	80
Figure 4.3	a) and b) Scanning electron micrograph for CPP and AFS.	80
Figure 4.4	IEP graph pattern for AFS and CPP.	82
Figure 4.5	Image of SEM for SG as coagulant.	85
Figure 4.6	Scanning electron micrograph for SG as coagulant.	85
Figure 4.7	IEP of commercial SG.	87
Figure 4.8	Removals obtained from the comparison of commercial and home-made sago starch	90
Figure 4.9	Removals of domestic wastewater by varying the pH from pH 4- pH 9 with application of 10 mg/L CPP at 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	91
Figure 4.10	Removals of domestic wastewater with the optimum pH 9 and varied CPP dosage from 0 – 350 mg/L at 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	93
Figure 4.11	Result for optimization of rapid mixing time test at pH 9, 150 mg/L of CPP dose, rapid mixing speed at 200 rpm, slow mixing speed at 40 rpm for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	95
Figure 4.12	Result for optimization of slow mixing time test at pH9, 150mg/L of copperas by-product dose, 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 1 minute, 40 rpm for slow mixing speed and 30 minutes of settling time.	95
Figure 4.13	Result for optimization of settling time duration test at pH 9, 150 mg/L CPP dose, 200 rpm rapid mixing speed for 1 minute and 40 rpm slow mixing speed for 20 minutes.	96

Figure 4.14	Result for optimization of rapid mixing speed test at pH 9, 150 mg/L CPP dose, 1 minute of rapid mixing speed, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 20 minutes and 18 minutes of settling time.	96
Figure 4.15	Result for optimization of slow mixing speed test at pH 9, 150 mg/L CPP dose, 100 rpm of rapid mixing time speed for 1 minute, 20 minutes of slow mixing time and 18 minutes of settling time duration.	97
Figure 4.16	a) and b) The comparison of FTIR spectrum between CPP coagulant and the floc formed at the optimum condition of pH 9, 150 mg/L of CPP dose, 100 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 1 minute, 60 rpm of slow mixing for 20 minutes and 18 minutes of settling time.	99
Figure 4.17	a) and b) Image of SEM test for the sludge formed of CPP as coagulant at the optimum condition of pH 9, 150 mg/L CPP dose, 100 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 1 minute, 60 rpm of slow mixing for 20 minutes and 18 minutes of settling time duration.	100
Figure 4.18	Removals of domestic wastewater after adjusting the pH from pH 4-pH 9 with application of 10 mg/L AFS as coagulant at 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	102
Figure 4.19	Removals of domestic wastewater with the optimum pH 9 and varied AFS dosage from 0 – 350 mg/L at 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	104
Figure 4.20	Result for optimization of rapid mixing time test at pH 9, 180 mg/L of AFS dose, rapid mixing speed at 200 rpm, slow mixing speed at 40 rpm for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	106
Figure 4.21	Result for optimization of slow mixing time test at pH 9, 180 mg/L of AFS dose, 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 1 minute, 40 rpm for slow mixing speed and 30 minutes of settling time.	106
Figure 4.22	Result for optimization of settling time duration test at pH 9, 180 mg/L AFS dose, 200 rpm rapid mixing speed for 1 minute and 40 rpm slow mixing speed for 32 minutes	108

Figure 4.23	Result for optimization of rapid mixing speed test at pH 9, 180 mg/L AFS dose, 1 minute of rapid mixing speed, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 32 minutes and 18 minutes of settling time.	108
Figure 4.24	Result for optimization of slow mixing speed test at pH 9, 180 mg/L AFS dose, 100 rpm of rapid mixing time speed for 1 minute, 32 minutes of slow mixing time and 18 minutes of settling time duration.	109
Figure 4.25	a) FTIR spectrum of AFS before treatment, b) FTIR spectrum of the AFS sludge at the optimum condition.	111
Figure 4.26	a) Image of AFS before treatment via SEM test, b) Image of the sludge of AFS after treatment at the optimum condition.	112
Figure 4.27	Removals of domestic wastewater after adjusting the pH with application of 5000 mg/L sago starch as coagulant at 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	115
Figure 4.28	Removals of domestic wastewater with the optimum pH 7 and varied SG dosage from 0 – 14 000 mg/L at 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 3 minutes, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	117
Figure 4.29	Result for optimization of rapid mixing time test at pH 7, 2000 mg/L of sago SG dose, rapid mixing speed at 200 rpm, slow mixing speed at 40 rpm for 30 minutes and 30 minutes of settling time.	119
Figure 4.30	Result for optimization of slow mixing time test at pH 7, 2000 mg/L of SG dose, 200 rpm of rapid mixing speed for 1 minute, 40 rpm for slow mixing speed and 30 minutes of settling time.	120
Figure 4.31	Result for optimization of settling time duration test at pH 7, 2000 mg/L SG dose, 200 rpm rapid mixing speed for 1 minute and 40 rpm slow mixing speed for 30 minutes.	121
Figure 4.32	Result for optimization of rapid mixing speed test at pH 7, 2000 mg/L SG dose, 1 minute of rapid mixing speed, 40 rpm of slow mixing speed for 30 minutes and 18 minutes of settling time.	122

