INTENSIFICATION OF UV-C TREATMENT TO REMOVE EMERGING CONTAMINANTS BY UV-C/H₂O₂ AND UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻: SUSCEPTIBILITY TO PHOTOLYSIS AND INVESTIGATION OF ACUTE TOXICITY

Maria Clara V.M. Starling^{1,2}, Patterson P. Souza³, Annaïg Le Person², Camila C. Amorim^{1*}, Justine Criquet²

(1) Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Environmental Applications of Advanced Oxidation Processes, 31270-901, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

(2) Université de Lille CNRS, UMR 8516 – LASIR, Equipe Physico-Chimie de l'Environnement F-59000 Lille, France

(3) Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Chemistry Department, 30421-169, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil

*Corresponding author: camila@desa.ufmg.br. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Av. Presidente Antônio Carlos 6627, 31270-901, Belo Horizonte, Brazil. Telephone: +55 31 3409-3677, Fax: +55 31 4409-1879.

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT

In this study, the degradation of four emerging contaminants (losartan potassium (LP), furosemide (FRSM), caffeine (CAF), and carbendazim (CBZ) under UV-C, UV-C/H₂O₂, and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ was investigated. A comparative evaluation of the efficiency of UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ in the degradation of these target CECs has not yet been reported. Moreover, target compounds were submitted to UV-C/AOPs individually in pure water and their simultaneous degradation was investigated in real surface water. Evolution of the acute toxicity of each compound during treatment was evaluated using *Alivibrio fischeri*. Quantum yields were determined for LP (0.011 to 0.016), FRSM (0.024 to 0.092), CAF (0.0007 to 0.0009), and CBZ (0.0016 to 0.0036) at different pH values. UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ achieved more than 98% removal of all compounds within 600 mJ cm⁻², and pseudo-first-order kinetic constants (k'_{app}) for the

degradation reactions were up to seven times higher in the presence of these oxidants when compared to k'_{app} values obtained for UV-C photolysis. k'_{app} measured for UV-C/H₂O₂ were higher than those calculated for UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ except in the case of LP. Acute toxicity analysis suggested the formation of toxic intermediates during the UV-C photolysis of LP and FRSM, and the degradation of LP via UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ also enhanced acute toxicity although electric energy efficiency per order identified UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ as the most efficient process for the removal of this compound. Finally, different transformation products obtained during the degradation of caffeine under the different UV-C AOPs suggested that distinct degradation routes were involved in each treatment tested.

Keywords: advanced oxidation processes, persulfate, UV-C process, quantum yield, contaminants of emerging concern

1. Introduction

After the scientific community raised awareness regarding the presence of contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) in different water resources (i.e. drinking water, groundwater, surface water, and wastewater) these compounds have been intensively studied over the past two decades. Therefore, many technologies have been developed for the removal of CECs from these matrices.

Advanced oxidation processes (AOPs) have proven to be effective methods for the degradation of CECs [1]. AOPs incorporating UV-C irradiation (UV-C AOPs) are attractive alternatives within this category [2, 3], because the UV-C reactors already being used worldwide in water and wastewater treatment plants could be easily adapted for these processes [4].

Photoperoxidation (UV-C/H₂O₂) is one of the most disseminated AOPs [5], wherein H₂O₂ undergoes UV-C photolysis ($\lambda=254$ nm) and is cleaved into two hydroxyl radicals (HO•) [6]. HO• presents a high redox potential ($E^0= 1.8\text{--}2.7$ V), thus being highly reactive and non-selective [7]. In addition, the UV-C/H₂O₂ process does not require pH adjustment, simplifying operational requirements in comparison to those involved in other AOPs such as Fenton and photo-Fenton [8, 9].

Most of the studies using UV-C/H₂O₂ to remove CECs from water have used pure solutions of target compounds in synthetic matrices [6, 10-12]. Meanwhile, in real matrices containing natural organic matter (NOM), inorganic ions (HCO₃⁻, Cl⁻, NO₃⁻, and SO₄²⁻), and dissolved oxygen (DO), UV-C/H₂O₂ reactions may be disturbed due to quenching of HO• [13], thus reducing the process efficiency. There has,

thus, been increased interest in alternative systems that employ strongly reactive yet selective radicals, such as the sulfate radical ($\text{SO}_4^{\cdot-}$) [14].

