



# Politecnico di Bari

Repository Istituzionale dei Prodotti della Ricerca del Politecnico di Bari

Solar photocatalysis: Materials, reactors, some commercial, and pre-industrialized applications. A comprehensive approach

This is a pre-print of the following article

*Original Citation:*

Solar photocatalysis: Materials, reactors, some commercial, and pre-industrialized applications. A comprehensive approach / Spasiano, Danilo; Marotta, Raffaele; Malato, Sixto; Fernandez Ibañez, Pilar; Di Somma, Ilaria. - In: APPLIED CATALYSIS. B, ENVIRONMENTAL. - ISSN 0926-3373. - 170-171:(2015), pp. 90-123. [10.1016/j.apcatb.2014.12.050]

*Availability:*

This version is available at <http://hdl.handle.net/11589/79970> since: 2022-05-30

*Published version*

DOI:10.1016/j.apcatb.2014.12.050

*Terms of use:*


(Article begins on next page)

Dear Author,

Please, note that changes made to the HTML content will be added to the article before publication, but are not reflected in this PDF.

Note also that this file should not be used for submitting corrections.

**AUTHOR QUERY FORM**

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <br><b>ELSEVIER</b> | <b>Journal:</b> APCATB<br><br><b>Article Number:</b> 13814 | <b>Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to:</b><br><br><b>E-mail:</b> <a href="mailto:corrections.esch@elsevier.thomsondigital.com">corrections.esch@elsevier.thomsondigital.com</a><br><br><b>Fax:</b> +353 6170 9272 |
|--|--|---|

Dear Author,

Please check your proof carefully and mark all corrections at the appropriate place in the proof (e.g., by using on-screen annotation in the PDF file) or compile them in a separate list. Note: if you opt to annotate the file with software other than Adobe Reader then please also highlight the appropriate place in the PDF file. To ensure fast publication of your paper please return your corrections within 48 hours.

For correction or revision of any artwork, please consult <http://www.elsevier.com/artworkinstructions>.

Any queries or remarks that have arisen during the processing of your manuscript are listed below and highlighted by flags in the proof. Click on the 'Q' link to go to the location in the proof.

| Location in article   | Query / Remark: <b>click on the Q link to go</b><br><b>Please insert your reply or correction at the corresponding line in the proof</b>   |
|---|--|
| <b>Q1</b><br><br><b>Q2</b><br><b>Q3</b><br><b>Q4</b><br><b>Q5</b><br><b>Q6</b><br><b>Q7</b><br><b>Q8</b><br><b>Q9</b> | <p>“Your article is registered as a regular item and is being processed for inclusion in a regular issue of the journal. If this is NOT correct and your article belongs to a Special Issue/Collection please contact e.mohan@elsevier.com immediately prior to returning your corrections.”</p> <p>Please confirm that given names and surnames have been identified correctly.</p> <p>Please check the presentation of Ref. [59], and correct if necessary.</p> <p>Please check the journal title of Ref. [107].</p> <p>Please provide page range for Refs. [137 and 143].</p> <p>Please provide volume number for Refs. [137, 141, 143, 181 and 198].</p> <p>Please provide year for Ref. [143].</p> <p>Fig. [8] will appear in black and white in print and in color on the web. Based on this, the respective figure captions have been updated. Please check, and correct if necessary.</p> <p>Please check the placement of table footnote "(e)", and correct if necessary.</p> <div> <p>Please check this box or indicate your approval if you have no corrections to make to the PDF file</p> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> |

Thank you for your assistance.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Applied Catalysis B: Environmental


journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/apcatb](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/apcatb)

## Graphical Abstract

Q1

**Solar photocatalysis: Materials, reactors, some commercial, and pre-industrialized applications. A comprehensive approach**

Danilo Spasiano, Raffaele Marotta\*, Sixto Malato,  
Pilar Fernandez-Ibanez, Ilaria Di Somma

*Applied Catalysis B: Environmental xxx (2015) xxx–xxx*

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

## Applied Catalysis B: Environmental

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/apcatb](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/apcatb)

### Highlights

Q1

**Solar photocatalysis: Materials, reactors, some commercial, and pre-industrialized applications. A comprehensive approach***Applied Catalysis B: Environmental xxx (2015) xxx–xxx*

Danilo Spasiano, Raffaele Marotta\*, Sixto Malato, Pilar Fernandez-Ibanez, Ilaria Di Somma

- Description of common commercial photocatalytic technologies based on sunlight.
- Solar driven photocatalytic processes for fine chemicals production.
- Calculation of “figures of merit” for several photocatalytic solar plants.
- The operative factors affecting the photocatalytic processes efficiency are given.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Applied Catalysis B: Environmental

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/apcatb](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/apcatb)



### Review

# Solar photocatalysis: Materials, reactors, some commercial, and pre-industrialized applications. A comprehensive approach

**Danilo Spasiano<sup>a</sup>, Raffaele Marotta<sup>a,\*</sup>, Sixto Malato<sup>b</sup>, Pilar Fernandez-Ibanez<sup>b</sup>,  
Ilaria Di Somma<sup>c</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> Dipartimento di Ingegneria Chimica, dei Materiali e della Produzione Industriale, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II", P.le V. Tecchio, 80, 80125, Napoli, Italy

<sup>b</sup> Plataforma Solar de Almería-CIEMAT, Carretera de Senés Km 4, 04200, Tabernas, Almería, Spain

<sup>c</sup> Istituto di Ricerche sulla Combustione, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR), P.le V. Tecchio, 80, 80125, Napoli, Italy

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 14 October 2014

Received in revised form

22 December 2014

Accepted 31 December 2014

Available online xxx

#### Keywords:

Solar photocatalysis

Solar photoreactors

Solar chemical production

Solar photocatalytic technology

Green photochemistry

### ABSTRACT

In the future, solar energy, along with other renewable resources, could play a key role in mass production of fine chemicals. It could also potentially solve environmental problems, as demonstrated by recent developments in the use of solar energy, such as solar photocatalysis. The solar photocatalytic technology has been demonstrated to be effective for:

- Treating groundwater, drinking water, industrial wastewater, and air and soil pollution,
- Water disinfection, and
- Industrial production of fine chemicals.

This report summarizes the current status of solar photocatalysis and identifies future opportunities for research and industry in this field, including recent relevant bibliography. The main commercial solar photocatalytic applications are described, included the technologies based on sunlight for antifogging and self-cleaning of coating materials, glass, and concrete. An overview of several different solar photoreactors and the main operating process parameters are also provided. For the estimation of capital costs, it is suggested the use of appropriate "figures of merit". The present review would be of interest for researchers, technologists, engineers, and industrialists.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

### Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction  | 00 |
| 1.1. Historical background   | 00 |
| 1.2. Principles of photocatalytic and sensitized photochemical reactions | 00 |
| 1.2.1. Homogeneous photocatalysis  | 00 |
| 1.2.2. Heterogeneous photocatalysis                                      | 00 |
| 1.2.3. Photo-induced super-hydrophilicity                                | 00 |
| 2. Photocatalytic technology   | 00 |
| 2.1. Self-cleaning functions and TiO <sub>2</sub> -modified concrete     | 00 |
| 2.2. Bactericidal (mildew-proof) coating                                 | 00 |
| 2.3. Preservation of perishable goods                                    | 00 |
| 3. Solar photocatalytic chemical production and wastewater treatment     | 00 |
| 3.1. Design of solar photocatalytic reactors for commercial use          | 00 |
| 3.1.1. Parabolic trough collectors                                       | 00 |
| 3.1.2. Non-concentrating collectors                                      | 00 |
| 3.1.3. Compound parabolic collectors                                     | 00 |

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 81 7682968; fax: +39 81 5936936.

E-mail address: [raffaele.marotta@unina.it](mailto:raffaele.marotta@unina.it) (R. Marotta).

|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 43 | 4. Solar photoreactors materials, efficiency, and costs .....                       | 00 |
| 44 | 5. Factors affecting solar photocatalysis .....                                     | 00 |
| 45 | 5.1. Solar irradiance and weather conditions .....                                  | 00 |
| 46 | 5.2. Catalyst load, optical density, photoreactor diameter, and specific area ..... | 00 |
| 47 | 5.3. Oxygen concentration .....   | 00 |
| 48 | 5.4. Effect of original pH .....  | 00 |
| 49 | 5.5. Effect of temperature .....  | 00 |
| 50 | 6. Conclusions .....  | 00 |
| 51 | Acknowledgment .....  | 00 |
| 52 | References .....  | 00 |

## 1. Introduction

Since non-renewable energy resources are being depleted [1], alternative sources, such as solar, wind, and geothermal energies, will acquire an increasingly important role in the near future. This is particularly true of solar energy, which may be converted into chemical energy by natural solar photo-assisted reactions.

Among the solar photoreactions, photocatalysis is the most widely studied, and is applied on different levels and in such different industries as fine chemical production, architecture and construction, water and air treatment, hygiene and sanitation, environmental protection, and the automotive industry [2–8].


Photocatalytic products were first marketed in Japan in the mid-1990s, and later in America and Europe. By 2009, the global volume of solar photocatalysis-based products was \$848 million and is expected to double in 2014, reaching nearly \$1.7 billion [9] (Fig. 1).

In 2009, photocatalytic products for construction accounted for the largest share of the market (over 87%), with estimated gains of \$740.3 million. At a predicted compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 14.5%, these will reach \$1.5 billion in 2014 [10]. The consumer products market segment was worth \$85 million for the same year, and is expected to grow at a CAGR of 13.2% to \$158 million in 2014.

Other products contributed with smaller sales volumes totaling \$22.1 million. The market is projected to reach \$33.6 million in 2014 at a 5-year CAGR of 8.7%. However, extensive research continues to further improve the photocatalytic technology and extend its potential uses, revealing that in the future they may provide realistic solutions to most major modern dilemmas: depletion of stocks of fossil fuels, progressive pollution of natural resources, and global warming. Some improvements in the performance of solar photocatalytic applications have also been related to advances in nanotechnology. In particular, the synthesis and manufacture of new photocatalysts, using nanotechnologies, show that it is possible to greatly enhance the photocatalytic efficiency of specific materials [11,12].

### 1.1. Historical background

The use of solar energy in chemical synthesis had not been explored until the beginning of the 20th century when Ciamician, called the “Father of Modern Photochemistry” [13], began to study the chemical behavior of organic compounds under solar irradiation. One of the first milestones in the use of solar photochemistry was the technical-scale production of ascaridole (an anthelmintic drug) by Schenck in 1943, by solar irradiation of  $\alpha$ -terpinene [14]:



The first solar chemical plant, a pilot plant to produce ascaridole, was built after World War II [15]. In the second half of the 20th century, with the development of artificial lamps, photochemistry moved indoors [16]. During the 1970s, after the oil crisis, and influenced by growing awareness of global warming, research on the possibility of using the sunlight as an energy source was intensified. During these years, Fujishima and Honda demonstrated the market potential of heterogeneous photocatalysis [17]. In the wake of revival of interest in solar production, new non-concentrating and concentrating solar pilot reactors were designed and built [18]. Several experiments in solar detoxification of aqueous effluents were undertaken during the 1990s [19–22]. The first experimental solar photocatalytic pilot plant, located in Albuquerque (New Mexico, USA), was designed and built in 1989 [23]. Immediately afterwards, in 1990, a similar facility was designed and built at the Plataforma Solar de Almeria (Almeria, Spain) [24]. Since the beginning of the 21st century, applied research has also focused on the use of natural sunlight for preindustrial fine chemical production.





Fig. 1. Global market for photocatalyst products 2007–2014 (\$ millions).

## 1.2. Principles of photocatalytic and sensitized photochemical reactions

The term “photocatalysis” indicates acceleration of a photoreaction due to the presence of a catalyst [25]. This definition also takes into account photosensitization, a chemical process by which one molecular entity is photochemically altered following absorption of radiation by another molecular entity called a photosensitizer. However, unlike a photocatalytic process, photosensitization rules out photoacceleration of a chemical reaction regardless of whether it occurs in a homogeneous or heterogeneous phase.


### 1.2.1. Homogeneous photocatalysis

The most commonly used homogeneous solar photocatalytic systems at both pilot and commercial scale are photo-Fenton and photo-sensitized oxidation by singlet oxygen. The main photo-Fenton reactions in a solar-assisted catalytic cycle are illustrated in the following simplified scheme [26]:



Hydrated ferric ions ([Fe(OH)]<sup>2+</sup>) are photo-reduced to ferrous ions in acidic aqueous solutions in the presence of sunlight radiation with wavelengths shorter than 580 nm, giving rise to hydroxyl radicals (HO•). Ferrous ions are reoxidized to ferric by hydrogen peroxide or molecular oxygen, producing additional reactive radicals, like hydroxyl and hydroperoxyl radicals [27,28]. These radicals promptly oxidize organic compounds converting them into carbon dioxide and water [29].

The starting concentrations of hydrogen peroxide and ferrous ions critically influence overall efficiency of the solar oxidation process. Oxidation rates generally increase with iron ions and hydrogen peroxide concentrations [30], even though such increase is sometimes observed to be deleterious at the highest concentrations. In fact, an excess of ferrous ions or hydrogen peroxide can cause inhibition of the solar photochemical oxidation process, because these species may compete with the organic compounds as hydroxyl radical scavengers [31,32]:



Photosensitization is a chemical process in which a soluble substance (sensitizer or photosensitizer) is capable of absorbing radiation and transferring the energy absorbed to a different reacting molecule like molecular oxygen (photosensitized oxidation) [33]. In this case, an oxygen molecule in the ground state (<sup>3</sup>O<sub>2</sub>) is excited to a higher energy and an energized species of oxygen, singlet oxygen (<sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>), is formed. This unstable activated species is much more reactive than the ground triplet state and it is responsible for the selective photooxidation of various organic compounds to fine chemicals [34–36]. Since the sensitizer is not usually consumed, or at most, is only partially degraded during the photochemical process, returning to its original state once the reaction is complete, photosensitization may be classified as a photocatalytic reaction [35]. Methylene blue (absorption wavelength max, λ<sub>max</sub> = 665 nm [37]) and Rose Bengal (λ<sub>max</sub> = 550 nm) are the most popular photosensitizers used for the production of singlet oxygen. The homogeneous catalytic or sensitized photooxidation of organic substrates using sunlight as the radiation source is of increasing commercial interest in the fields of production of chemical intermediates and wastewater treatment.

### 1.2.2. Heterogeneous photocatalysis

A heterogeneous photocatalyst is a semiconducting substance which can be chemically activated by radiation. A band model is often used for schematic representation of the electronic structures of photoconducting materials. Many well-documented reviews are devoted to the fundamentals of photocatalysis in this regard [38–44]. If a photoconductor is irradiated by light with energy matching or greater than its band gap energy (E<sub>g</sub>), an electron (e<sup>−</sup>) in an electron-filled valence band (VB) is excited to a vacant conduction band (CB), leaving a positive hole (h<sup>+</sup>) in the VB. These photogenerated electrons and positive holes drive reduction and oxidation, respectively, of different compounds, not necessarily adsorbed on the surface of the photocatalyst [45]. Valence band holes (h<sub>VB</sub><sup>+</sup>) are powerful oxidants, whereas, conduction band electrons (e<sub>CB</sub><sup>−</sup>) are reductants (Fig. 2). Due to their electronic structures, heterogeneous photocatalysts can act as mediators in chemical redox processes. The first step is the formation of charge carriers by a photon. The excited electrons and holes in the absence of suitable electron and hole scavengers tend to recombine very quickly, dissipating the energy as heat. Photocatalytic activity is strongly dependent on the competition between the surface transfer of charge carriers and electron–hole recombination [46]. If a suitable scavenger or surface defect is available to trap the photogenerated electrons or holes, recombination is limited and further photocatalytic reactions may occur that yield mineralization products during prolonged reaction periods. The strong oxidizing power of the positive hole can enable a one-electron oxidation step with water, normally present in the system, to produce hydroxyl radicals (HO•):








Fig. 2. Schematic illustration of basic mechanism of a solar heterogeneous photocatalytic process.

which are highly reactive species able to oxidize organic molecules in liquid or gas phase [38,47]. Moreover, if air is also present, oxygen can act as an electron acceptor, and be reduced by the photoelectrons in the conduction band to form a superoxide ion, which is also a powerful oxidant. The width of the band gap is a measure of the strength of the chemical bond [48]. Semiconductors that are stable under illumination, typically metal oxides, usually consist of the top of the valence band located at +3 eV or lower (vs. NHE). From the standpoint of solar energy, the development of photocatalysts which can drive redox reactions under visible light (>400 nm) is indispensable [49].

Among the photo-semiconductors (ZnO, WO<sub>3</sub>, MoO<sub>3</sub>, ZrO<sub>2</sub>, SnO<sub>2</sub>, α-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, etc.), titanium dioxide (TiO<sub>2</sub>, titania) is one of the most promising candidates for commercial solar applications, mainly due to its photochemical stability and high oxidation power (3.2 eV vs. NHE, which corresponds to photons with a wavelength of 388 nm), high resistance to photocorrosion in aqueous environments, safety, and lower cost than other photocatalytic materials [50]. The drawbacks of titania, which currently limit its wider commercial application, are that it absorbs only in the ultraviolet region, which is only about 3–4% of the solar energy reaching the terrestrial surface, and the high rate of electron/hole ( $e_{CB}^-/h_{VB}^+$ ) pair recombination. Much effort has been devoted to the development of TiO<sub>2</sub> visible-light harvesting photocatalysts to increase the amount of visible sunlight which TiO<sub>2</sub> can absorb [51].

Most of the research and commercial applications use a heterogeneous photocatalyst, generally titanium dioxide, dispersed in the liquid phase by mechanical agitation or immobilized on a surface, such as the reactor wall, or supported on particles forming a catalytic bed. The use of slurry systems requires a further separation step, such as filtration or centrifugation, which increases the complexity of the overall process and decrease its economic feasibility. However, the suspensions are easier to work with and provide higher efficiencies than immobilized catalysts, mainly due to a higher ratio of active catalytic surface to reaction volume and fewer mass transfer limitations [52].

Moreover, the photocatalyst slurry is easily prepared by several chemical routes [53]. On the contrary, synthesis of immobilized catalysts is more difficult and requires inert support materials, such as alumina pellets, molecular sieves, or glass or ceramic fibers [54].

Commercial titanium dioxide (TiO<sub>2</sub>) powders, such as anatase crystalline or anatase and rutile mixtures (Degussa, Evonik, Aeroxide P25, 80:20 anatase/rutile) are the most widely used heterogeneous catalysts for solar wastewater treatment applications, because their detoxification efficiencies are the highest [55].

Two parameters for the characterization of photocatalytic activities in heterogeneous systems, the photonic efficiency and the quantum yield, have been suggested. The photonic efficiency, is generally used to compare the photoactivity of different photocatalysts [56]. This can be derived from analytical data as the ratio of the experimental photocatalytic reaction rate ( $\text{mol L}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) to the incident photon rate ( $\text{Einstein L}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) measured by actinometry.

Several different definitions of the second indicator, the quantum yield ( $Q_y$ ), have been proposed [44,57]. However, these definitions are all based on a ratio involving the number of photoconverted or photoproducted molecules over the number of photons absorbed by the photocatalyst:

$$Q_y = \frac{n^0 \text{ molecules (moles) reacted or produced}}{n^0 \text{ photons (Einstein) absorbed}}$$

The quantum yield may be estimated by the macroscopic irradiation balance, which takes into account light scattering and photon absorption rates and the net consumption/production of chemicals.