Figure 4.33	Result for optimization of slow mixing speed test at pH 7, 2000 mg/L SG dose, 100 rpm of rapid mixing time speed for 1 minute, 30 minutes of slow mixing time and 18 minutes of settling time duration.	122
Figure 4.34	a) FTIR spectrum for SG powder before experiment b) Result of FTIR spectrum of SG after treatment at optimum condition.	125
Figure 4.35	a) Image of SG powder before testing via SEM test b) Image of the floc of SG at the optimum condition.	126
Figure 4.36	a)Sago starch, b)sago starch's sludge, c)analytical ferrous sulfate, d)analytical ferrous sulfate's sludge, e)copperas, f)copperas' sludge	131

LIST OF PLATES

		Page
Plate 3.1	Location of sampling site, Juru Sewage Treatment plant at Juru, Penang.	48
Plate 3.2	Point of taken raw sample at Juru Regional Sewage Treatment Plant site at Juru, Penang.	52
Plate 3.3	Point of taken treated sample at Juru Regional sewage Treatment Plant site at Juru, Penang.	52
Plate 3.4	Titanium dioxide pigment manufacturing facilities of Tioxide (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd. in Telok Kalong, Kemaman, Terengganu.	53
Plate 3.5	Image of CPP	54
Plate 3.6	Image of SG	56
Plate 3.7	Jar test during stirring condition	60
Plate 3.8	Settling samples during settling time duration before withdrawn the supernatant.	61

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WHO	World Health Organisation
APHA	American Public Health Association
BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
SEM-EDX	Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy Dispersive X-ray
FTIR	Fourier Transform Infrared
IEP	Isoelectro Static Point
pH	pondus Hidrogen
RPM	Rotation Per Minute
TKN	Total Kjehdahl Nitrogen
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
CPP	Copperas
AFS	Analytical Ferrous Sulfate
SG	Sago starch

**APLIKASI KOPERAS DAN KANJI SAGU DALAM OLAHAN AIR SISA
DOMESTIK SECARA PROSES PENGUMPALAN DAN
PENGGELOMPOKAN**

ABSTRAK

Olahan air sisa domestik secara konvensional melibatkan pelbagai proses seperti proses secara fizikal, kimia dan biologi. Pengumpalan dan pengelompokan adalah salah satu kaedah yang biasanya digunakan dalam olahan air dan air sisa. Koperas (CPP) dan kanji sagu (SG) sebagai bahan pengumpul dikaji dalam penyelidikan ini. CPP yang digunakan merupakan bahan sampingan yang terhasil dari salah sebuah kilang pemprosesan ilmenite di Malaysia. Sebelum ini ia hanya dibuang di tapak pelupusan tanpa olahan. Ciri-ciri serta potensi CPP diuji dalam olahan air sisa domestik dan keputusannya dibandingkan dengan ferum sulfat analitikal (AFS). SG adalah kanji komersial yang sering digunakan dalam industri pembuatan makanan, bioteknologi dan kosmetik. Kegunaannya dalam olahan air sisa domestik belum pernah lagi diuji setakat ini. Air sisa domestik yang digunakan dalam kajian ini diperoleh daripada Loji Olahan Air sisa Berpusat (JRSTP) yang terletak di Juru, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia. Proses pesampelan dilakukan selama setahun iaitu dari April 2014 hingga April 2015. Sampel air sisa didapati mengandungi kandungan keperluan oksigen kimia (COD), kekeruhan, pepejal terampai, ammonia dan warna yang agak tinggi. Dalam kajian ini, kedua-dua bahan pengumpul (CPP dan SG) telah diuji menggunakan kaedah ujian jar standard. Keadaan optimum bagi eksperimen melibatkan CPP adalah pada pH 9, kepekatan 150 mg/L dengan aplikasi 1 min untuk pengadukan laju (100 rpm), 20 min pengadukan perlahan (60 rpm) dan 18 min untuk masa enapan. Untuk ujian menggunakan SG, keadaan optimum berlaku pada pH 7, kepekatan 2000 mg/L dengan aplikasi 1 min pengadukan laju (100 rpm),