In irradiated systems, $\text{SO}_4^{\cdot-}$ ($E^0 = 2.55\text{--}3.1\text{ V}$) is formed when persulfate (PS, $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$) or peroxymonosulfate (PMS, SO_5^{2-}) are cleaved under UV-C (254 nm) irradiation [15]. $\text{SO}_4^{\cdot-}$ reacts primarily via an electron transfer mechanism, and is, thus, more selective and resistant than $\text{HO}^{\cdot}$ in the presence of matrix constituents such as NOM and inorganic ions [16]. In addition, $\text{SO}_4^{\cdot-}$ is not as easily influenced by carbonate ions (HCO_3^-) due to the lower rate constant of the reaction between $\text{SO}_4^{\cdot-}$ and HCO_3^- ($2.6\text{ to }9.1 \times 10^6\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}$) compared to that of the reaction between $\text{HO}^{\cdot}$ and HCO_3^- ($10^7\text{ M}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1}$) [6, 14, 17-20]. The removal of CECs via UV-C/ H_2O_2 and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ varies according to the chemical structure of the compound involved and as a consequence of the different reaction mechanisms promoted by each radical [2, 21, 22].

Toxic intermediates may be generated during UV-C AOPs [23], and appropriate treatment conditions for the simple removal of target compounds may not effectively eliminate their toxic effects [24]. Therefore, it is essential to follow the evolution of the toxicity of compounds during their treatment by UV-C AOPs in order to comprehensively understand treatment efficiency [25], especially with regard to UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$, for which only a few studies have investigated toxicity evolution [26, 27]. In addition, since in industrial applications these advanced treatments would not be utilized to achieve complete mineralization of CECs, it is necessary to investigate the evolution of toxicity resulting from the degradation of various harmful CECs present in environmental samples, as well as to identify any intermediates and/or byproducts of their degradation processes.

Considering the vast diversity of emerging contaminants present in surface water, four CECs were chosen as representative compounds for different classes of contaminants because of their environmental relevance as they have been increasingly consumed and consequently detected in surface water worldwide. Losartan potassium (LP) and furosemide (FRSM) represent pharmaceutical drugs. These compounds are widely prescribed to hypertensive patients worldwide and have been detected in environmental matrices in various locations [28-33], especially in developing countries where sanitary conditions are inadequate [34]. Caffeine (CAF) was chosen due to its regular occurrence in surface water and drinking water resources, for which it was recently proposed as an urban pollution tracer [35-37]. The fungicide carbendazim (CBZ), which has been detected in surface water around the world and is known for its toxicity, represents the diverse group of agrochemicals [36, 38, 39].

In this context, the goals of this study were to assess the susceptibility LP, FRSM, CAF and CBZ to UV-C photolysis; to evaluate the performance of UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ and UV-C/H₂O₂ in the degradation of each target compound individually in pure water as well as that of the four compounds in conjunction in pure water and real surface water; and to investigate the impact of each UV-C AOP on acute toxicity.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Determination of quantum yields

LP, FRSM, CAF, and CBZ were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Table S1 (Supplementary Material) shows the chemical structures and some physicochemical properties of each of the four CECs. Figure S1 shows the UV-Vis absorption spectra of the CECs at the natural pH of each solution.