### 1.2.3. Photo-induced super-hydrophilicity

When a thin-film photosemiconductor (e.g., TiO<sub>2</sub>) is activated by solar photons, the positive holes diffuse to the surface and react with water molecules adsorbed on it, producing hydroxyl radicals, thus, increasing the number of hydroxyl groups on the TiO<sub>2</sub> surface during irradiation [58]. Consequently, during irradiation, the contact angle between titania surfaces and water molecules gradually closes to near zero. This phenomenon was called photo-induced super-hydrophilicity: if water is added to the irradiated titanium dioxide surface, it does not form spherical droplets as in the dark, and is not repelled, but forms a highly uniform thin film.

## 2. Photocatalytic technology

The level of development of solar photocatalytic technology varies depending on the field of application, and ranges from basic research to mature market-ready processes (Fig. 3).




Fig. 3. Photocatalytic technology readiness level (adapted from [137]).

Table 1

Main commercial applications of titanium dioxide with sunlight.


| Commercial field                  | Function   | Use   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Glass                             | Self-cleaning, antibacterial, and antifogging                    | Windows, mirrors, and vehicle glasses                               |
| Vehicles                          | Self-cleaning, antibacterial, antifogging, and avoiding dewdrops | Coating and painting of vehicles, and side-view mirror              |
| Textiles                          | Self-cleaning and antibacterial                                  | Tent materials, storage structures, and stations and domes          |
| Food and flowers                  | Antibacterial and anti aging                                     | Fruits and flowers preservation                                     |
| Buldings, hospitals, and concrete | Self-cleaning, antibacterial, and antifogging                    | Kitchen, bathrooms, exterior tiles and coating, and walls and roofs |
| Road materials                    | Self-cleaning and antifogging                                    | Road pavements and mirrors, sidewalks, and lighting and signs       |
| Water treatment                   | Decontamination, antibacterial, and mineralization               | Small industrial and agricultural wastewater treatment plants       |
| Industrial chemistry              | Selective oxidation  | Fine chemicals solar productions                                    |

Solar photocatalytic applications marketed on different levels (narrow or expanded markets) relate to wastewater treatments, production of selected fine chemicals, air purification (outdoor environments), and self-cleaning materials.

Solar photocatalysis is used to treat very toxic wastewaters or mineralize, in the presence of oxygen, bio-refractory organic pollutants, especially halogenated compounds:



The direct use of solar radiation is highly attractive for industrial photochemical production of some fine chemicals. The opportunities for industry are twofold: solar chemical processes can be employed directly in industrialized countries wherever there is enough sunlight available, or they can be exported to industrializing countries with a good solar resource. In this respect, industrial production of  $\epsilon$ -caprolactam, the preferred monomer for manufacture of nylon-6, by photochemical synthesis is a reasonable reference case showing the energy-saving advantages of solar technology over conventional processes. The Japanese company Toyo Rayon Ltd. was able to produce 160,000 t/year of  $\epsilon$ -caprolactam (5% of global demand) by artificial cyclohexane photonitrosation in 1991 [59]:



Evaluation of the energy demand of industrial solar production of  $\epsilon$ -caprolactam demonstrated a four-fold lower demand for electricity and an eight-fold lower demand for cooling energy compared to the typical Toray protocol. Moreover, due to avoided conversion of fossil fuel to electricity, the solar process would avoid specific emissions of 1.5–2.5 t of CO<sub>2</sub> per ton  $\epsilon$ -caprolactam.

The solar photocatalytic technology, mainly heterogeneous with TiO<sub>2</sub> as the photocatalyst, has progressed rapidly, and is used increasingly in the development of construction materials, such as ceramic tiles, paving-blocks, glass, paints, concrete pavements with self-cleaning properties or finishing coatings with air–water purification, and antibacterial roles (Table 1) [60]. TiO<sub>2</sub> photocatalysts have attracted much attention as photofunctional materials for self-cleaning, antifogging, self-sterilizing, and antibacterial agents [12,61].

The widespread use of TiO<sub>2</sub> is attributed to its high catalytic efficiency, chemical stability, economy, low toxicity, and good compatibility with traditional construction materials [61].

The synergy of two titanium dioxide's photo-induced properties (photocatalysis and super-hydrophilicity), as described above, is the basis of its self-cleaning ability [62].



Fig. 4. Dives in Misericordia Church in Rome (left); Cité de la Musique et des Beaux-Arts in Chambéry (right).

### 2.1. Self-cleaning functions and $\text{TiO}_2$ -modified concrete

Among the first products based on solar photocatalysis with titanium dioxide to be marketed were self-cleaning coatings for window glass [63,64] and photovoltaic or solar panels with improved transmittance of natural sunlight (TitanShield™ Solar Coat). In 2001, Pilkington Glass, an affiliate of NSG, manufacturers of glass and glazing systems, announced the development of the first self-cleaning windows, Pilkington Activ™, and later other major glass companies released similar products, including PPG's Sunclean™, Saint Gobain's Bioclean, and Impact Safety Glass.

These products, which consist of a layer of nanocrystalline titanium dioxide (anatase form) a few score nanometer thick deposited by chemical vapor deposition on soda-lime silicate float glass, have high visible transmission and reflectance properties [65].

In practice, cleaning glass surfaces and tiles requires high energy consumption and chemical detergents, and consequently high costs. The inorganic and organic molecules adsorbed on a  $\text{TiO}_2$ -based self-cleaning surface can be easily degraded and then washed with water due to the high hydrophilicity of titania film. Thus, a fraction of the pollutants, or photo-oxidized byproducts, deposited on the surface can be removed by the cleaning effect of  $\text{TiO}_2$  [66]. The final result is "cold combustion" surface cleaning, which is the conversion of organic molecules to carbon dioxide, water, and other byproducts, if heteroatoms are present, at ambient temperature.

However, the self-cleaning function is effective only when the flux of the incident solar photons is higher than the rate of adsorption of the organic pollutants on the surface.

About  $2 \times 10^4 \text{ m}^2$  of outdoor photoactive self-cleaning glass, manufactured by the Nippon Sheet Glass Co., are installed in the Central Japan International Airport terminal building, which was completed in 2005 [62,67]. The New National Grand Theater of China is also equipped with self-cleaning glass [68].

In addition to glass surfaces, the best use of  $\text{TiO}_2$  self-cleaning properties is related to construction and coating materials for walls in buildings, since these materials are exposed to sunlight and natural rainfall.

Most exterior building walls become soiled from automobile exhaust, which contains mineral oils and unburnt components. By coating walls with super-hydrophilic  $\text{TiO}_2$ , dirt on walls can be washed away by rain, keeping building exteriors cleaner longer [69].

Since the late 1990s,  $\text{TiO}_2$ -based materials like tiles, aluminum siding, plastic films, fabrics for tents and cements are already being marketed, especially in Japan [62,70]. Some benefits of photocatalytic concrete are that it decomposes chemicals that contribute to soiling and air pollution, keeps the concrete cleaner, and reflects much of the sun's heat, because it is white, thus, reducing heat gain [71].


White cements containing  $\text{TiO}_2$  are used for the construction of buildings in Europe too. In 1996, the first real project on the self-cleaning activity of titanium dioxide in cementitious materials was for designing the mix for "Dives in Misericordia" Church in Rome, Italy, and evaluating the self-cleaning ability of a new type of cement (TX Millennium™) [69,72]. The project was completed in 2003 by Italcementi S.p.A., an Italian cement company (Fig. 4, left). Over a six-year monitoring period, only a slight difference was observed between the white exterior and interior Church walls.

Italcementi has developed different types of cement with a titanium dioxide surface, TX Aria™, TX Active™, and TX Millennium™ [73], and used them in many other demonstration projects, like a school in Mortara, Italy (completed in 1999), the Cité de la Musique et des Beaux-Arts in Chambéry, France, completed in 2000 (Fig. 4, right), the Roissy Air France Headquarters at Charles de Gaulle International Airport (Paris), and the Hôtel de Police in Bordeaux. In the Chambéry City Hall, the primary color remained almost constant in different facade positions (West/North/East/South) for approximately five years.

They have also been used to check the photocatalytic effects of a  $\text{TiO}_2$ -coated highway for converting polluting gas emissions, such as  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$ , to more environmentally benign forms like nitrates and sulfates [74,75].

TioCem®, manufactured by Heidelberg Cement Technology Center, GmbH, is another photocatalytically-active concrete product containing titanium dioxide which is able to promote catalytic degradation of  $\text{NO}_x$  and other air pollutants [76]. These photocatalytic cements were among Time magazine's top 50 inventions of 2008. By 2003, self-cleaning  $\text{TiO}_2$ -based tiles had been used in over 5000 buildings in Japan, the most famous of which is the Maru Building, located in Tokyo's main business district [67]. Other examples of Japanese buildings with photocatalytic materials are MM Towers in Yokohama, a food processing plant in Saga, and Juntendo and Hokkaido Universities in Tokyo and Hokkaido, respectively.





**Fig. 5.** (a) Cowboy Stadium (Dallas, U.S.), (b) Tokyo University (Japan), (c) Kajigaya Station (Japan), (d) YAS Marina Circuit (UAE). Manufacturer: Taiyo Kogyo Corporation.

In Japan, 2003, the sales of photocatalytic construction materials made up 60% of the whole photocatalytic market share and several tall buildings have been covered with thousands of TOTO's self-cleaning tiles [67].

TOTO, Ltd., the pioneer in titania coating self-cleaning technology, the maker of Hydrotec™, estimates that a building in a Japanese city covered with ordinary tiles should be cleaned at least every five years to maintain its good appearance, while one covered with self-cleaning tiles should remain clean for twenty years without any maintenance, thus, greatly decreasing maintenance costs.

A particularly interesting aspect of titanium dioxide–cement composites is that there is a clear synergy between the cementitious material and  $\text{TiO}_2$  that makes cement an ideal substrate for environmental photocatalysis [77,78]. In fact, many photooxidizing compounds, such as  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{SO}_x$  have acidic properties and the basic nature of the cement matrix is particularly suitable for fixing both the polluting reagent and the photooxidation products on its surface. These cements are normally loaded with up to 3% w/w of  $\text{TiO}_2$  for optimum activation and cost efficiency [78].  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalytic surface coatings have been demonstrated to provide acceptable durability and wear resistance [79].

Although no cost data are currently available, they are generally expected to be higher for  $\text{TiO}_2$  modified concrete than for conventional concrete. In this regard, a life-cycle cost analysis (LCA) carried out by Churchill and Panesar [80] demonstrated that for a 40-year service life and assuming a  $6 \text{ mg h}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-2}$   $\text{NO}_x$  degradation rate, a highway noise barrier designed with 100% general-use cement and a photocatalytic concrete cover (25 mm thick), has a 7% and 30% higher annual cost than the 100% general-use cement, and 35% ground granulated blast furnace slag barriers (GGBFS) normally employed as concrete replacement without photocatalytic cover, respectively. Moreover, the use of a photocatalytic concrete cover on cement containing 35 and 50% GGBFS is more economically viable than 100% general use cement, regardless of the lifetime and pollution removal rate.

In addition to cement, other coatings are commonly treated with titania particles, when the coated surface is sufficiently stable to physical (viscosity, flocculation) or chemical change (photodegradation, oxidation, etc.). For example, the “chalking” phenomenon which is the destructive oxidation of commercial polymers containing titania within the near surface layers of the coating under exposure to sunlight [62]. Continuous erosion of the material leaves the pigment particles exposed to weathering [81].

Photooxidation studies on polymeric materials containing nanoparticle and pigmentary-grade titanium dioxide show that in general the first exhibit high photocatalytic activity, promoting the oxidation of the polymer during processing and long-term thermal ageing by generating hydroperoxidic and carbonylic species [82].

Tent materials made from flexible PVC film are usually too difficult to clean. But photocatalytic PTFE and PVC membrane structures using  $\text{TiO}_2$  coating technology have recently been demonstrated to possess greater chemical resistance and self-cleaning properties. This technology enables  $\text{TiO}_2$  coated membrane structures to maintain their good appearance and light transmittance for a longer time. Self-cleaning tent materials have been widely applied for storage structures, business facilities, bus and train stations, sports arenas, domes, canopies and tents in parks, and at beaches [83,84], thus, saving time and cost of cleaning maintenance (Fig. 5).

Moreover,  $\text{TiO}_2$  has been found to be an excellent photocatalyst for use in pavement engineering for reducing polluting vehicle emissions [85].

Since titanium dioxide, when exposed to natural sunlight, is able to remove nitrogen oxides in exhaust from vehicles in metropolitan areas (photo-de- $\text{NO}_x$  process) [86,87], some companies are using  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalysts in paving materials, and  $\text{TiO}_2$ -coated paving stones over pavement have become available on the market. On the basis of the above, numerous photocatalytic cementitious materials have been patented [72,88–91], although the effectiveness of titania mixtures and their influence on overall photocatalytic performance still lacking systematic research [92]. In particular,  $\text{TiO}_2$  high-porosity cementitious composites have high  $\text{NO}_x$  degradation rates [93,94].




Fig. 6. Capturing energy from sunlight to neutralise vehicle pollution.

Japan's Mitsubishi Materials Corp., developed a paving stone called NOxer™ which they have tested in Osaka, Chiba, Chigasaki & Saitama-Shintoshin [89]. NOxer™ makes use of the catalytic properties of TiO<sub>2</sub> to remove nitrogen oxides, mainly from vehicle emissions, from the air, converting them into more ecofriendly molecules that can be washed away by rainwater [95].

When the surface of the NOxer™ material is illuminated, the oxygen created oxidizes NO<sub>x</sub> into nitric acid which can then be washed away by rainfall or neutralized by the alkaline composition of the concrete (Fig. 6).

TiO<sub>2</sub> paving stones have been tested on about twenty roads (more than 50,000 m<sup>2</sup>) in Japan over the past ten years. One of the places tested is a 300 m<sup>2</sup> area on Belt Highway No. 7 in Tokyo. Nitrogen oxides removed from this test area were estimated to be 50–60 mg day<sup>−1</sup>, the NO<sub>x</sub> load discharged by 1000 vehicles [93].

Hamada et al. [96] showed that TiO<sub>2</sub> materials applied in airports, including Tokyo International Airport (Haneda Airport) and Ishigaki Domestic Airport (Okinawa Prefecture), lowered NO<sub>x</sub> by 10–30%. Some estimates of NO<sub>x</sub> removal (50,000 t year<sup>−1</sup>), evaluated using photocatalytic pavements for five years, are very promising [97].

In Europe, some demonstration projects done by Italcementi have also confirmed the ability of titanium-dioxide cement (TX Aria) to destroy automotive gas emissions. These projects involved repaving Borgo Palazzo Street in Bergamo (Italy), Modigliani Street in Segrate (Italy), and Jean Bleuzen Street in Vanves, near Paris (France) [98].

Impresa Bacchi (Italy) has developed a photocatalytic technology for preparing a water emulsion with titanium dioxide that is sprayed onto asphalt pavement surfaces located in very polluted areas.

The asphalt pavement in the Rogoredo auto-park in the outskirts of Milan (4000 m<sup>2</sup>) and the SP70 road in the province of Forlì–Cesena (2500 m<sup>2</sup>) were treated with water–TiO<sub>2</sub> emulsions, achieving high photocatalytic NO<sub>x</sub> elimination efficiencies [99].

Interesting examples of pedestrian sidewalks made with TiO<sub>2</sub>-containing permeable blocks or TiO<sub>2</sub>-containing adsorbents as decorative elements located in open-spaces where sunlight is available, such as balconies and terraces, have been described [100].

Extensive large-scale research on NO<sub>x</sub> photoelimination carried out at the European Photoreactor (EUPHORE) in Valencia, Spain (Fig. 7) is worth noting. The EUPHORE photoreactor consists of two outdoor 200-m<sup>3</sup> hemispherical Teflon chambers that transmit over 80% of the natural sunlight. The chambers are equipped with sensors and analytical devices for detection of trace substances, such as spectrometers, on-line monitors for ozone and NO<sub>x</sub>, and several GC and HPLC systems. Sunlight intensities are measured with spectral radiometers [101]. The EUPHORE reactor has been used to study the synergic reactions of NO<sub>x</sub>, alifatic and aromatic hydrocarbons, ozone, and other gaseous pollutants under solar irradiation [102,103]. Another function related to the photo-induced hydrophilicity of TiO<sub>2</sub> is its antifogging



Fig. 7. European Photoreactor (EUPHORE), with some of the instrumentation located inside the chamber. In addition, sampling ports for on-line and off-line instruments are situated in the central flanges (photo: Euphore website, directly cited).

effect. Mirror surfaces fog up when steam cools down on these surfaces forming aqueous droplets. Many Japanese cars are equipped with super-hydrophilic antifogging and self-cleaning side-view mirrors [50,104].

## 2.2. Bactericidal (mildew-proof) coating


Titania and metal-doped titania coatings can not only inhibit the reproduction of bacteria, but also decompose the bacterial cells at the same time [105–107]. Thus, application of TiO<sub>2</sub> materials in hospitals and health care facilities, such as public lounges, have recently attracted the attention of both academia and industry [108]. Nanostructured crystalline titanium dioxide coatings deposited by cathodic arc evaporation on five medical implant-grade titanium substrates demonstrated UV-induced photocatalytic activity that can provide bactericidal protection against *Staphylococcus epidermidis*. These results and those of other studies are encouraging the development of antimicrobial surfaces in orthopedics and dentistry to prevent or treat post-surgical infection [109].

One of the most widely used applications of photocatalytic materials is for their antimicrobial property in interior paints. These paints are formulated with aqueous acrylic dispersion, rutile titanium dioxide, extenders, and special additives, such as photocatalytic nano zinc oxide and different types of photocatalytic anatase titanium dioxide. The paint containing a mixture of the first type of TiO<sub>2</sub> and nano-ZnO have shown the best photocatalytic antimicrobial effect. They have been demonstrated for *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, fungi *Aspergillus niger*, and *Penicillium chrysogenum* [110].

The first photocatalyst coating was made by the Japanese Arc-Flash Company in 1992 using photocatalyst fixation technology, sprayed directly on the surface. The Arc-Flash® photocatalyst coating, using titania nanoparticles as the main ingredient, can effectively sterilize mildew, sanitize environments, such as hospitals, residential kitchens, schools, and floors, killing bacteria with over 98% efficiency and improving hygiene standards [111]. Moreover, the photocatalytic and antibacterial properties of the Arc-Flash® photocatalyst may reduce the spread of infection to hospital patients, especially those with a weak immune system.

## 2.3. Preservation of perishable goods

In addition to the solar applications described above, TiO<sub>2</sub> may be used to treat the air in fruit, vegetable, and cut flower storage areas to prevent spoilage and increase product shelf life. The Kennesaw, Georgia-based KES Science & Technology Inc. (GA, USA), Catalyx Technologies, LLC, (PA, USA) and ABSOGER Sas Co. (Les Barthes, FR) have marketed enclosed systems called “Bio-KES”, “AiroCide®”, “FRESH+™” and “ABSOGER”, respectively, which make use of the photocatalytic properties of TiO<sub>2</sub> for the destruction of gas-phase ethylene to prevent premature fruit maturation [112–114]. Ethylene is a gaseous growth hormone produced naturally by plant tissue which in concentrations as low as 1 ppm triggers the ripening of fruits and vegetables. Originally developed by NASA to keep the air clean onboard the International Space Station and aboard the space shuttle [115], the “Bio-KES” and “AiroCide®” technologies break down ethylene into CO<sub>2</sub> and water:



The “Bio-KES”, “AiroCide®”, “FRESH+™” and “ABSOGER” systems are currently employed by florists and fruit merchants to keep produce fresh longer, slow wilting of flowers and eliminate growth of mold on fruits.

## 3. Solar photocatalytic chemical production and wastewater treatment

The use of homogeneous and heterogeneous solar photocatalysis for synthesis of fine chemicals and wastewater treatment is gaining interest. In fact, the use of solar energy in chemical production or in treatment of urban and industrial effluents could be an effective, economical solution to several environmental problems.