30 min untuk pengadukan perlahan (20 rpm) dan 18 min masa enapan. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa koperasikan berjaya mengurangkan 88% kekeruhan, 79% warna, 92% pepejal terampai, 83% keperluan oksigen kimia, 98% fosforus, 24% ammonia serta 44% Kjeldahl Nitrogen Jumlah. Manakala untuk AFS, 83% kekeruhan, 82% warna, 95% pepejal terampai, 79% keperluan oksigen kimia, 99% fosforus, 16% ammonia dan 12% jumlah Kjeldahl Nitrogen Jumlah. Olahan menggunakan SG pula mencatatkan penyingkiran 82% kekeruhan, 71% warna, 82% pepejal terampai, 73% keperluan oksigen kimia, 57% fosforus, 38% jumlah Kjeldahl Nitrogen Jumlah dan 6% ammonia. Dapat disimpulkan melalui kajian ini bahawa CPP, AFS serta SG mempunyai potensi besar dalam mengolah air sisa domestik.

APPLICATION OF COPPERAS AND SAGO STARCH IN DOMESTIC WASTEWATER TREATMENT BY COAGULATION FLOCCULATION PROCESS

ABSTRACT

Conventional treatment of domestic wastewater involves various processes which include physical, chemical and biological method. Coagulation and flocculation is one of the methods normally applied for water and wastewater treatment. In this study, copperas (CPP) and sago starch (SG) were used as coagulant. CPP used is a by-product of one of an ilmenite processing factories in Malaysia. Previously, it has been dumped in the landfill, untreated. The characteristics and its potential in treating domestic wastewater were investigated and the performances were compared with analytical ferrous sulfate (AFS). SG is a common starch commercially available. It has been used in food, biotechnology and cosmetic industries. Its usage as coagulant in domestic wastewater treatment has not been investigated to date. The domestic wastewater used in this research was collected from Juru Regional Sewage Treatment Plant (JRSTP) at Juru, Penang, Malaysia. Sampling process was conducted for one year (April 2014 to April 2015). The raw sample contains high concentration of COD, turbidity, suspended solids, ammoniacal nitrogen and colour. In this study, both coagulants (CPP and SG) were examined in standard jar test method. The optimum experimental conditions for CPP was pH 9, 150 mg/L of dosage with 1 min of rapid mixing (100 rpm), 20 mins of slow mixing (60 rpm) and 18 mins of settling. For test using SG, the optimum conditions occurred at pH 7, 2000 mg/L of dosage with 1 min of rapid mixing (100 rpm), 30 mins of slow mixing (20 rpm) and 18 mins of settling. It was found that, CPP removed 88% of turbidity, 79% of colour, 92% of suspended solids, 83% of COD, 98% of phosphorus, 24% of

ammonia and 44% of TKN. On the other hand, AFS removed 83% of turbidity, 82% of colour, 95% of suspended solids, 79% of COD, 99% of phosphorus, 16% of ammonia and 12% of TKN. Besides that, the treatment using SG obtained the removal of 82% of turbidity, 71% of colour, 82% of suspended solids, 73% of COD, 57% of phosphorus, 38% of TKN and 6% of ammonia. As a conclusion, CPP, AFS and SG have good potential to be used as coagulant in domestic wastewater treatment.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

Uncontrolled discharge of domestic and industrial wastewaters into the environment causes severe pollution problems such as eutrophication or oxygen depletion in receiving water bodies and toxicity to aquatic organisms which makes wastewater treatment mandatory (Cai et. al., 2013; Moharram et al., 2015). Almost 2.5 billion people stay in developing countries have lacked access to a basic sanitation system nowadays. Hence, more than 40% population in the world dumps their wastewater improperly in watercourses (WHO, 2012). This improper dumping generates environmental problems that directly affect public health and increases the cost water treatment for public supply (Von Sperling, 2005; Wang et al., 2007). Domestic wastewater consists of nutrients, organic matter and other chemicals such as PAHs and phthalates (Huang et al, 2010). Thus, the untreated wastewater can lead to spreading of disease in the form of several types of endemic and epidemic illnesses (Ahmad et al., 2008).

Currently, there are many types of wastewater treatment which can be applied ranging from modest, low priced and less efficient processes to very advanced, highly efficient and pricey operations. The factors influence the selection of the treatment applied are the local area circumstances, such as climate and the weather, social attributes, economy, availability of enforceable standards, availability of land and power, demanded operation skills and its availability, monitoring actions,