Experiments for the determination of quantum yields (Φ) were conducted in a UV-C bench reactor (volume 0.0035 L, pathway length 1 cm²) equipped with a low-pressure mercury-xenon lamp (LightningCure LC8, Hamamatsu City, Japan) under constant agitation by using a magnetic stirrer. Lamp intensity (I_0) was determined prior to experiments using H₂O₂ ($I_0 = 2.54 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) and atrazine ($I_0 = 2.14 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) as actinometers [40, 41]. A UV filter (254 nm; Semrock MaxLamp) was placed at the light source. Initial concentrations of LP, FRSM, CAF, and CBZ were 2.2, 3.0, 5.2, and 5.5 μM , respectively. Quantum yields were calculated by quantifying the decay of each compound when exposed to light at pH = 3.0, the natural pH of the solution (6.0 for LP, 5.5 for FRSM, 5.8 for CAF, and 7.1 for CBZ), and at pH = 9. The pH was adjusted using 0.01 M HCl or 0.01 M NaOH solutions.

The photolysis coefficient (C_p) was calculated for each of the target compounds. C_p is defined as the product of the quantum yield ($\Phi_{254\text{nm}}$) and the molar attenuation coefficient ($\epsilon_{254\text{nm}}$) of a substance, and can be calculated according to Equations 1 and 2 [4]:

$$k_d = (\Phi_{254\text{nm}} \times \epsilon_{254\text{nm}} \times 2302)/U = (C_p \times 2302/U) \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

$$C_p = (k_d \times U)/2302 \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

where k_d is the fluence-based pseudo-first-order rate constant (units J⁻¹ cm⁻²), U is the energy per mole of photons at 254 nm ($4.72 \times 10^5 \text{ J Einstein}^{-1}$), and 2302 is a factor used for unit conversion purposes (base 10 to base e, and mJ to J).

2.2 High-Performance Liquid Chromatography analyses

A liquid chromatograph equipped with a UV detector (Agilent 1260 Infinity II

series, UV and diode array detector equipped with a 60 mm high-sensitivity cell) was used for the quantification of CECs. The separation was performed on C₁₈ columns (Poroshell 120 EC-C18 (3 x 50 mm, internal diameter 2.7 μ m) followed by Poroshell HPH-C18 (4.6 x 150 mm, internal diameter 2.7 μ m) at a flow rate of 0.5 mL min⁻¹. Ultra-pure water (40%) and MeOH (60%; MERCK HPLC grade, 98% purity), both containing 0.1% formic acid (SIGMA-ALDRICH HPLC grade, 98% purity), was used as the mobile phase for LP and FRSM, adapting previously described procedures [42]. Both LP and FRSM were monitored at λ =240 nm. Methods adapted from those described by the USA Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) [43, 44] were used for the quantification of CAF (MeOH/H₂O 30/70 (v/v), 273 nm) and CBZ (MeOH/H₂O 50/50 (v/v); 285 nm).

2.3 Degradation of target compounds by UV-C AOP

UV-C, UV-C/H₂O₂, and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ treatments were performed in a 2 L cylindrical bench photo-reactor equipped with a low-pressure mercury vapor lamp emitting monochromatic radiation at 253.7 nm (Heraeus GPH212T5L/4, 10 W) in the axial position. The optical pathway (1.7 cm) was calculated according to the method developed by Beltran et al. (1995) [45]. Incident photonic flux (I_0) was determined via actinometry experiments using H₂O₂ and atrazine as actinometers [40, 41], the results of which indicated an I_0 of 2.41 J m⁻² s⁻¹. The reactor was coupled to a cooling system, and temperature was kept constant at 20 °C during reactions.

The UV-C lamp was pre-heated for 20 minutes before each reaction. Once the solution temperature was stabilized at 20 °C, H₂O₂ (commercial grade, 39%) or sodium persulfate (Na₂SO₈, Aldrich) were added to the solution at a concentration

of 10^{-3} M (molar ratio of H_2O_2 or $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$: target substance 20:1 for CAF, LP, and FRSM, and 32:1 for CBZ). Samples were withdrawn during the reactions for quantification of the target compounds using HPLC, total organic carbon (TOC; TOC-VCSH Total Carbon Analyzer, Shimadzu), and residual H_2O_2 or persulfate, according to previously described procedures [46]. All conditions were tested in duplicate, and the pH was monitored during reactions.