### 3.1. Design of solar photocatalytic reactors for commercial use

Any industrial application of a photocatalytic process requires a photoreactor, that is, a specific device which can efficiently bring solar photons and chemical reagents into contact with the photocatalyst. Solar photoreactors differ significantly from classic chemical reactors in that their physical geometry is of critical importance in ensuring that solar radiation is efficiently collected. In this sense, conventional operating parameters, such as temperature, pressure, and mixing may be less important for the purposes of optimal photocatalytic process operation. However, it should be noted that for the photo-Fenton process the effect of the reaction temperature caused by the Fenton thermal reaction can be important on the reactor performance [116].


With a heterogeneous catalyst, one of the major problems in the design and scale-up of a solar photoreactor is achieving uniform distribution of sunlight inside the reactor, due to absorption, reflection, and scattering effects by the catalyst particles or the supporting material. Poor distribution of the solar radiation entering the reactor leads to lower overall efficiencies of the photochemical process. In fact, if the catalyst load is too high, the resulting turbidity keeps enough sunlight from penetrating inside the reactor.

On the other hand, a homogeneous photocatalyst absorbs the solar energy depending on its molar absorptivity and this has to be taken into account when estimating the optimal concentration of the catalyst with respect to the photoreactor light-path length.

Another important factor related to a natural solar photoreactor design is its optical-path length (OPL), since it must be ensured that it is uniform for both the flow and distribution of the photon flux at all times, everywhere inside the reactor. When suspended heterogeneous photocatalysts are employed, turbulent flow must be ensured to prevent particle deposition phenomena in the hydraulic circuit. But turbulent flow causes loss of pressure, a critical parameter that can affect scale-up, especially in the case of long photoreactor lengths. An OPL below 20–23 mm is not feasible due to pressure loss, whereas, over 50–55 mm is impractical for constructing photoreactors with sufficient pressure resistance without making glass walls too thick [117].

There are some critical reviews in which the design parameters and performance of the more common pilot and commercial-scale photoreactors are discussed and compared [116,124,125]. Most solar photoreactors can be divided into three different families:





**Q8 Fig. 8.** PTC solar photoreactor (right) and behavior of incident solar radiation on a PTC (left). (For interpretation of the references to color in this text, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

- Parabolic trough collectors (PTCs).
- Non-concentrating collectors (NCCs).
- Compound parabolic collectors (CPCs).

### 3.1.1. Parabolic trough collectors

The PTC engineering concept came from solar thermal energy production applications [126]. They consist of reflective, parabolic surfaces that concentrate the solar radiation on a transparent tube along the parabolic focal line through which the reactant fluid flows (Fig. 8). The platform usually has two motors controlled by a two-axis (azimuth and elevation) tracking system. Thus, for maximum efficiency, the collector aperture plane is always perpendicular to the solar radiation, which is thus, reflected by the parabola onto the reactor tube (light blue zone in the figure).

The concentration factor (CF) of the solar collector is defined as the ratio between the collector “aperture area” and “absorber area”. The “aperture area” is the area that intercepts the solar radiation and the “absorber area” is the area of the component that receives the sunlight. For photocatalytic applications with PCT reactors, the concentration factor ranges from 5 to 35 suns [18,127].


The trough surfaces are usually aluminum to ensure the highest reflectivities. The system supports turbulent flow with efficient homogenization. Some overviews on commercial parabolic-trough collectors designed for supplying thermal energy are also available [125,126].

The reactor tube is a closed system, preventing vaporization of volatile compounds. The photocatalyst is generally suspended in the fluid although some designs for a supported photocatalyst have been studied [53].

The major advantage derives from the increased intensity of the incident radiation, which allows smaller photocatalyst loads than other photoreactors with the same solar light collecting area. This results in smaller receiver tube diameter requirements, which in turn means operating pressures can be higher and construction material quantities lower.

The main disadvantages are that, because of their geometry, the collectors can use only direct beam radiation, making them practically useless on cloudy days, their tracking system makes them more expensive, and quantum efficiencies are low due to high electron/hole recombination [18]. Moreover, for intermediate and high solar zenith angles, the diffuse component in the UV solar spectrum may be equal to or greater than the direct component of UV solar radiation, even for cloudless days [128].

However, high capital and operating costs from the mechanical complexity of PTCs are expected to drop as innovative tracking mechanisms and processes are further developed [124]. The PTC capacity to concentrate solar radiation may cause the reactor to overheat and increase the photogenerated  $e_{CB}^-/h_{VB}^+$  recombination reaction rates if heterogeneous metal-oxide photocatalysts are used, thus, reducing process efficiency.



**Fig. 9.** (left) SOLARIS loop with two-axis tracked parabolic trough collectors concentrate solar radiation for chemical processes (source: [www.volker-quaschnig.de](http://www.volker-quaschnig.de)); (right) PROPHIS loop with line-focusing parabolic mirrors (left three troughs) and reflection holograms (right trough) (with permission of RSC).

As mentioned above, the first PTC was installed in Albuquerque (New Mexico, USA) in 1989, and consisted of six aligned parabolic-trough collectors with single-axis solar tracking, an aperture of 2.13 m and a length of 36.4 m, for a total area of 465 m<sup>2</sup>. The collector concentrated the sunlight about 50 times on the photoreactor, which was designed for photocatalytic treatment of polluted water containing chlorinated solvents and heavy metals [23,129].


PTC reactors were later adapted specifically for solar photocatalytic applications at the Plataforma Solar de Almeria (PSA) in Spain (Fig. 9, left) and at the German Aerospace Centre (DLR) in Cologne, Germany (Fig. 9, right), where laboratory, preindustrial, and industrial-scale experiments in production of fine chemicals can be carried out. The SOLARIS and PROPHIS (Parabolic tRough collector for Organic PHotochemical syntheses In Solar light) loops, with a 35–120 L reaction mixture capacity, are used for industrial reactions.

Each SOLARIS and PROPHIS collector consists of a turret, a crossbeam, four troughs, piping and electrical equipment, and a two-axis solar tracker to align the collector with the Sun's position. Direct solar radiation strikes the rectangular collector aperture and the parabolic mirrors reflect the radiation into the transparent receiver-reactor tubes which are positioned in the four focal lines. The reaction mixture is pumped through the receiver-reactor tubes connected in series until the desired conversion has been achieved. In an external heat exchanger, excess heat is removed and rejected to the ambient by an air cooled process cooler [59].

These parabolic-trough collectors were initially designed to transform solar radiation into thermal energy and were later transformed for photochemical applications [24].

The concentrating power is about 30–32 suns. They can achieve a productivity up to 1000 kg year<sup>-1</sup> with product quantum yields in the range of 0.5–0.8, and products up to a molecular weight of about 100 u.m.a [130].


Use of SOLARIS and PROPHIS PTCs for the synthesis of fine chemicals has been described. One of the first important industrial processes was the solar photooxygenation of citronellol with singlet oxygen sensitized by Rose Bengal in isopropanol. The product mixture, after a reduction with sodium sulfite, contains Rose Oxide (yield 55%), an important fragrance, over 100 t of which is currently produced annually with sunlight [131]:



(r8)

A solar plant manufacturing Rose Oxide in Central Europe is up to 11% more lucrative than conventional production, reducing the manufacturing costs of rose oxide to \$1.60/kg [132].


Application of the SOLARIS reactor for synthesis involving photooxidation of furfural sensitized by Rose Bengal or Methylene Blue to yield 5-hydroxyfuranone, a versatile C<sub>4</sub> building block, has also been reported [133]:



(r9)


Another interesting application of solar radiation is the production of juglone (5-hydroxy-1,4-naphthoquinone), a coloring agent for foods and cosmetics and versatile biologically active quinone, by Rose Bengal or Methylene Blue-sensitized photooxygenation of 1,5-dihydroxynaphthalene under a stream of oxygen using isopropanol as solvent [134]:






Acceptable multi-gram juglone yields of up to 79% are achieved after just 4 h of illumination in a PTC reactor equipped with holographic concentrators designed to reduce warming caused by the infrared solar radiation, and thereby cut cooling costs. Under these adapted outdoor conditions, the solar process has been demonstrated to be a valid alternative to existing conventional processes [135].



The PROPHIS plant was also employed for the synthesis of 2-alkyl and 2-aryl pyridines, which are bulk chemicals and precursors of biologically active compounds. The cyclization of ethyne and nitriles, photocatalyzed by  $(C_5H_5)Co(C_2H_4)$  yielded over 98% of the desired product [136]:



The heterocyclization of ethyne with benzonitrile in a toluene-water mixture under argon atmosphere and in the presence of  $(C_5H_5)Co(C_8H_{12})$  as the catalyst yielded 40% 2-phenyl-pyridine after 5 h of solar illumination [130]:



A solar photoinduced acylation reaction of quinones and naphthoquinones was carried out in the PROPHIS facility producing 90% half-kilogram yields of acylated derivatives, which are versatile synthones for the synthesis of tetracycline [138]:



Biorecalcitrant water has been treated in a solar  $TiO_2$ -based photocatalytic plant with 158 m<sup>2</sup> of parabolic-trough concentrator collectors installed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, in Livermore, California (USA). The plant was used for chemical treatment of groundwater contaminated with trichloroethylene [139].

### 3.1.2. Non-concentrating collectors

The non-concentrating (NCC) or inclined plate collector (IPC) is a flat or corrugated inclined plate over which the fluid flows in a thin film. The photocatalyst is usually supported on the surface of the inclined plate, with the photons first traveling through the reactant fluid before reaching the photocatalyst (Fig. 10). The back plate may be glass, metal, or stone. As the solar radiation is not concentrated, this reactor design is able to capture diffuse light.

The top may also be left open to the atmosphere, further increasing efficiency by excluding light absorption by the reactor cover and removing the potential for a suspended photocatalyst to form an opaque film on its inner surface. In this case, the main drawback may be high volatile chemical and water losses by evaporation and interference from the atmosphere [19]. It could also be dangerous under windy conditions when wastewater to be treated is toxic.

The thin-film fluid, typically in the range of 100–200  $\mu m$ , requires a relatively low flow rate to be maintained on the bottom surface. Normally, the specific flow rates are in the range of 0.15–1.0 L min<sup>-1</sup> m<sup>-2</sup>. With higher flow rates, reactor residence times are shorter and film thickness increases, thus, leading to increased mass-transfer constraints and a decrease in NCC efficiency.

NCCs collectors, due to their design simplicity (staticity) and low capital costs (no moving parts or tracking mechanisms) [140], have been demonstrated to be effective for small-scale operations, particularly in less developed regions where other wastewater treatment plants are unfeasible.

However, non-concentrating reactors require larger surfaces than the concentrating photoreactors and, therefore, must be designed to resist the high operating pressures necessary to be able to pump the fluid, substantially increasing their cost [141].

NCCs are mainly used in solar pilot plants for the photocatalytic treatment of various industrial or agricultural wastewaters containing bio-refractory organic pollutants [142–144] and for agroindustrial water disinfection using a heterogeneous catalyst [145].





Fig. 10. NCC solar photoreactor (right) and behavior of incident solar radiation on a NCC (left).

In 2004, 2.5 m-wide by 10 m-long solar photocatalytic NCC reactors using  $\text{TiO}_2$  with a total illuminated area of  $50 \text{ m}^2$ , oriented to the South and tilted  $20^\circ$ , were combined with two  $15 \text{ m}^3$ -capacity bioreactors used for pretreating the effluents, and installed at a Tunisian textile mill (Menzel Temime) for decoloration of wastewater [146].

Some applications in presence of a homogenous catalyzed process, i.e., photo-Fenton, have also been reported [147].

An NCC reactor has been used in Germany for photosensitized cyclization of 1,1-dicarbonitrile using 1,4-dicyano-2,3,5,6-tetramethylbenzene (DCTMB) as the electron acceptor [148]:



The results, collected under partly sunny or cloudy conditions, demonstrate higher NCC reactor efficiency than with a PTC, probably due to the high percentage (40%) of diffuse radiation in the solar radiation incident in central Europe.

### 3.1.3. Compound parabolic collectors

Compound parabolic collectors (CPCs) are an interesting cross between PTC and NCC photoreactors and are a good solution for solar photochemical applications [18]. CPCs are stationary collectors with a parabolic reflective surface around a cylindrical reactor tube (Fig. 11).

The main advantage of a CPC is that the reflector geometry reflects indirect light onto the receiver tube, and can therefore, capture both direct and diffuse sunlight [149,150].

The concentration factor and acceptance angle of a CPC are directly related as follows:

$$\text{CF} = \frac{1}{\sin \theta} = \frac{a}{2\pi R}$$

where  $\theta$  is the acceptance angle,  $a$  the width of the reflector aperture, and  $R$  the radius of the receiver. Thus, a CPC with a concentration factor equal to one sun (no concentration) has a  $90^\circ$  acceptance angle. That is, all solar light entering the aperture (both direct and diffuse) is reflected onto the reactor tube.

The total amount of sunlight absorbed in a CPC reactor is much higher than in a PTC, so photoreactors can be smaller and can also be used on overcast days when there is not much direct natural sunlight. Moreover, solar trackers are not required, which significantly reduces system complexity and costs.

Demonstration and pilot-scale CPCs with collector areas ranging from  $3 \text{ m}^2$  to  $150 \text{ m}^2$  (Fig. 12), have been used for homogeneous and heterogeneous photocatalytic removal of very toxic compounds, such as cholophenols, pathogenic organisms [149,151], dyes [152], pesticides [153], chlorinated solvents [154], bacteria [155], and biorecalcitrant compounds [156,157] from water. Other CPC applications include treatment of sanitary landfill leachate [158], olive mill waste [159], and urban wastewater [160].




Fig. 11. CPC solar photoreactor (reactor) and behavior of incident solar radiation on a CPC (left).

Solar homogeneous (photo-Fenton) and heterogeneous ( $\text{TiO}_2$ ) photocatalytic wastewater treatments have been designed by a European industrial consortium called SOLARDETOX and installed in several different places in Spain [161,162]. These demonstration plants, using photocatalytic CPC reactor modules with photon collection areas of 100–150  $\text{m}^2$ , can treat large volumes ( $\text{m}^3$ ) of contaminated water in a few hours.

Since 2007, a homogeneous solar photocatalytic CPC plant (100  $\text{m}^2$ ) for the pretreatment of saline industrial wastewater containing bio-refractory pharmaceuticals has been operating at a Spanish pharmaceutical company (DSM DIRETIL). The system is able to remove 50% of the initial dissolved organic carbon, and the remaining 45% is removed by an aerobic biological treatment [163].

CPCs for solar production of fine chemicals have been installed for “gram-per-day” or “kg-per-year” reactions. For example, the SOLFIN (SOLar synthesis of FINE chemicals) CPC facility, employed sunlight at a low concentration factor ( $\text{CF} = 2\text{--}3$  suns) [164]. The SOLFIN apparatus is a 1 m long and 0.2 m wide CPC photoreactor in which the solution volume (up to 25 L) is circulated by a centrifugal pump. The heat generated is discharged by a cooling system to keep the temperature of the reaction mixture below 20  $^\circ\text{C}$ .

The reactors have been tested, producing precursors and additives in the industrial synthesis of polymers, pyrethrin insecticides, and pharmaceuticals in the presence of several different photocatalysts, such as titanium dioxide or decatungstate-anions [165].

The SOLFIN facility, for example has been used for 10-gram-scale production of terebic acid, an important industrial intermediate, starting from maleic acid and isopropanol in the presence of water, using benzophenone disodium disulfonate as the photocatalyst. An 83% yield was gained after 14 h of exposure to sunlight [165]:











Fig. 12. Partial views of CPC used for solar photocatalytic water detoxification (with permission of Elsevier).

**Table 2**  
Comparison of advantages and disadvantages of PTC, NCC and PTC reactors.

| PTC   |   | NCC   |   | CPC   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smaller reactor volumes   | Higher costs (sun tracking)   | No optical losses and high optical efficiencies                                   | Large reactor volumes   | Smaller reactor volumes   | Moderate capital cost   |
| Higher flow rates   | Direct solar beams  | Low costs (no reflective surfaces)  | Pressure limitations  | Higher flow rates   | Moderate heat generation  |
| Better mass transfer  | Optical losses  | Simple design (no tracking parts)   | Low mass transfer (Laminar flow)  | Better mass transfer (turbulent flow)   | Difficult to scale up   |
| Low catalyst load   | Overheating   | Direct and diffuse solar beams  | Reactant evaporation (if open)  | Direct and diffuse solar radiation  | –   |
| Smaller reactor area  | Low efficiency  | No heating  | –   | Low catalyst load   | –   |




(r16)

1,3-Dioxolane has also been added to,  $\beta$ -unsaturated aldehydes in the SOLFIN plant under the same conditions, producing monoprotected aldehyde yields ranging from 31% to 55% [165].

Moreover, the SOLFIN facility has been used to study the parameters affecting scale-up of selected organic chemical processes [35].

The possibility of producing benzaldehyde, an important ingredient in the manufacture of aromas and flavors, by selective  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalytic oxidation of benzyl alcohol, has been demonstrated in aqueous solution under natural solar radiation at pilot plant scale in a CPC reactor [2]:



(r17)

The best benzaldehyde yields found were 53.3% for the starting benzyl alcohol concentration (63.4% selectivity) with accumulated energy of 78.9 kJ/L and operating at an average temperature of 38.6 °C.

Such research has clearly demonstrated that some fine chemicals, in particular, valuable substances ( $> \$100 \text{ kg}^{-1}$ ) produced in small amounts ( $< 100 \text{ t year}^{-1}$ ) may be synthesized by solar photoreactors, such as CPC collectors.

The main advantages and disadvantages of the reactors described are summarized in Table 2. Several, small or multi-gram-scale studies in bottles, flasks, and glass pipes located on a window ledge, have demonstrated that combining homogeneous or heterogeneous photocatalysis and non-concentrated sunlight is a good method of organic synthesis (alkylation and acylation, cyclisation and cycloaddition, selective oxidation, etc.) for the production of bulk and fine chemicals (Table 3), and reaction yields may theoretically be increased by scaling up PTC, NCC, or CPC reactors for industrial use [166].

#### 4. Solar photoreactors materials, efficiency, and costs

As the reactor walls must be able to transmit solar radiation, materials must be transparent, consequently leading to size limitations, sealing problems, and risk of breakage.

The choice of materials that are transparent to UV-solar radiation, and at the same time resistant to aging by it, is limited. Common materials that meet these requirements are fluorinated and acrylic polymers and several types of glass. In particular, fluoropolymers are a good choice of materials due to their high UV-light transmittance, UV, and chemical stability. However, to gain the required minimum operative pressure resistance, the fluorinated wall thickness of the photoreactor has to be increased, thus, decreasing the UV transmittance [167].

Quartz has excellent UV transmittance, as well as good thermal and chemical resistance, but its high cost makes it completely unfeasible for large-scale solar photocatalytic applications. A standard glass cover is insufficient, because it adsorbs part of the near UV solar radiation that reaches the photoreactor surface due its high iron content. However, low-iron borosilicate glass has good transmittance in the solar range to about 285 nm (Pyrex or Duran glass) [117].

Moreover, when glass is exposed to UV-solar radiation, it undergoes changes that reduce its ability to transmit UV light. This phenomenon, called “ultraviolet solarization”, is attributed to the valence changes in metal ions in the glass, mainly iron ( $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  transforms into  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ ) which absorbs UV light. One way to reduce this negative effect is to add 0.1% Si to the glass during melting [118]. As a result, glass transmittance in the 300–400 nm region can only be optimized by strongly reducing the iron content to less than  $100 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ . The German company Schott-Rohr Glas GmbH, has developed a borosilicate glass with an iron content of a little over  $50 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  and remarkable transmissivity within the UV range of over 50% at 300 nm [117].

An additional aspect which limits the efficiency of the photocatalytic reactor is so called “window fouling” problem, produced by the photocatalyst sticking on reactor surfaces. The adhesion of a few commercially available powders of  $\text{TiO}_2$  on the reactor window can produce an important reduction of the radiation flux entering the photocatalytic reactor [119].

The best choice for the reflecting/concentrating panels is aluminum, because of its very low cost and higher UV-solar reflectivity than silver-coated mirrors. Most piping may be made of polyethylene or polypropylene, however, the use of metals that could be damaged by



**Table 3**  
Selection of photocatalyzed solar organic synthesis.











| Photocatalytic alkylation   |                                |                                  |  |           |       |  |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------|-------|--|
| Reaction  | Product and use                | Photocatalyst                    | Solvent                                    | Yield (%) | Ref.  |  |
|    | Alkylated nitriles             | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 53        | [178] |  |
|    | Ketones                        | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 40        | [178] |  |
|    | Esters                         | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 68        | [178] |  |
|    | Esters                         | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 43        | [178] |  |
|    | Amido-esters                   | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 64        | [178] |  |
|   | Esters                         | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 59        | [178] |  |
|  | Keto-esters                    | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 90        | [178] |  |
|  | Keto-nitriles                  | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 72        | [178] |  |
|  | Functionalisation of quinoline | Titania (anatase)                | Acetonitrile/H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> | 75        | [179] |  |
|  | Functionalisation of quinoline | Titania (anatase)                | Acetonitrile/H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> | 26        | [179] |  |

Table 3 (Continued)









| Photocatalytic alkylation  |   |                                  |  |           |       |  |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------|-------|--|
| Reaction   | Product and use                         | Photocatalyst                    | Solvent                                    | Yield (%) | Ref.  |  |
|   | Functionalisation of heterocyclic bases | Titania (anatase or rutile)      | Acetonitrile/H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> | 31–29     | [179] |  |
|   | Functionalisation of quinoline          | Titania (anatase)                | Acetonitrile/H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> | 45        | [179] |  |
|   | Keto-ester                              | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 70        | [166] |  |
|   | Keto-ester                              | Tetrabutylammonium decatungstate | Acetonitrile                               | 65        | [166] |  |
|   | Unsaturated esters                      | Benzophenone                     | Cycloalkane                                | 26        | [180] |  |
|  <p>Ar = 4-MeOC<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub><br/>E = CO<sub>2</sub>H or E–E = (CO)<sub>2</sub>O</p> | Benzylated succinic acids or anhydrides | Titania                          | Acetonitrile                               | 65        | [181] |  |
|   | Biologically active quinonoid compounds | –                                | Benzene                                    | 88        | [182] |  |
|   | Biologically active quinonoid compounds | –                                | Benzene                                    | 80        | [182] |  |

Table 3 (Continued)









| Photocatalytic alkylation   |   |   |  |           |       |
|---|---|---|--|-----------|-------|
| Reaction  | Product and use   | Photocatalyst   | Solvent                                    | Yield (%) | Ref.  |
|    | Diketones   | Tetrabutylammonium Decatungstate  | Acetonitrile                               | 88        | [166] |
|    | Functionalisation of some heterocyclic bases                      | Titania (anatase)   | Acetonitrile/H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> | 15–88     | [183] |
|    | Precursors of $\beta$ -lactams                                    | Chromium carbenes   | Ether or hexane                            | 52–76     | [184] |
|    | Bicyclic dione  | Ru(bipy) <sub>3</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub> , LiBF <sub>4</sub> and <i>i</i> -Pr <sub>2</sub> NEt | Acetonitrile                               | 94        | [185] |
|    | Artemisinin analogues with antimalarial activity [Hoffmann, 2008] | Tetraarylporphyrine on polystyrene  | Solvent less                               | 95        | [186] |
|   | Ascaridole, antimalarial activity [Hoffmann, 2008]                | Alkene  | Solvent less                               | –         | [187] |
|  | C <sub>5</sub> building block for synthetic use [Hoffmann, 2008]  | Rose Bengal or methylene blue   | Methanol                                   | 69–94     | [188] |
|  | Aldehydes and ketones   | CuCl <sub>2</sub> or FeCl <sub>3</sub>  | Acetonitrile                               | >30       | [189] |

Table 3 (Continued)







| Photocatalytic alkylation  |   |  |                        |   |       |
|--|---|--|------------------------|---|-------|
| Reaction   | Product and use   | Photocatalyst  | Solvent                | Yield (%)   | Ref.  |
|  <p><math>n = 2, 4 \text{ or } 6</math></p> | Organic acids   | Amberlyst 15, NaBr   | Ethyl acetate          | 62–97   | [190] |
|  <p><math>R = t\text{-Bu, Cl}</math></p>    | Organic acids   | Amberlyst 15, NaBr   | Ethyl acetate          | 95–99   | [190] |
|  <p>10 hours</p>                            | Ketones   | Amberlyst 15, NaBr   | Ethyl acetate          | 21<br>R   | [190] |
|  <p>6 hours</p>                             | Valueable building blocks in synthesis                              | Rose Bengal  | <i>t</i> -Amyl alcohol | Me 90%<br>Et 53%<br>cyclo-Pr 53%<br><i>t</i> -Bu 54%<br>Ph 80%<br><i>p</i> -ClC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> 54%<br><i>p</i> -MeC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> 63%<br><i>p</i> -NCC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> 23% | [191] |
|  <p>3 hours</p>                            |   |  |                        |   |       |
|  <p>7 hours</p>                           | <i>p</i> -Anisaldehyde, an intermediate for pharmaceutical industry | N-doped mesoporous titania (meso-TiO <sub>2-x</sub> N <sub>x</sub> ) | Water                  | 25  | [193] |



Table 3 (Continued)








| Photocatalytic alkylation   |  |                      |                            |                                    |       |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| Reaction  | Product and use                                    | Photocatalyst        | Solvent                    | Yield (%)                          | Ref.  |
|    | Thebaine,<br>precursor,<br>analgesic activity      | Eosin                | Ethanol                    | nr                                 | [194] |
|    | Isomer of vitamin A<br>series                      | Rose-Bengal          | Ethanol                    | 30, 7- <i>cis</i> 60,<br>7,9-dicis | [195] |
|    | Isomer of vitamin A<br>series                      | Rose-Bengal          | Ethanol                    | 49, 7- <i>cis</i> 43,<br>7,9-dicis | [195] |
|    | Isomer of vitamin A<br>series                      | Rose-Bengal          | Ethanol                    | 18                                 | [195] |
|   | Hindered olefinic<br>isomers                       | Differentsensitizers | Organic solvents           | 30–100                             | [196] |
|  | <i>Cis</i> -stilbene                               | Benzil               | Toulene                    | 71                                 | [130] |
|  | Functionalisation<br>of some<br>heterocyclic bases | Titania (anatase)    | Formamide/sulfuric<br>acid | 100                                | [197] |

Table 3 (Continued)

| Photocatalytic alkylation  |  |                   |                         |           |       |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Reaction   | Product and use                          | Photocatalyst     | Solvent                 | Yield (%) | Ref.  |
| <p> <math>\text{H}-\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{NH}_2 + \text{Quinoline}(R^1, R^2) \xrightarrow{10-15 \text{ hours}} \text{Quinoline}(R^3, R^4)</math> </p> <p> <math>R^1 = \text{CH}_3; R^2 = \text{H}</math><br/> <math>R^1 = R^2 = \text{H}</math> </p> <p> <math>R^3 = \text{CH}_3; R^4 = \text{CONH}_2</math><br/> <math>R^3 = \text{CONH}_2; R^4 = \text{H}</math> </p>  | Functionalisation of some quinolines     | Titania (anatase) | Formamide/sulfuric acid | 90–100    | [197] |
| <p> <math>\text{H}-\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{NH}_2 + \text{Norbornene} \xrightarrow{2 \text{ weeks}} \text{Norbornane carboxamide}</math> </p>  | Norbornane carboxamide                   | Acetone           | <i>t</i> -ButOH/acetone | 87        | [198] |
| <p> <math>\text{H}-\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{NH}_2 + \text{RCH}=\text{CHR}' \xrightarrow{\text{days or weeks}} \text{RCH}_2\text{CHR}'(\text{CONH}_2) + \text{RCHCH}_2\text{R}'(\text{CONH}_2)</math> </p> <p> <math>\text{R} = \text{R}' = \text{CH}_3; \text{R} = \text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_n, \text{R}' = \text{CH}_3;</math><br/> <math>\text{R} = \text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_n, \text{R}' = \text{CH}_3; \text{R} = \text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_n, \text{R}' = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5;</math><br/> <math>\text{R} = \text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_n, \text{R}' = (\text{CH}_2)_n\text{COOCH}_3;</math><br/> <math>\text{R} = \text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_n, \text{R}' = (\text{CH}_2)_n\text{CONH}_2</math> </p> | Amides                                   | Acetone           | <i>t</i> -ButOH/acetone | 21–51     | [199] |
| <p> <math>\text{H}-\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{NH}_2 + \text{RCH}=\text{CHCOOCH}_3 \xrightarrow{\text{days}} \text{RCHCH}_2\text{COOCH}_3(\text{CONH}_2)</math> </p>  | Amidoesters                              | Benzophenone      | <i>t</i> -ButOH         | 80–90     | [199] |
| <p> <math>\text{H}-\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{NH}_2 + \text{Cyclohexene} \xrightarrow{2 \text{ weeks}} \text{Cyclohexanecarboxamide}</math> </p>   | Cyclohexanecarboxamide                   | Acetone           | <i>t</i> -ButOH/acetone | 65        | [199] |
| <p> <math>\text{N-Ph-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline} + \text{MeNO}_2 \xrightarrow{3 \text{ h}} \alpha\text{-Functionalised tertiary amine}</math> </p>  | $\alpha$ -Functionalised tertiary amines | Rose Bengal       | Nitromethane            | 87        | [200] |

process oxidizing conditions must be avoided, and for longer equipment lifetime, any materials used must be inert to UV degradation by solar radiation [120].

The main factor affecting solar photocatalytic reactor technology costs is its scale-up. Scaling up solar photocatalytic reactors is considerably more complicated than scaling up conventional chemical reactors. In addition to conventional reactor complications, reagent and catalyst contact, flow patterns, mixing, mass transfer, and temperature control must be calculated to achieve efficient exposure of the catalyst to solar irradiation, so axial and radial scale-up are essential parameters for maximizing the surface areas exposed per unit of reactor volume, and making distribution of sunlight inside the reactor uniform. Higher illuminated surface to volume ratios reduce the reactor dimensions, and thereby, capital and operating costs.

Operating costs associated with solar concentration and its use frequently limit the potential applications of solar photocatalysis. Therefore, it is important to know how to employ solar radiation in the photoreactor efficiently, and how solar energy varies under different operating conditions. For optimum solar-assisted photocatalysis, in addition to achieving highly active photocatalysts and identifying the best operating conditions for the chemical reactions involved, special attention must also be given the photoreactor design factors that most affect use of the solar radiation.

The efficiency of the photocatalytic reactor ( $\eta$ ) can be defined by thermodynamic principles, such as the ratio of radiant power used ( $Q_{\text{used}}$ , J s<sup>-1</sup>) to radiant power absorbed ( $Q_{\text{absorbed}}$ ) for the production of desired chemicals or for the formation of reactive species, such as hydroxyl radicals, singlet oxygen, or positive holes, which react with the chemical reagents to be converted, or adsorbed on the solid photocatalyst if a heterogeneous process is involved.

The efficiency factor  $\eta$  can be used as a parameter to find the energy efficiency of a solar photocatalytic reactor [121]. In heterogeneous systems, this can be expressed in terms of the specific reaction rate per unit weight of irradiated catalyst ( $r_s$ , mol g<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>), the enthalpy of formation of the reactive species ( $\Delta H_{rs}$ , J mol<sup>-1</sup>) and the irradiated catalyst weight ( $W_{\text{irr}}$ , g r):

$$\eta = \frac{Q_{\text{used}}}{Q_{\text{absorbed}}} = -\frac{V}{V_1} \times \frac{r_s \times \Delta H_{rs} \times W_{\text{irr}}}{Q_{\text{absorbed}}}$$

where  $\nu$  and  $\nu_1$  are the stoichiometric coefficients of the consumption of reactive species and the substrate respectively. Thus, the basic information required for analysis of solar photocatalytic reactor efficiency is an expression containing the specific reaction rate.

The kinetics for heterogeneous photocatalytic water disinfection and heterogeneous photocatalytic abatement of a large number of organic pollutants, such as dye molecules, pesticides, herbicides and phenolic compounds or alkanes, haloalkanes, aliphatic alcohols, and carboxylic acids are extensively reported in the literature [38]. The Chick–Watson (C–W) and Hom (H) kinetic models or their empirical modifications are the most commonly used for photocatalytic water disinfection.

The C–W and H models assume that the photodisinfection rate is a function (linear in the C–W model) of the bacteria concentration and catalyst load:

$$\ln \frac{N}{N_0} = -k \times C^n \times t^m, m = 1(\text{C–W model}); n, m \neq 1(\text{H model})$$

where

$n, m$  = empirical constants,

$C$  = photocatalyst load,

$N$  = microorganism concentration at time  $t$ ,

$N_0$  = initial microorganism concentration,

$t$  = treatment time.

However, a freeware add-in Microsoft® Excel tool, named GlnaFIT [Geeraerd and Van Impe Inactivation Model Fitting Tool], is now available for the describing of solar photocatalytic microbial inactivation kinetics characterized by different shapes [122,123].

The Langmuir–Hinshelwood (L–H) mechanism is usually employed to explain heterogeneous photocatalytic oxidation reactions. The L–H mechanism assumes that the photocatalytic reaction rate ( $r$ ) is proportional to the fraction of the photocatalyst surface covered by the organic pollutant ( $\theta_x$ ):

$$r = k_r \times \theta_x = \frac{k_r \times K \times C}{1 + K \times C}$$

where  $k_r$  is the reaction rate constant,  $C$  is the concentration of organic species, and  $K$  is the Langmuir adsorption constant. However, the reaction order in the L–H kinetic model may range from 0 to 1 [41]. In fact, if the initial concentration of the organics ( $C_0$ ) is low, the L–H equation can be simplified to an apparent first-order equation. For the highest concentrations  $C$ , where the  $KC$  term is much greater than one, a zero-order equation may be used. The solar photocatalytic process economics generally determine its commercial feasibility. The overall cost of a photochemical process is represented by the sum of the fixed capital, recurrent operating costs, and maintenance costs.

Since the cost of the land required for the installation of a solar photocatalytic reactor and the collector surface needed add a significant portion to the overall cost of the process, it is important to calculate the illuminated reactor area required as accurately as possible.

In this respect, the estimated price of the photochemical parabolic trough collectors (PTC) is close to \$235/m<sup>2</sup>, for completely installed parabolic trough collectors used for solar thermal energy, and the price for the flatbed reactor is around \$200/m<sup>2</sup> [168].

However, the starting cost of a one sun CPC collector is estimated at around \$160/m<sup>2</sup>. This cost includes the support structure, reflector materials, Pyrex glass tubes, labor, and manufacture. The Pyrex glass tubes are a substantial fraction of the system cost (\$51/m<sup>2</sup>). An aluminum reflector sheet is \$10/m<sup>2</sup>. The remaining collector costs, mainly labor, and manufacturing costs, make up about 60% of the investment [169].

A “figure of merit” can be used to assess the solar photochemical technology efficiency and related capital costs. In a solar-driven treatment system, the electrical energy component is practically absent and a solar “figure of merit” is usually defined based on the collector area necessary to achieve a specific degradation rate.

However, even though solar radiation has no cost, there could be a non-marginal capital cost for the collector. Since the capital cost of a solar collector facility is generally proportional to its land requirement, a “figure of merit” based on the solar collector area is appropriate for estimating the irradiated reactor area required [127].

For NCC, PTC, and CPC reactors, using batch or through-flow mode, the appropriate “figure of merit” are described for high and low concentrations, respectively [170].

The collector area per mass ( $A_{CM}$ ,  $\text{m}^2 \text{kg}^{-1}$ ), defined as the collector area required to reduce a unit of substrate mass in the reactor system in a reference time of 1 h ( $t_0$ ) and incident solar irradiance of  $1000 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  ( $E_s^0$ ) based on the AM1.5 standard solar spectrum on a horizontal surface, is:

$$A_{CM} = \frac{10^3 \cdot A_r \cdot t \cdot \bar{E}_s}{M \cdot V_t \cdot t_o \cdot E_s^0 \cdot (C_i - C_f)} \quad \text{“batch”} \quad A_{CM} = \frac{10^3 \cdot A_r \cdot \bar{E}_s}{M \cdot F \cdot t_o \cdot E_s^0 \cdot (C_i - C_f)} \quad \text{“through-flow”}$$

where  $A_r$  is the real collector area,  $M$  is the molar mass of the substrate ( $\text{g mol}^{-1}$ ),  $V_t$  is the volume of treated solution (L), ( $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ) is the average direct solar irradiance during reaction time  $t$ ,  $F$  ( $\text{m}^3 \text{h}^{-1}$ ) is the flow rate, and  $C_i$  and  $C_f$  are the starting and final substrate concentrations ( $M$ ), respectively. It is worth noting that the higher the  $A_{CM}$ , the lower the photoreactor efficiency is. For the natural solar  $\text{TiO}_2$ -photocatalytic production of benzaldehyde in a CPC reactor, an  $A_{CM}$  of  $3.08 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  per kilogram and hour of benzyl alcohol converted has been reported [2].

The collector area per mass has also been used for scaling up CPC reactor parameters to find the solar collecting area required to treat different volumes of industrial wastewater using solar homogenous photocatalysis (photo-Fenton).

Depending on the type of wastewater, in this case, real wastewater, in a combined solar photocatalysis and biological treatment, the volume effluents ( $0.1 \text{ m}^3$ ) can be treated until the complete removal of COD using  $7 \text{ m}^2$  of solar CPC collectors [171].

In order to include the effect of intermittent solar irradiance ( $E_s$ ), the experimental data are reported as a function of the normalized illumination time ( $t_{30W}$ )

$$t_{30W,n} = t_{30W,n-1} + \frac{\bar{I}_{UV,n}}{30W/\text{m}^2} \times \frac{V_i}{V_t} \times \Delta t_n; \Delta t_n = t_n - t_{n-1}; t_0 = 0 (n = 1)$$

and accumulated energy per unit volume ( $Q_{jUV}$ ):

$$Q_{jUV,n} = Q_{jUV,n-1} + \bar{I}_{UV,n} \times \frac{A_r}{V_t} \times \Delta t_n; \Delta t_n = t_n - t_{n-1}; t_0 = 0 (n = 1)$$

where  $t_n$  is the experimental time of each sample,  $V_i$  the irradiated volume of solution, and the average UV irradiance (300–400 nm) during. Considering that UV irradiance is only 3.5% of all direct solar irradiance [172,173], the  $A_{CM}$  formulation is rearranged as a function of the and parameters:

$$A_{CM} = \frac{10^3 \times A_r \times 30W/\text{m}^2 \times t_{30W,f}}{M \times V_i \times t_0 \times E_s^0 \times (C_i - C_f) \times 0.035} = \frac{10^3 \times Q_{jUV,f}}{M \times t_0 \times E_s^0 \times (C_i - C_f) \times 0.035}$$

where  $t_{30W,f}$  and  $Q_{jUV,f}$  represent the normalized illumination time and accumulated energy per unit of volume necessary to reach concentration  $C_f$ , respectively. When the reduction in organic carbon concentration is evaluated,  $A_{CM}$  is calculated for the removal of 1 kg of organic carbon.

Several  $A_{CM}$ s have been extrapolated from the results reported in the literature for heterogeneous and homogeneous photocatalysis as examples (Tables 4 a and b).