In order to assess the influence of natural scavengers, namely inorganic ions (HCO_3^- , NO_3^- , PO_4^{3-}) and NOM, on the degradation of CECs via UV-C, UV-C/ H_2O_2 , and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$, reactions were performed in surface water and ultra-pure water each containing all four target compounds. Both matrices were spiked with a solution containing a mix of the four compounds such that the final concentration of each compound was 10 μM (total CEC_0 concentration = 40 μM). The surface water (SW) used in these experiments was sampled from the Lys River at Aire sur la Lys, France.

2.4 Acute toxicity assays

Acute toxicity analyses were performed using the Microtox® method (Model 500 Analyzer SDI) (ISO 11348-3:2007) on samples withdrawn during UV-C photolysis and the UV-C AOP processes performed in the UV-C reactor, as described previously [47]. *Allivibrio fischeri* was exposed to samples diluted to different degrees, luminescence was measured after 5, 15, and 30 min of exposure, and relative inhibition (EC_{50} , %) was obtained and converted to acute toxicity units (a.T.u.; = $100/\text{EC}_{50}$). According to the method employed, samples were considered toxic when the a.T.u. value was above 1.2 ($\text{EC}_{50} > 81.9\%$). Catalase (Synth®, 460 mg L^{-1} in 0.04 M phosphate buffer) and ascorbic acid (Merck, 440

mg L⁻¹) solutions were used as quenching agents for the consumption of residual hydrogen peroxide and persulfate present in the samples, respectively [48, 49]. Neither of these reagents are toxic to *Allivibrio fischeri*, as previously reported [49] and as confirmed experimentally by blank tests. The pH was adjusted (to 6.5–7.5) prior to toxicity analysis.

2.5 Transformation products (TPs)

The samples withdrawn during UV-C and UV-C/AOP treatments were analyzed via direct injection high-resolution electrospray ionization (ESI)-mass spectrometry (Bruker micrOTOF-QII) in negative mode for LP and FRSM, and in positive mode for CAF and CBZ. In order to increase the signal, formic acid was added to the CAF and CBZ samples, and ammonium hydroxide was added to the FRSM and LP samples (both at concentrations at 0.1%). A blank sample containing water and formic acid or ammonium hydroxide was analyzed before each measurement. The transformation products (TPs) obtained from the original substances were proposed by considering two different strategies: a structure showing the exact mass detected by the instrument; or simpler structures considering oxidative radical attack and the energy required to break specific chemical bonds in the original molecule.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Determination of quantum yields

Figure 1 shows the UV-C photolysis of each target compound at different pH values, and Table 1 presents the quantum yields and C_p values obtained at acidic (pH = 3.0), natural (pH of solution without adjustment), and basic (pH = 9.0) pH.

Figure 1. Photolysis (UV-C_{254nm}) of LP (2.2 μ M), FRMS (3.0 μ M), CAF (5.2 μ M), and CBZ (5.5 μ M) in ultrapure water at acidic, natural (non-adjusted), and basic pH ($I_0 = 2.54 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, volume 3.5 mL) as a function of incident energy per area (mJ cm^{-2}).

Table 1 – Quantum yields and photolysis coefficients (C_p) obtained for each compound at 254 nm at different pH values.

pH	$\Phi_{254 \text{ nm}} (\text{mol Einstein}^{-1})$			$C_{p \text{ 254 nm}} (\text{L Einstein}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1})$		
	3	n	9	3	n	9
LP	0.0115 $\pm$ 0.0001	0.0153 $\pm$ 0.0001	0.0144 $\pm$ 0.0006	123.6	190.2	190.2
FRSM	0.0815 $\pm$ 0.0001	0.0294 $\pm$ 0.0006	0.0245 $\pm$ 0.0006	380.4	95.1	95.1
CAF	0.0007 $\pm$ 0.0001	0.0005 $\pm$ 0.0002	0.0008 $\pm$ 0.0001	4.1	1.9	3.8
CBZ	0.0027 $\pm$ 0.0001	0.0016 $\pm$ 0.0001	0.0021 $\pm$ 0.0001	7.6	4.7	9.5

n = pH of solution without adjustment (6.0 for LP, 5.5 for FRSM, 5.8 for CAF, 7.1 for CBZ). Errors were calculated from duplicate measurements.