As shown in Table 4a and b, photo-Fenton usually requires solar photoreactor surfaces smaller than those used for  $\text{TiO}_2$  heterogeneous photocatalysis. For instance, the solar removal of imidacloprid, a neonicotinoid insecticide, by photo-Fenton in a CPC reactor is characterized by an  $A_{CM}$  of  $5.54 \times 10^2 \text{ m}^2$  (5a, Table 4b) and  $4.58 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  with  $\text{TiO}_2$  (11a, Table 4a). If the aim of the process is to mineralize pollutants, the  $A_{CM}$  values is expected to increase, since the by-products also have to be oxidized.

Another interesting example is the one reported by Bauer et al. [174], in which aqueous mixtures of 10 commercial pesticides, each at a concentration of  $10 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ , were treated by both photo-Fenton and  $\text{TiO}_2$  in CPC reactors to decontaminate the solution by completely oxidizing the pollutants. In this case, the  $A_{CM}$  required to totally oxidize 1 kg of organic carbon in a reference time of 1 h for  $10^3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  of incident solar irradiance, is  $1.35 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  by photo-Fenton (3, Table 4b) and  $1.59 \times 10^4 \text{ m}^2$  by  $\text{TiO}_2$  (10, Table 4a). These results, according to the economic evaluation reported by the authors [174], led them to the conclusion that the investment in a solar  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalytic process is higher than for solar photo-Fenton due to the larger collector area required. On the other hand, the costs derived from the consumption of chemicals for a  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalytic treatment are negligible compared to photo-Fenton, which requires hydrogen peroxide and mineral acids. In particular, starting hydrogen peroxide and iron concentrations not only affect chemical costs, but also reaction rates and  $A_{CM}$ . As shown in Table 4b (1a and 1b), when  $\text{FeSO}_4$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  are present in the solution at starting concentrations of 0.1 mM and 5.0 mM, respectively, the removal of Direct Black 38, a commercial dye, is characterized by an  $A_{CM}$  of  $4.09 \times 10^2 \text{ m}^2$ . This decreased by 11% ( $A_{CM} = 3.64 \times 10^2 \text{ m}^2$ ) when the starting concentrations of ferrous sulfate and hydrogen peroxide were increased tenfold. Moreover, when real wastewater was treated in a CPC reactor in the presence of  $\text{FeSO}_4$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  at starting concentrations of 1.0 mM and 50 mM, respectively, an  $A_{CM}$  of  $5.60 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  is required to completely oxidize 1 kg of Direct Black 38 in a reference time of 1 h at  $10^3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  of incident solar irradiance (Table 4b and 1c). The nearly 54% increase in  $A_{CM}$  is probably due to the presence of other substances in the real wastewater acting as hydroxyl radical scavengers [171].

To eliminate the cost of hydrogen peroxide, a modified photo-Fenton process based on oxygen as the oxidant and ferric ions as homogeneous catalysts has been proposed [175].

In this process, the sole source of hydroxyl radicals is direct photolysis of iron(III) aquo complex ( $\text{Fe}(\text{HO})^{2+}$ ). The catalytic cycle is closed by reoxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  to  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  by the dissolved oxygen. This photo-Fenton-like method was used in a CPC pilot plant at a starting  $\text{Fe}(\text{III})$

**Table 4**

"Figure of merit"  $A_{CM}$  values of heterogeneous (a) and homogeneous (b) photocatalytic process for wastewater treatment. The green colored fields represent values of TOC initial concentration, TOC removal and  $A_{CM}$  values calculated on the removal of 1.0 kg of total organic carbon.

| Table 4a | Substance                      | [C] <sub>0</sub><br>(mg/L) | Removal<br>(%) | V <sub>f</sub><br>(L) | V <sub>i</sub><br>(L) | S<br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | [TiO <sub>2</sub> ]<br>(mg/l) | Form  | pH | Solvent               | Collector geometry | $A_{CM}$<br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | Refs. |
|----------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| 1a       | Methyl-oxydemeton              | 50                         | 70             | 25                    | 15.1                  | 2.15                   | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Water (milli Q grade) | CPC                | $1.16 \times 10^4$            | [201] |
| 1b       | Methidathion                   | 50                         | 100            | 25                    | 15.1                  | 2.15                   | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Water (milli Q grade) | CPC                | $4.06 \times 10^3$            |       |
| 1c       | Carbaryl                       | 50                         | 100            | 25                    | 15.1                  | 2.15                   | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Water (milli Q grade) | CPC                | $1.62 \times 10^4$            |       |
| 1d       | Dimethoate                     | 50                         | 100            | 25                    | 15.1                  | 2.15                   | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Water (milli Q grade) | CPC                | $8.54 \times 10^3$            |       |
| 2a       | Progesterone                   | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 335                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $8.93 \times 10^5$            | [202] |
| 2b       | Triclosan                      | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 335                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $4.46 \times 10^5$            |       |
| 2c       | Hydroxybiphenyl                | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 336                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $2.23 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2d       | Diclofenac                     | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 337                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $2.23 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2e       | Ibuprofen                      | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 338                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | syntetic water        | CPC                | $2.90 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2f       | Ofloxacin                      | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 339                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $4.46 \times 10^5$            |       |
| 2g       | Caffeine                       | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 340                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $1.78 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2h       | Acetaminophen                  | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 341                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $1.78 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2i       | Sulfamethoxazole               | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 342                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $4.91 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2j       | Antipyrine                     | 0.1                        | 70             | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 343                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $8.29 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2k       | Flumequine                     | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 344                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $1.34 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2l       | Isoproturon                    | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 345                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $5.35 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2m       | Ketorolac                      | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 346                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $5.36 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2n       | Carbamazepine                  | 0.1                        | 100            | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 347                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $5.36 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 2o       | Atrazine                       | 0.1                        | 80             | 10                    | 0.96                  | 0.3                    | 335                           | Immobilized (HP on glass spheres)                 | –  | Syntetic water        | CPC                | $7.25 \times 10^6$            |       |
| 3a       | Cyanides                       | 50                         | 100            | 247                   | 108                   | 8.9                    | 200                           | Slurry (100% anatase HP)                          | 10 | Desalinated water     | CPC                | $2.09 \times 10^{3***}$       | [162] |
| 3b       | Cyanides                       | 50                         | 88             | 975                   | 675                   | 100                    | 200                           | Slurry (100% anatase HP)                          | 10 | Raw water             | CPC                | $5.44 \times 10^{3***}$       |       |
| 4a       | 2,4 dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid | 28                         | 100            | 247                   | 108                   | 8.9                    | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Desalinated water     | CPC                | $8.20 \times 10^{2*}$         | [203] |
| 5a       | Oxalic acid                    | 900                        | 85             | 10                    | 5.4                   | 0.72                   | 200                           | Slurry (>99% anatase Aldrich)                     | –  | Water                 | CPC                | $2.10 \times 10^{2**}$        | [176] |
| 5b       | Oxalic acid                    | 900                        | 70             | 10                    | 0.67                  | 0.72                   | 200                           | Slurry (>99% anatase Aldrich)                     | –  | Water                 | PTC                | $2.54 \times 10^{2**}$        |       |
| 5c       | Oxalic acid                    | 900                        | 70             | 10                    | 8                     | 0.72                   | 200                           | Slurry (>99% anatase Aldrich)                     | –  | Water                 | Flat tubular       | $2.54 \times 10^{2**}$        |       |
| 5d       | Carbaryl                       | 50.3                       | 77             | 10                    | 5.4                   | 0.72                   | 500                           | Slurry (>99% anatase Aldrich)                     | –  | Water                 | CPC                | $4.10 \times 10^{3**}$        |       |
| 5e       | Carbaryl                       | 50.3                       | 68             | 10                    | 0.67                  | 0.72                   | 500                           | Slurry (>99% anatase Aldrich)                     | –  | Water                 | PTC                | $4.70 \times 10^{3**}$        |       |
| 5f       | Carbaryl                       | 50.3                       | 55             | 10                    | 8                     | 0.72                   | 500                           | Slurry (>99% anatase Aldrich)                     | –  | Water                 | Flat tubular       | $5.92 \times 10^{3**}$        |       |
| 6        | Oxytetracycline                | 15                         | 100            | 15                    | 2.94                  | 0.91                   | 500                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Water                 | CPC                | $8.47 \times 10^{2***}$       | [204] |
| 7        | Humic acid (sodium salt)       | 10                         | 90             | 50                    | 16                    | 1                      | 20 (g/m <sup>2</sup> )        | Immobilized (degussa P-25 on 1049 AHLSTROM paper) | –  | Deionized water       | CPC                | $6.17 \times 10^{4***}$       | [205] |
| 8        | Yellow cibacron FN-2R          | 70                         | 95             | 50                    | 16                    | 1                      | 20 (g/m <sup>2</sup> )        | Immobilized (degussa P-25 on 1049 AHLSTROM paper) | –  | Well water            | FFR                | $2.56 \times 10^{3***}$       | [142] |
| 9a       | 2,4-Dichlorophenol             | 8                          | 100            | 15                    | 6.5                   | 1.4                    | 1500                          | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Tap water             | CPC                | $1.20 \times 10^{4**}$        | [206] |
| 9b       | 2,4-Dichlorophenol             | 22                         | 100            | 15                    | 6.5                   | 1.4                    | 1500                          | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Tap water             | CPC                | $9.85 \times 10^{3**}$        |       |
| 10       | Mix 10 commercial pesticides   | 100                        | 30             | 250                   | 108                   | 9                      | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Desalinated water     | CPC                | $1.59 \times 10^{4***}$       | [174] |
| 11a      | Imidacloprid                   | 52                         | 100            | 40                    | 22                    | 3                      | 200                           | Slurry (degussa P-25)                             | –  | Desalinated water     | CPC                | $4.58 \times 10^{3*}$         | [207] |
| 11b      |                                | 28                         | 98             |                       |                       |                        |                               |   |    |                       |                    | $3.19 \times 10^{4*}$         |       |

Table 4 (Continued)

| Table 4b | Substance                             | [C] <sub>0</sub><br>(mg/L) | Removal<br>(%) | V <sub>i</sub><br>(L) | V <sub>f</sub><br>(L) | S<br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | [Fe]<br>(mM) | Fe source                          | [H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> ]<br>(mM) | pH  | Solvent             | Collector geometry | A <sub>CM</sub><br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | Refs. |
|----------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--|-----|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|
| 1a       | Direct Black 38                       | 100                        | 80             | 3                     | 0.05                  | 0.1                    | 0.1          | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 5  | 2   | Syntetic wastewater | CPC                | 4.09 × 10 <sup>2</sup>               | [171] |
| 1b       | Direct Black 38                       | 100                        | 90             | 3                     | 0.05                  | 0.1                    | 1            | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 50 (in 2 portions)                       | 2   | Syntetic wastewater | CPC                | 3.64 × 10 <sup>2</sup>               |       |
| 1c       | Direct Black 38                       | 100                        | 60             | 3                     | 0.05                  | 0.1                    | 1            | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 50 (in 2 portions)                       | 2   | Real wastewater     | CPC                | 5.60 × 10 <sup>2</sup>               |       |
| 2a       | Phenols (from olive mill wastewaters) | 3000                       | 97             | 30                    | 22.4                  | 3.08                   | 1            | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 588                                      | 2.8 | Real wastewater     | CPC                | 5.75 × 10 <sup>2***</sup>            | [159] |
| 2b       | Phenols (from olive mill wastewaters) | 2800                       | 79             | 30                    | 22.4                  | 3.08                   | 5            | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 147                                      | 2.8 | Real wastewater     | CPC                | 4.91 × 10 <sup>2***</sup>            |       |
| 2c       | Phenols (from olive mill wastewaters) | 2700                       | 88             | 19                    | –                     | 1                      | 5            | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 147                                      | 2.8 | Real wastewater     | FFR                | 7.95 × 10 <sup>2***</sup>            |       |
| 3        | Mixture of 10 commercial pesticides   | 100                        | 88             | 250                   | 108                   | 9                      | 1            | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 1 (in 5 portions)                        | 2.8 | Desalinated water   | CPC                | 1.35 × 10 <sup>3***</sup>            | [174] |
| 4a       | 4-Chlorophenol                        | 216                        | 100            | 4                     | 2                     | 0.42                   | 0.75         | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 45                                       | 2.8 | Distilled water     | Pool               | 1.74 × 10 <sup>2**</sup>             | [208] |
| 4b       | 4-Chlorophenol                        | 216                        | 100            | 12                    | 12                    | 0.42                   | 0.75         | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 45                                       | 2.8 | Distilled water     | Pool               | 75**                                 |       |
| 4c       | 4-Chlorophenol                        | 216                        | 100            | 20                    | 20                    | 0.42                   | 0.75         | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 45                                       | 2.8 | Distilled water     | Pool               | 52**                                 |       |
| 5a       | Imidacloprid                          | 52                         | 100            | 40                    | 22                    | 3                      | 0.05         | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 15 (maintained constant)                 | 2.8 | Desalinated water   | CPC                | 5.54 × 10 <sup>2*</sup>              | [207] |
| 5b       |                                       | 28                         | 98             |                       |                       |                        |              |                                    |  |     |                     |                    | 1.74 × 10 <sup>4*</sup>              |       |
| 6a       | Diethyl phthalate                     | 58                         | 100            | 40                    | 22                    | 3                      | 0.305        | Fe(ClO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> | 0  | –   | Desalinated water   | CPC                | 4.10 × 10 <sup>2***</sup>            | [175] |
| 6b       |                                       | 38                         | 85             |                       |                       |                        |              |                                    |  |     |                     |                    | 1.36 × 10 <sup>3***</sup>            |       |
| 7a       | Grape juice (WG)                      | 1185                       | 93             | 40                    | 22                    | 3                      | 55           | FeSO <sub>4</sub>                  | 12                                       | 3   | Milli-Q water       | CPC                | 3.89 × 10 <sup>2*</sup>              | [209] |

\* Calculated by using the normalized illumination time ( $t_{30W}$ ) necessary to reach the final conversion.\*\* Calculated by using the  $I_{UV,n}$  during the experimental run and considering that represent only 3.5% of the global radiation.\*\*\* Calculated by using the accumulated energy per unit of volume ( $Q_{UV}$ ) necessary to reach the final value.



concentration of 0.305 mM for the removal of diethyl phthalate (58 ppm). The  $A_{CM}$  for removal of diethyl phthalate and the corresponding TOC is  $4.10 \times 10^2 \text{ m}^2$  and  $1.36 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$ , respectively (6a and b, Table 4b).

This  $A_{CM}$ , calculated with the data reported by Bandala et al. [176], emphasizes the importance of the reactor type chosen. In fact, as shown in 5d–f of Table 4a, under the same operating conditions, ( $\text{TiO}_2$  load, initial pollutant concentration, and reactor irradiated surfaces), the  $A_{CM}$  changes with variations in the solar collector geometry. In particular, for CPC, PTC, and flat tubular reactors, the  $A_{CM}$  found from the experimental data for carbaryl oxidation in the presence of 500 ppm of titania (pure anatase) is  $4.10 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$ ,  $4.70 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$ , and  $5.92 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$ , respectively.

Additional results from data reported by Malato et al. [162], who described the setup of the first industrial European solar detoxification plant, a  $100 \text{ m}^2$  CPC designed for the batch treatment of at least  $2 \text{ m}^3$  of water and aerated aqueous suspensions of polycrystalline  $\text{TiO}_2$ . Plant performance was compared to smaller CPC pilot plants at the Plataforma Solar de Almeria using cyanide at a starting concentration of 50 ppm as the model compound and 200 ppm of in-house prepared anatase catalyst.  $A_{CM}$  calculated from the data of the two experimental runs was  $2.09 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  and  $5.44 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  for the pilot and industrial treatment plant, respectively (3a and b, Table 4a). The  $A_{CM}$  in the larger plant was over 150% higher for two reasons: the  $\text{O}_2$  concentration dropped, becoming limiting, and the experimental runs in the industrial plant were carried out with raw water which is rich in inorganic anions able to react with HO radicals and photo-generated holes [177].

Table 5 shows the  $A_{CM}$  for photocatalytic production of fine chemicals. Like the results above, it is observed that homogeneous photocatalytic processes are characterized by a lower  $A_{CM}$  than  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalysis. In particular, in presence of Rose Bengal and isopropanol alcohol, or benzophenone disodium disulfonate (BPSS), the  $A_{CM}$  is less than  $4.00 \times 10^2 \text{ m}^2$  in all cases studied (Table 5, 1–9). On the other hand, if  $\text{TiO}_2$  as pure anatase and cupric ions are used to produce benzaldehyde by selectively oxidizing the benzyl alcohol, the  $A_{CM}$  is lowered to  $3.19 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^2$  (Table 5, 10), which could be considered low compared to those shown in Table 4a with  $\text{TiO}_2$  photocatalysis.

The “figure of merit” for photocatalytic disinfection is the collector area required to decrease the starting microorganism concentration 6-log in a reference time of 1 h ( $t_0$ ) with incident solar irradiance of  $1000 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  ( $E_s^0$ ):

$$A_{CX} = \frac{6 \times A_r \times t \times \bar{E}_s}{t_0 \times E_s^0 \times (\log X_i - \log X_f)}$$

where  $A_r$  is the real collector area, ( $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ) is the average direct solar irradiance during reaction time  $t$ , and  $X_i$ , and  $X_f$  are the starting and final microorganism concentrations (CFU/100 mL or MPN/mL), respectively.

$A_{CX}$  could also be calculated as a function of the final  $Q_{jUV}$  or  $t_{30W}$ :

$$A_{CX} = \frac{6 \times Q_{jUV,f} \times V_t}{t_0 \times E_s^0 \times (\log X_i - \log X_f) \times 0.035} = \frac{6 \times A_r \times t_{30W,f} \times 30 \text{ W/m}^2}{t_0 \times E_s^0 \times (\log X_i - \log X_f) \times 0.035}$$

where  $V_t$  is the total solution volume. The term 0.035 refers to the fact that UV radiation between 300 nm and 400 nm is only 3.5% of the daily global solar radiation.

The use of a figure of merit ( $A_{CM}$ ) to estimate the surface area required to decontaminate a certain volume of polluted water is based on the concept that the more photons received in the system, the more oxidation there is on the organic molecules. However, in disinfection, the mechanism is not exactly the same. While it is true that the more radiation a system receives, the stronger the bactericidal effect, the bactericidal damage depends strongly on how the radiation is delivered to the system. If the radiation is continuous and uninterrupted during treatment, then the germicidal effect is much more effective than intermittent delivery of the same amount of energy to the same water [210]. Irradiance (i.e., solar intensity in terms of  $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ) also plays an important role. For example, the log decrease in bacteria observed for the same dose (total energy) received by the system at low irradiance is different from the decrease observed at higher irradiance [211].

This can be attributed to bacterial defense mechanisms which develop under stress, like UVA irradiation or hydroxyl radicals. If the bacteria are under UVA stress, but are not killed effectively during the exposure time, then they respond to that stress with these defense mechanisms and become resistant to treatment. This is why, due to dark regions in the reactor, recirculated flow reactors are not always as effective as stationary batch reactors for disinfection. Therefore, sequential batch reactors [212] and others [213] have been designed to achieve higher effective disinfection efficiency under outdoor conditions.

The per order collector area ( $A_{CO}$ ,  $\text{m}^2 \text{ m}^{-3} \text{ order}^{-1}$ ) is the collector area needed to reduce substrate concentration by one order of magnitude per unit of volume (e.g.,  $1 \text{ m}^3$ ) in water or air with “standardized” incident solar irradiance ( $E_s^0$ ) of  $1000 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  (AM1.5 standard solar spectrum) on a horizontal surface over a reference period of 1 h ( $t_0$ ):

$$A_{CO} = \frac{A_r \cdot t \cdot \bar{E}_s}{V_t \cdot t_o \cdot E_s^0 \cdot \log\left(\frac{C_i}{C_f}\right)} \quad A_{CO} = \frac{A_r \cdot \bar{E}_s}{F \cdot t_o \cdot E_s^0 \cdot \log\left(\frac{C_i}{C_f}\right)}$$

“batch”

“flow”

“Figures of merit” enable system costs to be estimated quickly and provide an indication of the capital investment required for solar photocatalytic NCC, CPC, or PPC reactors, although there may be other cost factors, like chemicals and operation/maintenance, which would have to be included in a complete cost analysis.

The operating costs can be calculated by the sum of the costs of each liquid chemical ( $X_i$ ) and solid ( $Y_j$ ) reagents, assuming the cost of energy associated with a solar process to be zero [214]:

$$\text{Operating costs} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cost} X_i + \sum_{j=1}^m \text{cost} Y_j \quad \text{with} \quad \text{cost} X_i = \frac{\text{price} X_i (\text{€}/\text{ton}) \times C_{X_i} 10^{-3} (\text{ton}/\text{m}^3) \times \rho_{X_i} (\text{kg}/\text{L})}{\% \text{ of purity} / 100 (\text{kg}/\text{L})} \quad \text{for liquid reagents and} \quad \text{cost} Y_j = \frac{\text{price} Y_j (\text{€}/\text{ton}) \times C_{Y_j} 10^{-6} (\text{ton}/\text{m}^3) \times \text{MW}_{\text{starting material}} / \text{MW}_{Y_j}}{\% \text{ of purity} / 100} \quad \text{for solid reagents.}$$

**Table 5**“Figure of merit”  $A_{CM}$  values of photocatalytic process aimed at the production of fine chemicals.

| Reagent                                     | Product                            | [C] <sub>0</sub><br>(mg/L) | Conversion<br>(%) | Selectivity<br>(%) | V <sub>r</sub><br>(L) | V <sub>i</sub><br>(L) | S<br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | Solvent                   | Catalyst/sensitizer   | [Catalyst]<br>(mg/L) | Collector<br>geometry | A <sub>CM</sub><br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | Refs. |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|
| 1 Citronellol                               | Rose oxide                         | 85000                      | 100               | 55                 | 80                    | –                     | 32                     | Isopropanol               | rose bengal   | 450                  | PTC                   | 9                                    | [131] |
| 2 1,5-Dihydroxynaphthalene                  | Juglone                            | 5000                       | 100               | 80                 | 0.2                   | –                     | 0.188                  | Isopropanol               | rose bengal   | 500                  | PTC                   | 2.35 × 10 <sup>2</sup>               |       |
| 4 Maleic acid<br>Isopropanol                | Terebic acid                       | 11607 Large excess         | 90                | 83                 | 1.2                   | –                     | 0.2                    | Isopropanol-water         | BPSS  | 3858                 | CPC                   | 1.23 × 10 <sup>2*</sup>              | [165] |
| 5 Acetylenedicarboxylic acid<br>Isopropanol | Bis(γ-methyl)-di-valerolactone     | 7984 Large excess          | 35                | 43                 | 1.2                   | –                     | 0.2                    | Isopropanol-water (1:1)   | BPSS  | 3858                 | CPC                   | 1.49 × 10 <sup>2*</sup>              |       |
| 6 <i>trans</i> -2-Hexenal<br>Isopropanol    | β-propyl-γ-di-methyl-valerolactol  | 9814 Large excess          | 83                | 66                 | 1.2                   | –                     | 0.2                    | Isopropanol-water (1:1)   | BPSS  | 7716                 | CPC                   | 97 <sup>*</sup>                      |       |
| 7 Crotonaldehyde<br>Isopropanol             | β,γ,γ'-tri-methyl-valerolactol     | 7000 Large excess          | 55                | 55                 | 1.2                   | –                     | 0.2                    | Isopropanol-water         | BPSS  | 3858                 | CPC                   | 3.76 × 10 <sup>2*</sup>              |       |
| 8 Crotonaldehyde<br>1,3-Dioxolane           | 1,3-Dioxolane-2-(3-butyraldehyde)  | 7000 Large excess          | 80                | 31                 | 1.2                   | –                     | 0.2                    | 1,3-Dioxolane-water (5:7) | BPSS  | 3858                 | CPC                   | 2.11 × 10 <sup>2*</sup>              |       |
| 9 <i>trans</i> -2-Hexenal<br>1,3-Dioxolane  | 1,3-Dioxolane-2-(3-capronaldehyde) | 9814 Large excess          | 88                | 40                 | 1.2                   | –                     | 0.2                    | 1,3-Dioxolane-water (5:7) | BPSS  | 7716                 | CPC                   | 91 <sup>*</sup>                      |       |
| 10 Benzyl alcohol                           | Benzaldehyde                       | 162                        | 62                | 70                 | 39                    | 22                    | 3                      | Desalinated water         | TiO <sub>2</sub> (Aldrich pure anatase)<br>Cu (added as CuSO <sub>4</sub> ) | 200<br>63.5          | CPC                   | 3.19 × 10 <sup>3</sup>               | [2]   |

<sup>\*</sup> Calculated by using the  $\tilde{I}_{UV,n}$  during the experimental run and considering that represent only 3.5% of the global radiation.






Fig. 13. Shading by collectors in a solar field.




Fig. 14. Estimation of the minimum distance between the rows to minimize the shadowing the collectors.

Once  $A_{CM}$  has been estimated, particularly if many mirrors are required in a limited field, the optimal design of the solar field should minimize plant costs and avoid shading and masking effects that decrease the incident solar energy on the collectors (Fig. 13) [215].

In this regard, the dark area can be estimated by calculating the shortest distance ( $\overline{AC}$ ) between the rows to minimize collector shadowing.

Defining as the solar altitude angle (Fig. 14), that is the angle between the solar rays and the horizontal terrestrial plane at a given latitude, as the collector inclination, which should be equal to the local latitude, and as the collector height (known from  $A_{CM}$ ), the segment may be estimated by calculating angles  $\angle AC$ ,  $\angle AD$  and  $\angle DC$ , respectively:

$$\angle ABC = 180^\circ - \alpha - \beta, \angle ABD = 90^\circ - \beta, \angle DBC = \angle ABC - \angle ABD = 90^\circ - \alpha$$

It is trigonometric fact that:

$$\overline{BD} = \overline{AB} \times \sin \beta, \overline{AD} = \overline{AB} \times \cos \beta, \overline{DC} = \overline{BD} \times \tan \angle DBC = \overline{AB} \times \sin \beta \times \tan(90^\circ - \alpha)$$

From the above formulas, the distance between two collectors is:

$$\overline{AC} = \overline{AD} + \overline{DC} = \overline{AB} \times [\cos \beta + \sin \beta \times \tan(90^\circ - \alpha)]$$

## 5. Factors affecting solar photocatalysis

### 5.1. Solar irradiance and weather conditions

As expected, solar photocatalytic reaction rates increase with increasing solar irradiance which is indirectly related to the quantum yield of the overall process ( $Q_y$ ). In fact, the total number of photons received by a photoreactor can be calculated by measuring and integrating the solar irradiance around the reactor walls. Obviously, under uncontrollable weather conditions and low solar intensities (overcast and rainy days), the quantum yield dependence on irradiance cannot be calculated. In heterogeneous photocatalysis, reaction rate profiles are proportional to the number of incoming photons on the solid photocatalyst (Fig. 15).

Performance is almost linear when solar irradiance is low. Above a certain amount, depending on reaction conditions (photocatalyst, target compounds, photoreactor design, etc.), the reaction rate becomes proportional to the square of the solar irradiance. At very high solar irradiances, the reaction rates become independent of radiation intensity.

Some studies have reported that the reason for the square root relationship is explained by bulk recombination of photoelectron-hole pairs within the catalyst particles [216,217]. Furthermore, at sufficiently high light intensity, the photocatalytic reaction is no longer dependent on radiation received, and depends only on mass transfer within the reaction. So the rate remains constant even though radiation increases. This effect can appear for different reasons, such as lack of electron scavengers (i.e.,  $O_2$ ), or organic molecules in the proximity of  $TiO_2$  surfaces, and/or excess of products occupying active catalyst centers, etc. These phenomena appear more frequently when working with supported catalysts, and/or with slow agitation, implying less catalyst surface in contact with the liquid and less turbulence. This does not favor the contact of reactants with the catalyst.




Fig. 15. Heterogeneous photocatalytic reaction rate vs solar irradiance.

This result, and the need for cooling units necessary for solar photoreactors which employ sunlight concentrators, led research to gradually focus on CPC systems instead of PTCs for solar photocatalytic applications.

### 5.2. Catalyst load, optical density, photoreactor diameter, and specific area

Catalyst load, or in homogeneous processes, its concentration, system optical density, and solar photoreactor diameter are essential, mutually interrelated reactor design parameters. With photocatalytic heterogeneous slurries, both light absorption and scattering by catalyst particles must be taken into account for optimal reactor light-path length and catalyst loads.

In fact, in heterogeneous slurries, the reaction rate increases with increasing catalyst load, but decreases over a certain amount [218,219]. At the highest particle concentrations, photocatalytic activity falls, mainly because sunlight is scattered, particles agglomerate, and photon flux penetration in the mixture is poor. Therefore, in slurry reactors, the photocatalyst load must be optimized for best photocatalytic activity [220,221]. Larger photoreactor diameters result in a lower optimum catalyst load, and vice versa [222]. From a practical point of view, the ideal diameter of the solar photoreactor must be in the 25–50 mm range [140,223,224]. Less than 20–25 mm diameters are not feasible, because of operating pressure loss. In photocatalytic reactors employing immobilized photocatalyst particles, the film thickness is crucial. The incoming solar photons are only partly absorbed when films are very thin (<1 m), whereas, thick catalyst films cause an unreactive “dark zone” directly below the catalytic surface exposed. The optimal photocatalyst film depends on several parameters, such as the solar wavelength range, the physical and optical characteristics of the material used and the photocatalyst deposition technique [225,226].

In heterogeneous reactions, the specific surface area is another key factor, since it is proportional to the density of active catalytic sites. It has been demonstrated that the activity of a heterogeneous photocatalyst is not simply correlated with its specific surface area, but is controlled by photoinduced electron transfer [227–229]. However, the specific surface areas for the most commonly used photocatalysts are listed in Table 6. Like heterogeneous photocatalysis, in homogeneous photocatalysis, the catalyst concentration is affected by the light-path length. For photo-Fenton, it has been demonstrated that the optimum ferric ion concentration is about 0.2–0.5 mM, regardless of photoreactor type [151,230].



### 5.3. Oxygen concentration

Dissolved oxygen concentration has a fundamental role in photocatalytic reactions, since it reacts with photogenerated electrons forming radical oxidizing species and helping prevent very fast recombination of photoelectrons and holes [231,232]. There is a consensus in the literature regarding the influence of oxygen. Oxygen is necessary for complete mineralization and does not seem to be competitive with other reagents during adsorption on  $\text{TiO}_2$ , since oxidation takes place at a different location from reduction. The concentration of oxygen also affects the reaction rate, but it seems that the difference between air ( $P_{\text{O}_2} = 0.21$  atm) and pure oxygen ( $P_{\text{O}_2} = 1$  atm) is not very great. In an industrial plant it would simply be a matter of economy of design. It has been reported that the rate of oxidation is independent of oxygen concentration up to air saturation, suggesting that mass transfer of oxygen to the surface could also be rate limiting.

### 5.4. Effect of original pH

The pH of the solution affects both heterogeneous and homogeneous solar photocatalysis. Heterogeneous photocatalysts generally show a strong pH dependency of the surface charge state and the band gap potential. According to Nerst's law, when the solution pH is varied, the valence energy and conduction band edges shift by 0.059 per unit pH at room temperature [42]. This makes the valence band electron more effective, and the conduction band holes less effective at higher pH.

Additionally, if the surface of catalyst is characterized by amphoteric groups, such as titania, then:



**Table 6**  
pH<sub>zpc</sub> and BET specific surface areas for the more common used photocatalysts.

|   | pH <sub>zpc</sub>  | BET (m <sup>2</sup> /g) |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|
| TiO <sub>2</sub>                                |                    |                         |
| Degussa P25 (Evonik) ~80% anatase, ~20% rutile  | 6.3 <sup>(a)</sup> | 50.0 <sup>(a)</sup>     |
| Anatase 100% (Aldrich)                          | 4.2 <sup>(a)</sup> | 9.2 <sup>(a)</sup>      |
| Anatase 100% nanopowder (Aldrich)               | 5.2 <sup>(b)</sup> | (e)                     |
| Rutile 100% (Aldrich)                           | 4.8 <sup>(a)</sup> | 1.9 <sup>(a)</sup>      |
| Rutile 100% (Tioxide Specialities Ltd., UK)     | 5.4 <sup>(c)</sup> | 17 <sup>(c)</sup>       |
| Rutile P25                                      | 6.1 <sup>(a)</sup> | 29.2 <sup>(a)</sup>     |
| Millenium PC100 (Millenium Inorganic Chemicals) | 5.9 <sup>(a)</sup> | 89.6 <sup>(a)</sup>     |
| Millenium PC500 (Millenium Inorganic Chemicals) | 6.2 <sup>(a)</sup> | 287.0 <sup>(a)</sup>    |
| Hombikat UV 100 (Sachtleben chemie GmbH)        | 6.0 <sup>(a)</sup> | 348.0 <sup>(a)</sup>    |
| TiO <sub>2</sub> (Junsei)                       | 4.4 <sup>(a)</sup> | 9.7 <sup>(a)</sup>      |
| TiO <sub>2</sub> ST-01 (Ishihara)               | 5.8 <sup>(a)</sup> | 340.0 <sup>(a)</sup>    |
| Combustion synthesized TiO <sub>2</sub>         | 2.4 <sup>(d)</sup> | 246 <sup>(d)</sup>      |
| ZnO   |                    |                         |
| ZnO (Aldrich)                                   | 9.2 <sup>(b)</sup> |                         |
| ZnO (Bio-Tech)                                  | 8.0 <sup>(g)</sup> |                         |
| Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>                  |                    |                         |
| Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (Aldrich)        | 6.5 <sup>(b)</sup> |                         |
| Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (Home prepared)  | 8.4 <sup>(b)</sup> |                         |
| Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (Home prepared)  | 9.5 <sup>(f)</sup> |                         |

<sup>(a)</sup> [227].<sup>(b)</sup> [238].<sup>(c)</sup> [239].<sup>(d)</sup> [240].<sup>(e)</sup> [241].<sup>(f)</sup> [242].<sup>(g)</sup> [243].

where MOH, MOH<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>, and MO<sup>−</sup> are the neutral, positive, and negative surface hydroxyl groups, respectively. The point of zero charge (pH<sub>zpc</sub>) can be calculated as:

$$\text{pH}_{\text{zpc}} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{p}K_{\text{a1}} + \text{p}K_{\text{a2}})$$

where pK<sub>a1</sub> and pK<sub>a2</sub> are the negative logarithms of dissociation constants in acid and alkaline media, respectively.

When the pH < pH<sub>zpc</sub>, the surface charge of the catalyst is positive, if pH > pH<sub>zpc</sub> it is negative, and it is neutral when pH = pH<sub>zpc</sub>.

These characteristics significantly affect the adsorption–desorption properties of the photocatalyst surface [233]. For example, for Degussa P-25 (Evonik) TiO<sub>2</sub>, the most widely used titania for photocatalytic processes in aqueous media, pH<sub>zpc</sub> is from 6.25 to 6.60 [234]. As a reference organic compound, phenol, which has a pK<sub>a</sub> of 9.95, can be charged positively or negatively depending on the pH range, and consequently, interaction with Degussa P-25 titania changes with the pH of the solution. In acidic media, phenol is mainly present in its nonionic form, and its adsorption on the positively charged catalyst surface is noticeably promoted, and therefore, the photocatalytic oxidation rate is enhanced. On the other hand, in alkaline media, phenol exists primarily as phenolate anions and the Degussa P-25 TiO<sub>2</sub> surface is negatively charged. Thus, Coulombic repulsion between the negatively charged photocatalyst particle surface and phenolates could prevent its adsorption and the reaction rate would be slowed down [235]. The pH<sub>zpc</sub> also changes significantly with the synthesis techniques, the type of photocatalyst [227,236], structural and adsorbed impurities and textural defects (Table 6) [237].

However, the effect of pH on heterogeneous photocatalysis is almost controversial, since the positive holes are considered the major oxidation species at low pH whereas, hydroxyl radicals are considered the predominant species at neutral or high pH [244,245].

Moreover, it should be kept in mind that pH<sub>zpc</sub> is measured on unirradiated catalyst samples, and therefore, it may not always be correct to extrapolate those measurements to illuminated conditions. For example, tests performed on illuminated heterogeneous photocatalysts have demonstrated that the equilibrium adsorption constants of organics on these solids are generally higher than those measured separately under dark conditions [246], confirming that the distribution of amphiphilic and hydrophobic surface sites for a same photocatalyst changes depending on lighting conditions.

One very important feature of photocatalysis often not taken into consideration for decontamination of water is that during the reaction, a multitude of intermediate products are produced that may behave differently depending on the pH of the solution. Consideration of only the original substrate decomposition rate could lead to taking an erroneous pH as the best for contaminant degradation. Therefore, a detailed analysis of pH should include not only the initial substrate, but also the rest of the compounds produced during the process. Measurement of an overall parameter, such as TOC (or COD, or toxicity, or biodegradability, etc.) should be used for choosing the optimum pH, or at least to determine the effect of pH on behavior of the key parameter chosen.

Homogeneous photocatalytic reactions are usually strongly pH-dependent. For example, in the photo-Fenton treatments, pollutant degradation rates decrease at pH over 3.5 due to the precipitation of iron as hydroxide [247]. Moreover, it is known that the oxidation potential of hydroxyl radicals generated during the photocatalytic process decreases with increasing pH [248]. Finally, a further reason for less efficient degradation at pH over 3.5 is attributed to the dissociation and auto-decomposition of the hydrogen peroxide used as a reagent in photo-Fenton systems [249].

When pH is too acid (below 2.0), HO• production is strongly affected by hydroxyl-radical scavenging by proton ions [248]. The formation of oxonium ions (H<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>) enhances the stability of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and reduces hydroxyl radical generation [250].

### 5.5. Effect of temperature

Homogeneous photocatalysis kinetic rate constants (i.e., photo-Fenton) are significantly affected by reaction temperature [251], and increase with increasing temperature up to a limit, above which reaction rates fall due to thermal decomposition and/or significant loss of iron by precipitation [252]. However, for the photo-Fenton process the effect of the reaction temperature caused by the Fenton thermal reaction can be important on the reactor performance [116].

In heterogeneous systems, the band-gap energy of the photocatalyst is too high (3.0 eV for  $\text{TiO}_2$ ) to be affected by thermal activation energy ( $kT = 0.026$  eV at 25 °C for  $\text{TiO}_2$ ) so heterogeneous photocatalysis is not usually very temperature-sensitive, and very little information is available concerning the influence of temperature on it [253].

A temperature increase usually promotes electron-hole recombination [254] and speeds up diffusion of hydroxyl radicals from the surface of the solid photocatalyst to the bulk liquid.

However, when temperatures are too high, the adsorption capacity of solid substrates is reduced, oxygen is dissolved, and as adsorption is a spontaneous exothermic phenomenon, superficial reaction rates of other reagents decrease [255,256].

Moreover, a negative effect of temperature on the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the bulk liquid may be expected, in the sense that if it is too low, it may allow photoelectron-hole recombination.

## 6. Conclusions

At the International Congress of Applied Chemistry held in New York in 1912, Ciamician presented his remarkable vision of “The Photochemistry of the Future” [257]. On that occasion, he outlined his belief that photochemistry, which was an entirely solar discipline at that time, could be an essential component of industry in the future: “On the arid lands there will spring up industrial colonies without smoke and without smokestacks; forests of glass tubes will extend over the plains, and glass buildings will rise everywhere; inside of these will take place the photochemical processes that hitherto have been the guarded secret of the plants, but that will have been mastered by human industry which will know how to make them even more abundant fruit than nature, for nature is not in a hurry and mankind is”.

Ciamician's dream has not yet been realized. Although solar photocatalysis has produced significant interest in research, it is still too young for commercialization: there are only a few examples of medium and large-scale solar photocatalytic chemical processes in industry.

However, these few demonstrate that solar photochemical production of selected fine chemicals and solar photocatalytic wastewater treatment, particularly in sunnier regions, may be environmentally-friendly alternatives to existing conventional processes.

The results found from solar photocatalytic technologies employed in different markets encourage further research in the use of solar photochemistry to advance in the field of commercial and industrial processes.

In particular, application of heterogeneous solar photocatalysis with  $\text{TiO}_2$  should have a future beneficial impact on the environment, public health and a greener economy, and thereby, on the quality of life.

In any case, some barriers still need to be overcome:

- Solar chemical processes require photoreactors specifically designed for a light source.
- During scale-up, it is very difficult to reproduce the same ratio of irradiated surface to total volume.
- Photochemical processes are usually characterized by a “quantum yield” of less than one, making the use of more efficient catalytic systems necessary.
- Individualization of solar-specific reactions and optimization of operating conditions, in particular, the solar radiation-catalyst interaction.
- Lack of “in situ” experiments on the long-term reliability of solar operation.
- Suppression of charge recombination in photoconductor materials still needs to be addressed.

If the photochemical approach can overcome certain drawbacks of conventional operations, the industrial acceptance of solar photocatalytic reactions will increase considerably.

## Acknowledgment

The Authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions to improve the quality of the paper.

## References

- [1] I. Dincer, Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev. 4 (2000) 157–175.
- [2] D. Spasiano, L.P. Rodriguez, J.C. Oller, S. Malato, R. Marotta, R. Andreozzi, Appl. Catal. B: Environ. 136–137 (2013) 56–63.
- [3] Y. Ohama, D. Van Gemert, Application of Titanium Dioxide Photocatalysis to Construction Materials: State-of-the-Art Report of The RILEM Technical Committee 194-TDP, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [4] D. Jing, L. Guo, L. Zhao, X. Zhang, H. Liu, M. Li, S. Shen, G. Liu, X. Hu, X. Zhang, K. Zhang, L. Ma, P. Guo, Int. J. Hydrogen Energy 35 (2010) 7087–7097.
- [5] S. Malato, P. Fernandez-Ibanez, M.I. Maldonado, J. Blanco, W. Gernjak, Catal. Today 147 (2009) 1–59.
- [6] K. Hashimoto, H. Irie, A. Fujishima, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. 44 (2005) 8269–8285.
- [7] D.W. Banhemann, Solar Energy 77 (2004) 445–459.
- [8] A. Mills, S.K. Lee, J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem. 152 (2002) 233–247.
- [9] M.M. Gagliardi, Photocatalysts: Technologies and Global Market, BCC Research Report, March, 2010.
- [10] BCC Research Market Research Reports and Technical Publications, Product Catalog, December 2012, <http://www.bccresearch.com>
- [11] H. Tong, S. Ouyang, Y. Bi, N. Umezawa, M. Oshikiri, J. Ye, Adv. Mater. 24 (2012) 229–251.
- [12] X. Chen, S.S. Mao, Chem. Rev. 107 (2007) 2891–2959.
- [13] H.D. Roth, Angew. Chem. 28 (1989) 1193–1207.
- [14] G.O. Schenck, K. Ziegler, Naturwissenschaften 32 (1944) 157–161.
- [15] G.O. Schenck, Angew. Chem. 64 (1952) 12–23.
- [16] A.M. Braun, M.T. Maurette, E. Oliveros, Photochemical Technology, Wiley, West Sussex, England, 1991.
- [17] A. Fujishima, K. Honda, Nature 238 (1972) 37–38.



- [18] S. Malato, J. Blanco, A. Vidal, C. Richter, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 37 (2002) 1–15.
- [19] R. Goslich, R. Dillert, D. Bahnemann, *Water Sci. Technol.* 36 (1997) 137–148.
- [20] K. Pacheco, A.S. Watt, C.S. Turchi, In: A. Kirkpatrick, W. Worek (Eds.), *ASME/ASES Joint Solar Energy Conference*, 1993, pp. 43–49.
- [21] D.J. Alpert, J.L. Sprung, J.E. Pacheco, M.R. Prairie, H.E. Reilly, T.A. Milne, M.R. Nimlos, *Solar Energy Mater.* 24 (1991) 594–607.
- [22] B.P. Gupta, J.V. Anderson, *Solar Energy Mater.* 24 (1991) 40–61.
- [23] J.E. Pacheco, M. Prairie, L. Evans, L. Yellowhorse, *Proceedings 25th Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference*, Reno, Nevada, 1990, pp. 141–145.
- [24] C. Minero, E. Pelizzetti, S. Malato, J. Blanco, *Chemosphere* 26 (1993) 2103–2119.
- [25] S.E. Braslavsky, A.M. Braun, A.E. Cassano, A.V. Emeline, M.I. Litter, L. Palmisano, V.N. Parmon, N. Serpone, *Pure Appl. Chem.* 83 (2011) 931–1014.
- [26] M. Rodriguez, S. Malato, C. Pulgarin, S. Contreras, D. Curcio, J. Gimenez, S. Esplugas, *Solar Energy* 79 (2005) 360–368.
- [27] R. Andreozzi, M. Canterino, R. Marotta, *Water Res.* 40 (2006) 3785–3792.
- [28] S.H. Bossmann, E. Oliveros, S. Göb, S. Siegwart, E.P. Dahlen, L. Payawan Jr., M. Straub, M. Wörner, A.M. Braun, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 102 (1998) 5542–5550.
- [29] O. Legrini, E. Oliveros, A.M. Braun, *Chem. Rev.* 93 (1993) 671–698.
- [30] F.J. Rivas, F.J. Beltrán, J. Frades, P. Buxeda, *Water Res.* 35 (2001) 387–396.
- [31] J.J. Pignatello, E. Oliveros, A. MacKay, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36 (2006) 1–84.
- [32] F. Torrades, M. Pérez, H.D. Mansilla, J. Peral, *Chemosphere* 53 (2003) 1211–1220.
- [33] J.D. Spikes, In: K.C. Smith (Ed.), *The Science of Photobiology*, Plenum Press, New York and London, 1989, pp. 79–110.
- [34] M. Canterino, I. Di Somma, R. Marotta, R. Andreozzi, V. Caprio, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 210 (2010) 69–76.
- [35] M.C. De Rosa, R.J. Crutchley, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 233–234 (2002) 351–371.
- [36] D. Faust, K.H. Funken, G. Horneck, B. Milow, J. Ortnier, M. Sattlegger, M. Schäfer, C. Schmitz, *Solar Energy* 65 (1999) 71–74.
- [37] M. Mrowetz, W. Balcerski, A.J. Colussi, M.R. Hoffmann, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 108 (2004) 17269–17273.
- [38] M.N. Chong, B. Jin, C.W.K. Chow, C. Saint, *Water Res.* 44 (2010) 2997–3027.
- [39] K. Rajeshwar, M.E. Osugi, W. Chanmanee, C.R. Chenthamarakshan, M.V.B. Zanoni, P. Kajitvichyanukul, R. Krishnan-Ayer, J. Photochem. Photobiol. C: Photochem. Rev. 9 (2008) 171–192.
- [40] M. Kitano, M. Matsuoka, M. Ueshima, M. Anpo, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* 325 (2007) 1–14.
- [41] O. Carp, C.L. Huisman, A. Relle, *Prog. Solid State Chem.* 32 (2004) 33–177.
- [42] M.R. Hoffmann, S.T. Martin, W. Choi, D.W. Bahnemann, *Chem. Rev.* 95 (1995) 69–96.
- [43] A.L. Linsebigler, G. Lu, J.T. Yates, *Chem. Rev.* 95 (1995) 735–758.
- [44] M.A. Fox, M.T. Dulay, *Chem. Rev.* 93 (1993) 341–350.
- [45] U.I. Gaya, A.H. Abdullah, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. C: Photochem. Rev.* 9 (2008) 1–12.
- [46] M. Ni, M.K.H. Leung, D.Y.C. Leung, K. Sumathy, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 11 (2007) 401–425.
- [47] K. Demeestere, J. Dewulf, H. Van Langenhove, *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 37 (2007) 489–538.
- [48] M. Matsuoka, M. Kitano, M. Takeuchi, K. Tsujimaru, M. Anpo, J.M. Thomas, *Catal. Today* 122 (2007) 51–61.
- [49] R. Vinu, D.G. Madras, *J. Indian Inst. Sci.* 90 (2010) 189–230.
- [50] A. Fujishima, K. Hashimoto, T. Watanabe, *TiO<sub>2</sub> Photocatalysis: Fundamentals and Applications*, BKC Inc., Tokyo, 1999.
- [51] D. Li, H. Huang, X. Chen, Z. Chen, W. Li, D. Ye, X. Fu, *J. Solid State Chem.* 180 (2007) 2630–2634.
- [52] V. Augugliaro, M. Litter, L. Palmisano, J. Soria, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. C: Photochem. Rev.* 7 (2007) 123–144.
- [53] A.O. Ibhadon, P. Fitzpatrick, *Catalysts* 3 (2013) 189–218.
- [54] K. Cendrowski, X. Chen, B. Zielinska, R.J. Kalenczuk, M.H. Rummeli, B. Buchner, R. Klingeler, E. Borowiak-Palen, J. Nanopart. Res. 13 (2011) 5899–5908.
- [55] M.A. Lazar, S. Varghese, S.S. Nair, *Catalysts* 2 (2012) 572–601.
- [56] D.W. Banhemann, *Res. Chem. Intermed.* 26 (2000) 207–220.
- [57] H. Ibrahim, H. De Lasa, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 58 (2003) 943–949.
- [58] R. Wang, K. Hashimoto, A. Fujishima, M. Chikuni, E. Kojima, A. Kitamura, M. Shimohigoshi, T. Watanabe, *Adv. Mater.* 10 (1998) 135–138.
- [59] K.H. Funken, F.J. Muller, J. Ortnier, K. Jurgen, R.C. Sattler, *Energy* 24 (1999) 681–687; K.H. Funken, *Technol. Lab.* 40 (1992) 793–800.
- [60] J. Chen, C. Poon, *Build. Environ.* 44 (2009) 1899–1906.
- [61] A. Fujishima, T.N. Rao, D.A. Tryk, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. C: Photochem. Rev.* 1 (2000) 1–21.
- [62] A. Fujishima, X. Zhang, D.A. Tryk, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* 63 (2008) 515–582.
- [63] M. Stamate, G. Lazar, *Rom. Technol. Sci. Acad.* 3 (2007) 280–285.
- [64] X. Zhao, Q. Zhao, J. Yu, B. Liu, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* 354 (2008) 1424–1430.
- [65] A. Mills, A. Lepre, N. Elliot, S. Bhopal, I.P. Parkin, S.A. O'Neill, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 160 (2003) 213–224.
- [66] I.P. Parkin, R.G. Palgrave, *J. Mater. Chem.* 15 (2005) 1689–1695.
- [67] A. Fujishima, X.T. Zhang, C.R. Chim. 9 (2006) 750–760.
- [68] C.L. Bai, *Science* 309 (2005) 61–63.
- [69] A.M. Ramirez, K. Demeestere, N. De Belie, T. Mantyla, E. Levanen, *Build. Environ.* 45 (2010) 832–838.
- [70] S. Guo, Z.B. Wu, W.R. Zhao, *Chin. Sci. Bull.* 54 (2009) 1137–1142.
- [71] E. Puzenat, *Eur. Phys. J. Conf.* 1 (2009) 69–74.
- [72] L. Cassar, C. Pepe, G. Tognon, G.L. Guerrini, R. Amadelli, *Proceeding 11th International Congress on the Chemistry of Cement. The Cement and Concrete Institute of South Africa, Durban*, 2003, pp. 2012–2021.
- [73] G.L. Guerrini, A. Plassais, C. Pepe, L. Cassar, in: L. Cassar, P. Baglioni (Eds.), *Proceedings of Int. RILEM Symposium on Photocatalysis 'Environment and Construction Materials*, Florence, Italy, 2007, pp. 219–226.
- [74] T.X. Italcementi, *Millennium Photocatalytic Binders* (Technical Report), Italcementi, Italy, 2005.
- [75] L. Cassar, *Mater. Bull.* 29 (2004) 328–331.
- [76] G. Bolte, *Nanotechnol. Constr.* 3 (2009) 55–61.
- [77] B. Ruot, A. Plassais, F. Olive, L. Guillot, L. Bonafous, *Solar Energy* 83 (2009) 1794–1801.
- [78] N.S. Allen, M. Edge, J. Verran, J. Stratton, J. Maltby, C. Bygott, *Polym. Degrad. Stab.* 93 (2008) 1632–1646.
- [79] M.M. Hassan, H. Dylla, L.N. Mohammad, T. Rupnow, *Constr. Build. Mater.* 24 (2010) 1456–1461.
- [80] C.J. Churchill, D.K. Panesar, *Structure and infrastructure engineering: maintenance management, Life-Cycle Des. Perform.* 9 (2013) 983–998.
- [81] M. Anpo, P.V. Kamat, *Environmentally Benign Photocatalysts: Applications of Titanium Oxide-Based Materials*, Springer, Ottawa, Canada, 2010.
- [82] N.S. Allen, M. Edge, A. Ortega, G. Sandoval, C.M. Liauw, J. Verran, J. Stratton, R.B. McIntyr, *Polym. Degrad. Stab.* 85 (2004) 927–946.
- [83] T. Yuranova, D. Laub, J. Kiwi Synthesis, *Catal. Today* 122 (2007) 109–117.
- [84] T. Kallio, S. Alajoki, V. Pore, M. Ritala, J. Laine, M. Leskelä, P. Stenius, *Colloids Surf. A: Phys. Eng. Asp.* 291 (2006) 162–176.
- [85] M. Chen, Y. Liu, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 174 (2010) 375–379.
- [86] R. Hela, P. Novosad, J. Valek, J. Prikryl, M. Holak, *Proc. Eng. Concr. Struct.* 65 (2013) 20–24.
- [87] H. Dylla, M.M. Hassan, M. Schmitt, T. Rupnow, L.N. Mohammad, E. Wright, *J. Transp. Res. Board* 2240 (2011) 22–29.
- [88] R. Cucitore, S. Cangiano, L. Cassar, *High durability photocatalytic paving for reducing urban polluting agent*, WO Patent 565, 2006.
- [89] Y. Murata, H. Tawara, H. Obata, K. Murata, *NOX-cleaning paving block*, European Patent 786283, 2003.
- [90] L. Cassar, P. Carmine, *Hydraulic binder and cement compositions containing photocatalyst particles*, USA Patent 6409821, 2002.
- [91] L. Cassar, C. Pepe, *Paving tile comprising an hydraulic binder and photocatalyst particles*, European patent 1600430A1, 1997.
- [92] A. Folli, I. Pochard, A. Nonat, U.H. Jakobsen, A.M. Shepherd, D.E. Macphree, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 93 (2010) 3360–3369.
- [93] F. Pacheco-Torgal, S. Jalali, *Constr. Build. Mater.* 25 (2011) 582–590.
- [94] N.S. Allen, M. Edge, G. Sandoval, J. Verran, J. Stratton, J. Maltby, *Photochem. Photobiol.* 81 (2005) 279–290.
- [95] L. Frazer, *Environ. Health Perspect.* 109 (2001) A174–A177.
- [96] H. Hamada, K. Komure, R. Takahashi, T. Yamaji, *RILEM International Symposium on Environment-Consious Materials and Systems for Sustainable Development*, Koriyama, Japan, 2004, pp. 361–366.
- [97] D.H. Chen, K. Li, R. Yuan, A. Green, *Photocatalytic Coating on Road Pavements/Structures for NO<sub>x</sub> Abatement*. Annual Project Report, Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas, 2005.

- [98] E. Peccati, G.L. Guerrini, Photocatalytic cementitious roads for de-pollution, in: L. Cassar, P. Baglioni (Eds.), Proceedings of Int. RILEM Symposium on Photocatalysis 'Environment and Construction Materials', Florence Italy, 2007, pp. 179–186.
- [99] L. Venturini, M. Bacchi, II International Conference Environmentally Friendly Roads ENVIROAD, Warsaw, Poland, 2009.
- [100] H. Taoda, *Synthesiology* 1 (2008) 287–295.
- [101] R. Volkamer, U. Platt, K. Wirtz, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 105 (2001) 7865–7874.
- [102] M.G. Vivanco, M. Santiago, A.M. Tarifa, E. Borrás, M. Ródenas, C. García-Diego, M. Sánchez, *Atmos. Environ.* 45 (2011) 708–715.
- [103] B. Zielinska, J. Sagebiel, W. Stockwell, J. McDonald, J. Seagrave, P. Wiesen, K. Wirtz, in: I. Barnes, K. Rudzinski (Eds.), *Environmental Simulation Chambers: Application to Atmospheric Chemical Processes*, Springer, Netherlands, 2006, pp. 279–284.
- [104] S. Hata, Y. Kai, I. Yamanaka, H. Oosaki, K. Hirota, S. Yamazaki, *JSAE Rev.* 21 (2000) 97–102.
- [105] A. Huang, H. Su, *J. Environ. Eng.* 5 (2011) 477–480.
- [106] J. Luo, Y. Xu, W. Zeng, *Paint Coat Ind.* 41 (2011) 52–55.
- [107] J. Li, X. Tan, L. Zhao, *Synth. Mater. Ag. Appl.* 34 (2005) 44–47.
- [108] M. Machida, W.K. Norimoto, T. Kimura, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 88 (2005) 95–100.
- [109] M. Lilja, J. Forsgren, K. Welch, M. Åstrand, H. Engqvist, M. Strømme, *Biotechnol. Lett.* 34 (2012) 2299–2305.
- [110] L. Hochmannova, J. Vytrasova, *Prog. Org. Coat.* 67 (2010) 1–5.
- [111] J. Zhang, S. Li, L. Chen, Y. Pan, S. Yang, *IOSR J. Eng.* 2 (2012) 50–53.
- [112] N. Keller, M.N. Ducamp, D. Robert, V. Keller, *Chem. Rev.* 113 (2013) 5029–5070.
- [113] M.E. Zorn, D.T. Tompkins, W.A. Zeltner, M.A. Anderson, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 34 (2000) 5206–5210.
- [114] A. Sirisuk, C.G. Hill, M.A. Anderson, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 159–164.
- [115] M.E. Zorn, Proceedings of the 13th Annual Wisconsin Space Conference, Wisconsin Space Grant Consortium, Green Bay WI, 2003.
- [116] A. Zapata, I. Oller, E. Bizani, J.A. Sanchez-Perez, M.I. Maldonado, S. Malato, *Catal. Today* 144 (2009) 94–99.
- [117] J. Blanco, S. Malato, P. Fernández, A. Vidal, A. Morales, J.C. Trincado, J.C. Oliveira, C. Minero, M. Musci, C. Casalle, M. Brunotte, S. Tratzky, N. Dischinger, K.H. Funken, C. Sattler, M. Vincent, M. Collares-Pereira, J.F. Mendes, C.M. Rangel, *Solar Energy* 67 (2000) 317–330.
- [118] E. Watzke, T.H. Kloss, Borosilicatglas mit hoher transmission im UV-Bereich, niedriger Warmedehnung und hoher chemischer Beständigkeit, Verfahren zu seiner Herstellung und seiner Verwendung, Patent DE4338128C1, 1994.
- [119] R.L. Pozzo, J.L. Giombi, M.A. Baltanás, A.E. Cassano, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 38 (2002) 61–69.
- [120] P. Pichat, M. Lu, *Photocatalysis and Water Purification: From Fundamentals to Recent Applications*, Wiley-VCH, 2013, 2015.
- [121] B. Serrano, H. De Lasa, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 36 (1997) 4705–4711.
- [122] A.H. Geeraerd, V.P. Valdramidis, J.F. Van Impe, *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 102 (2005) 95–105.
- [123] D.M.A. Alrousan, M.I. Polo-Lopez, P.S.M. Dunlop, P. Fernandez-Ibanez, J.A. Byrne, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 128 (2012) 126–134.
- [124] R.J. Braham, A.T. Harris, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 48 (2009) 8890–8905.
- [125] S. Malato, J. Blanco, M.I. Maldonado, P. Fernandez, D. Alarcon, M. Collares, J. Farinha, J. Correia, *Solar Energy* 77 (2004) 513–524.
- [126] A. Fernandez-Garcia, E. Zarza, L. Valenzuela, M. Perez, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 14 (2010) 1695–1721.
- [127] O. Alfano, D. Bahnemann, A. Cassano, R. Dillert, R. Goslich, *Catal. Today* 58 (2000) 199–230.
- [128] M. Paulescu, E. Paulescu, P. Gravila, V. Badescu, *Weather Modeling and Forecasting of PV Systems Operation*, Springer Science & Business Media, UK, 2012.
- [129] J.V. Anderson, H. Link, M. Bohn, B. Gupta, *Solar Energy Mater.* 24 (1991) 538–549.
- [130] C. Jung, K.H. Funken, J. Ortner, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.* 4 (2005) 409–411.
- [131] M. Oelgemoller, C. Jung, J. Ortner, J. Mattay, E. Zimmermann, *Green Chem.* 7 (2005) 35–38.
- [132] N. Monnerie, J. Ortner, *J. Solar Energy Eng.* 123 (2001) 171–174.
- [133] B. Pohlmann, H.D. Scharf, U. Jarolimek, P. Mauermann, *Solar Energy* 61 (1997) 159–168.
- [134] M. Oelgemoller, N. Healy, L. De Oliveira, C. Jung, J. Mattay, *Green Chem.* 8 (2006) 831–834.
- [135] C. Grundmann, *Synthesis* (1977) 644–645.
- [136] G. Oehme, B. Heller, P. Wagler, *Energy* 22 (1997) 327–336.
- [137] L. Brand, C.S. Ciesla, M. Werner, Observatory nano, briefing no. 10. Chemistry & materials, Appl. Photocatal. (2011).
- [138] C. Schiel, M. Oelgemoller, J. Ortner, J. Mattay, *Green Chem.* 3 (2001) 224–228.
- [139] M.S. Mehos, C.S. Turchi, *Environ. Prog.* 12 (1993) 194–199.
- [140] R. Dillert, A.E. Cassano, R. Goslich, D.W. Bahnemann, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 267–282.
- [141] R.J. Enzweiler, D.L. Mowery, L.M. Wagg, J.J. Dong, *Int. Solar Energy Conf.* (1994) 155–161.
- [142] G. Zayani, L. Bousselmi, F. Mhenni, A. Ghrabi, *Desalination* 246 (2009) 344–352.
- [143] C. Guillard, J. Disdier, C. Monnet, J. Dussaud, S. Malato, J. Blanco, M.I. Maldonado, J.M.
- [144] A.J. Feitz, B.H. Boyden, T.D. Waite, *Water Res.* 34 (2000) 3927–3932.
- [145] S.J. Khan, R.H. Reed, M.G. Rasul, *BMC Microbiol.* 12 (2012) 1–11.
- [146] L. Bousseimi, S.U. Geissen, H. Schroeder, *Water Sci. Technol.* 49 (2004) 331–337.
- [147] I.B.S. Will, J.E.F. Moraes, A.C.S. Teixeira, R. Guardani, C.A.O. Nascimento, *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 34 (2004) 51–57.
- [148] C. Heinemann, X. Xing, K.D. Warzecha, P. Ritterskamp, H. Gerner, M. Demuth, *Pure Appl. Chem.* 70 (1998) 2167–2176.
- [149] S. Malato, J. Blanco, C. Richter, D. Curcó, J. Gimenez, *Water Sci. Technol.* 35 (1997) 157–164.
- [150] S.A. Kalogirou, *Solar Energy Engineering: Processes Systems*, Academic Press, UK, 2014.
- [151] W. Gernjak, T. Krutzler, A. Glaser, S. Malato, J. Cáceres, R. Bauer, *Chemosphere* 50 (2003) 71–78.
- [152] J. Garcia-Montano, L. Perez-Estrada, I. Oller, M.I. Maldonado, F. Torrades, J. Peral, *Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 195 (2008) 205–214.
- [153] I. Oller, W. Gernjak, M.I. Maldonado, L.A. Perez-Estrada, J.A. Sanchez-Perez, S. Malato, J. Hazard. Mater. 138 (2006) 507–517.
- [154] S. Malato, J. Blanco, M.I. Maldonado, P. Fernández-Ibanez, W. Gernjak, I. Oller, *Chemosphere* 58 (2005) 391–398.
- [155] P. Fernandez, J. Blanco, C. Sichel, S. Malato, *Catal. Today* 101 (2005) 345–352.
- [156] S. Malato, J. Blanco, M.I. Maldonado, I. Oller, W. Gernjak, L. Pérez-Estrada, J. Hazard. Mater. 146 (2007) 440–446.
- [157] V. Sarria, S. Kenfack, O. Guillod, C. Pulgarin, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 159 (2003) 89–99.
- [158] T.F.C. Silva, M.E.F. Silva, A.C. Cunha-Queda, A. Fonseca, I. Saraiva, R.A.R. Boaventura, V.J.P. Vilar, *Chem. Eng. J.* 228 (2013) 850–866.
- [159] W. Gernjak, M.I. Maldonado, S. Malato, J. Cáceres, T. Krutzler, A. Glaser, R. Bauer, *Solar Energy* 77 (2004) 567–572.
- [160] M. Kositz, I. Poulos, S. Malato, J. Cáceres, A. Campos, *Water Res.* 38 (2004) 1147–1154.
- [161] A. Zapata, I. Oller, C. Sirtori, A. Rodríguez, J.A. Sánchez-Pérez, A. López, M. Mezcu, S. Malato, *Chem. Eng. J.* 160 (2010) 447–456.
- [162] S. Malato, J. Blanco, A. Vidal, P. Fernández, J. Cáceres, P. Trincado, J.C. Oliveira, M. Vincent, *Chemosphere* 47 (2002) 235–240.
- [163] I. Oller, S. Malato, J.A. Sánchez-Pérez, M.I. Maldonado, W. Gernjak, L.A. Pérez-Estrada, A. Muñoz, C. Ramos, C. Pulgarin, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 46 (2007) 7467–7475.
- [164] J. Blanco, S. Malato, P. Fernández, A. Vidal, A. Morales, P. Trincado, J.C. Oliveira, C. Minero, M. Musci, C. Casalle, M. Brunotte, S. Tratzky, N. Dischinger, K.H. Funken, C. Sattler, M. Vincent, M. Collares-Pereira, J.F. Mendes, C.M. Rangel, *Solar Energy* 67 (1999) 317–330.
- [165] D. Dondi, S. Protti, A. Albini, S. Mañas Carpio, M. Fagnoni, *Green Chem.* 11 (2009) 1653–1659.
- [166] S. Protti, M. Fagnoni, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.* 8 (2009) 1499–1516.
- [167] N. Enteria, A. Akbarzadeh, *Solar Energy Sciences and Engineering Applications*, CRC Press, UK, 2013.
- [168] H. Brown, A.W. Hewett, R. Gee, K. May, *Energy Eng.* 94 (1997) 33–44.
- [169] J.I. Ajona, A. Vidal, *Solar Energy* 68 (2000) 109–120.
- [170] J.R. Bolton, K.G. Bircher, W. Tumas, C.A. Tolman, *Pure Appl. Chem.* 73 (2001) 627–637.
- [171] E.R. Bandala, M.A. Pelaez, A.J. Garcia-Lopez, M.J. Salgado, G. Moeller, *Chem. Eng. Process.* 47 (2008) 169–176.
- [172] J.A. Martinez-Lozano, F. Tena, M.P. Utrillas, *Int. J. Climatol.* 19 (1999) 903–911.
- [173] A. Podstawczynska, *Int. J. Climatol.* 30 (2010) 1–10.
- [174] R. Bauer, G. Waldner, H. Fallmann, S. Hager, M. Klare, T. Krutzler, S. Malato, P. Maletzky, *Catal. Today* 53 (1999) 131–144.
- [175] G. Mailhot, M. Sarakha, B. Lavedrine, J. Cáceres, S. Malato, *Chemosphere* 49 (2002) 525–532.
- [176] E.R. Bandala, C. Estrada, *J. Solar Energy Eng.* 129 (2007) 22–26.
- [177] R. Marotta, D. Spasiano, I. Di Somma, R. Andreozzi, V. Caprio, *Chem. Eng. J.* 209 (2012) 69–78.
- [178] S. Protti, D. Ravelli, M. Fagnoni, A. Albini, *Chem. Commun.* 47 (2009) 7351–7353.

- [179] T. Caronna, C. Gambarotti, L. Palmisano, C. Punta, F. Recupero, *Photochem. Photobiol.* 171 (2005) 237–242.
- [180] R.A. Doohan, N.W.A. Geraghty, *Green Chem.* 7 (2005) 91–96.
- [181] L. Cermenati, C. Richter, A. Albini, *Chem. Commun.* (1998) 805–806.
- [182] J. Benites, D. Rios, P. Díaz, J.A. Valderrama, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 52 (2011) 609–611.
- [183] T. Caronna, C. Gambarotti, L. Palmisano, C. Punta, M. Pierini, F. Recupero, *Photochem. Photobiol. A* 189 (2007) 322–328.
- [184] M.A. McGuire, L.S. Hegedus, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 104 (1982) 5538–5540.
- [185] M.A. Ischay, M.E. Anzovino, J. Du, T.P. Yoon, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 130 (2008) 12886–12887.
- [186] A.G. Griesbeck, T.T. El-Idreesy, A. Bartoschek, *Appl. Chem.* 77 (2005) 1059–1074.
- [187] N. Hoffmann, *Chem. Rev.* 108 (2008) 1052–1103.
- [188] S. Marinkovic, C. Brule, N. Hoffmann, E. Prost, J.M. Nuzillard, V.J. Bulach, *J. Org. Chem.* 69 (2004) 1646–1651.
- [189] K. Takami, J. Yamamoto, K. Komeyama, T. Kawabata, K. Takeira, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* 77 (2004) 2251–2255.
- [190] A. Itoh, S. Hashimoto, K. Kuwabara, T. Kodama, Y. Masaki, *Green Chem.* 7 (2005) 830–832.
- [191] E. Haggiage, E.E. Coyle, K. Joyce, M. Oelgemoller, *Green Chem.* 11 (2009) 318–321.
- [192] D.T. Santos, J.Q. Albarelli, K. Joyce, M. Oelgemoller, *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.* 84 (2009) 1026–1030.
- [193] K. Sivarajani, C.S. Gopinath, *J. Mater. Chem.* 21 (2011) 2639–2647.
- [194] K. Wiesner, J.G. McCluskey, J.K. Chang, V. Smula, *Can. J. Chem.* 49 (1971) 1092–1098.
- [195] Y.P. Zhao, R.O. Campbell, R.S.H. Liu, *Green Chem.* 10 (2008) 1038–1042.
- [196] Y. Zhao, L. Yang, R.S.H. Liu, *Green Chem.* 11 (2009) 837–842.
- [197] T. Caronna, C. Gambarotti, A. Mele, M. Pierini, C. Punta, F. Recupero, *Res. Chem. Intermed.* 33 (2007) 311–317.
- [198] D. Elad, J. Rokach, *J. Chem. Soc.* (1965) 800–802.
- [199] D. Elad, J. Rokach, *J. Org. Chem.* 30 (1965) 3361–3364.
- [200] Y. Pan, C.W. Kee, L. Chen, C.H. Tan, *Green Chem.* 13 (2011) 2682–2685.
- [201] A. García-Ripoll, A. Arques, R. Vicente, A. Domenech, A.M. Amat, *Solar Energy Eng.* 130 (2008) 41011/1–41011/5.
- [202] N. Miranda-García, S. Suárez, B. Sánchez, J.M. Coronado, S. Malato, M.I. Maldonado, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 103 (2011) 294–301.
- [203] J.M. Herrmann, J. Disdier, P. Pichat, S. Malato, J. Blanco, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 17 (1998) 15–23.
- [204] J.H.O.S. Pereira, V.J.P. Vilar, M.T. Borges, O. Gonzalez, S. Esplugas, R.A.R. Boaventura, *Solar Energy* 85 (2011) 2732–2740.
- [205] E. Remoundaki, R. Vidali, P. Kousi, A. Hatzikioseyan, M. Tsezo, *Desalination* 248 (2009) 843–851.
- [206] F. Correia, V. Goetz, G. Plantard, D. Sacco, *J. Solar Energy Eng.* 133 (2011) 31002/1–31002/5.
- [207] S. Malato, J. Caceres, A. Agüera, M. Mezcuca, D. Hernando, J. Vial, A.R. Fernandez-Anda, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 35 (2001) 4359–4366.
- [208] R. Krutzler, H. Fallmann, P. Maletzky, R. Bauer, S. Malato, J. Blanco, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 321–327.
- [209] M.S. Lucas, R. Mosteo, M.I. Maldonado, S. Malato, J.A. Peres, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 57 (2009) 11242–11248.
- [210] E. Ubomba-Jaswa, C. Navntoft, I. Polo-López, P. Fernández-Ibáñez, K.G. McGuigan, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.* 8 (2009) 587–595.
- [211] C. Sichel, J.C. Tello, M. De Cara, P. Fernández-Ibáñez, *Catal. Today* 129 (2007) 152–160.
- [212] M.I. Polo-López, P. Fernández-Ibáñez, E. Ubomba-Jaswa, C. Navntoft, I. Garcia-Fernandez, P.S.M. Dunlop, M. Schmidt, J.A. Byrne, K.G. McGuigan, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 196 (2011) 16–21.
- [213] E. Ubomba-Jaswa, P. Fernández-Ibáñez, C. Navntoft, M.I. Polo-López, K.G. McGuigan, *J. Chem. Technol. Biotech.* 85 (2010) 1028–1037.
- [214] C.S.D. Rodrigues, L.M. Madeira, R.A.R. Boaventura, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 52 (2013) 13313–13324.
- [215] D. Weinstock, J. Appelbaum, *J. Solar Energy Eng.* 126 (2004) 898–905.
- [216] P.R. Gogate, A.B. Pandit, *AIChE J.* 50 (2004) 1051–1079.
- [217] A.M.T. Silva, E. Nouli, N.P. Xekoukoulotakis, D. Mantzavinos, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 73 (2007) 11–22.
- [218] V.K. Pareek, A.A. Adesina, in: H.S. Nalwa (Ed.), *Handbook of Photochemistry and Photobiology*, Vol. 1, American Scientific Publishers, Stevenson Ranch, 2003, pp. 345–412.
- [219] A.E. Cassano, O.M. Alfano, *Catal. Today* 58 (2000) 167–197.
- [220] R.L. Romero, O.M. Alfano, A.E. Cassano, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 36 (1997) 3094–3109.
- [221] M.I. Cabrera, O.M. Alfano, A.E. Cassano, *J. Phys. Chem.* 100 (1996) 20043–20050.
- [222] P. Fernandez-Ibanez, S. Malato, F.J. De Las Nieves, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 195–204.
- [223] C. Guillard, J. Disdier, J.M. Herrmann, C. Lehaut, T. Chopin, S. Malato, J. Blanco, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 217–228.
- [224] J. Jimenez, D. Curco, M.A. Queral, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 229–244.
- [225] G. Camera-Roda, F. Santarelli, *Catal. Today* 129 (2007) 161–168.
- [226] D. Chen, F. Li, A.K. Ray, *AIChE* 46 (2000) 1034–1045.
- [227] J. Ryu, W. Cho, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 42 (2008) 294–300.
- [228] A.G. Agrios, P. Pichat, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A* 180 (2006) 130–135.
- [229] D. Hufschmidt, D. Bahnmann, J.J. Testa, C.A. Emilio, M.I. Litter, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A* 148 (2002) 223–231.
- [230] H. Fallmann, T. Krutzler, R. Bauer, S. Malato, J. Blanco, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 309–319.
- [231] C.S. Zalazar, C.A. Martin, A.E. Cassano, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 60 (2005) 4311–4322.
- [232] D.D. Dionysiou, A.A. Burbano, M.T. Suidan, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36 (2002) 3834–3843.
- [233] A. Piscopo, D. Robert, J.V. Weber, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 35 (2001) 117–124.
- [234] K.H. Wang, Y.H. Hsieh, M.Y. Chou, C.Y. Chang, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 21 (1999) 1–8.
- [235] I.K. Konstantinou, T.A. Albanis, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 49 (2004) 1–14.
- [236] M. Kosmulski, *J. Colloids Interface Sci.* 353 (2011) 1–15.
- [237] G.A. Parks, *Chem. Rev.* 65 (1965) 177–198.
- [238] Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, P. Westerhoff, K. Hristovski, J.C. Crittenden, *Water Res.* 42 (2008) 2204–2212.
- [239] M.L. Machesky, D.J. Wesolowski, D.A. Palmer, K. Ichiro-Hayashi, *J. Colloids Interface Sci.* 200 (1998) 298–309.
- [240] K. Nagaveni, M.S. Hegde, N. Ravishanker, G.N. Subbanna, G. Madras, *Langmuir* 20 (2004) 2900–2907.
- [241] T. Hathway, W.S. Jenks, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 200 (2008) 216–224.
- [242] I. Christl, R. Kretzschmar, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 63 (1999) 2929–2938.
- [243] C. Tso, C. Zhung, Y. Shih, Y.M. Tseng, S. Wu, R. Doong, *Water Sci. Technol.* 61 (2010) 127–133.
- [244] V. Augugliaro, C. Baiocchi, A.B. Prevot, E. García-López, V. Loddó, S. Malato, G. Marci, L. Palmisano, M. Pazzi, E. Pramauro, *Chemosphere* 49 (2002) 1223–1230.
- [245] H. Lachheb, E. Puzenat, A. Houas, M. Ksibi, E. Elaloui, C. Guillard, J.M. Herrmann, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 39 (2002) 75–90.
- [246] Y. Xu, C.H. Langford, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 133 (2000) 67–71.
- [247] A.A. Bilgin, J. Silverstein, M. Hernandez, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39 (2005) 7826–7832.
- [248] M.S. Lucas, J.A. Peres, *Dyes Pigm.* 71 (2006) 236–244.
- [249] M.I. Badawy, M.Y. Ghaly, T.A. Gad-Allah, *Desalination* 194 (2006) 166–175.
- [250] B.G. Kwon, D.S. Lee, N. Kang, J. Yoon, *Water Res.* 33 (1999) 2110–2118.
- [251] L. Prieto-Rodríguez, D. Spasiano, I. Oller, I. Fernández-Calderero, A. Agüera, S. Malato, *Catal. Today* 209 (2013) 188–194.
- [252] H. Krýsová, J. Jirkovský, J. Krýsa, G. Mailhot, M. Bolte, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 40 (2003) 1–12.
- [253] M. Kositz, I. Poullos, K. Samara, E. Tsatsaroni, E. Darakas, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 146 (2007) 680–685.
- [254] H. Al-Ekabi, P. Mayo, *J. Phys. Chem.* 89 (1985) 5815–5821.
- [255] S. Mozia, M. Tomaszewska, A.W. Morawski, *Desalination* 185 (2005) 449–456.
- [256] J.M. Herrmann, *Top. Catal.* 34 (2005) 49–65.
- [257] G. Ciamician, *Science* 36 (1912) 385–394.