Considering the high $\epsilon_{254\text{nm}}$ of LP ($12\,355 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$) at pH 6, its degradation by direct UV-C photolysis could have been supposed. The chemical structure of LP (Table S1) consists of two aromatic rings and various unsaturated bonds and functional groups containing nitrogen, all of which are known as absorbers [11], thus explaining the high molar attenuation coefficient (Table S1) [10]. The susceptibility of LP to photolysis at 254 nm in medical formulations based on a drinkable cherry syrup has been reported previously [50, 51]. However, there are no previous reports on the photolysis nor on the values of quantum-yield for LP in water. The quantum yields obtained for LP (Table 1) varied from 0.011 to 0.015 mol Einstein^{-1} (Figure 1, Table 1), and was slightly lower at acidic pH compared to the values obtained at pH 9 and 6 (Figure 1A). The slightly higher molar absorptivity and photolysis coefficients obtained at pH 6 and 9 in comparison to

that at pH 3 could be explained by the pKa of this compound (4.15) (Table S1). According to the pKa, LP would exist in its neutral form at pH 3 but in the dissociated form at pH 6 and 9. As the chemical structures of the neutral and the protonated form are distinct, the molar absorptivity may be affected [40]. Specifically, it was slightly higher for the dissociated form of LP than for the neutral form, as confirmed by the $\epsilon_{254\text{nm}}$ values which increased from 10 700 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹ at pH 3 to 13 140 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹ at pH 9 (Table S2).

As molar attenuation coefficient is influenced by the dissociated/non-dissociated structure and C_p describes a relation between the quantum yield and the molar attenuation coefficient, the C_p values obtained for LP also varied according to pH (Table 1), specifically being higher at pH 6 and 9 than at pH 3. The C_p obtained for LP is higher than the value of 40 which indicates that a compound is susceptible to direct photolysis [3]. The C_p is also similar to those obtained for atrazine and pentachlorophenol [4]. Atrazine also presents functional groups that contribute to light absorption and photolysis. Although atrazine exhibits a lower ϵ_{254} (3860 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹ at pH 7) than LP, atrazine has a higher quantum yield (0.046 mol Einstein⁻¹). Therefore, these compounds show similar susceptibility to photolysis ($C_{p \text{ atrazine}} = 160$) [4]. In addition to direct UV-C photolysis, chain reactions may be triggered after a compound undergoes photolysis due to the formation of other radicals in the system, such as Cl• [4]. Considering that LP, atrazine, and pentachlorophenol all contain chlorine atoms in their structures, Cl• radicals may be generated, which would lead to further degradation of these compounds under UV-C irradiation.

As shown in Figure S1, FRSM has a lower light absorption coefficient at 254 nm, while it absorbs strongly at 230 nm and 270 nm. In addition, the molar attenuation

coefficients obtained for FRSM at 254 nm ranged from 3200 to 4700 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹, corresponding to pH 5.5 and 3, respectively (Table S2). As the pK_a of FRSM is 3.9 (Table S1) [52], this compound exists in its neutral form at pH 3, where it exhibited a higher absorptivity and molar attenuation coefficient at 254 nm (Table S2) than at other pH values. As a consequence, photolysis coefficient, and UV-C photolysis of FRSM were higher at acidic pH (Table 1, Figure 1). The photolysis of FRSM in the neutral form has been previously reported, and the photolysis product showed increased reactivity, solubility in water, and genotoxicity in comparison to the parent compound [53, 54].

As the molar attenuation coefficient (4660 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹) of FRSM at 254 nm was highest at pH 3, the photolysis coefficient *C_p* of this compound was more than 3 times higher at pH 3 than at pH 5.8 and 9 (Table 1). The photolysis coefficient of FRSM at pH 3 is comparable to that of the antibiotic sulfamethazine, likely due to the presence of similar functional groups present, such as sulfonamide and chlorobenzene moieties. These functional groups are light absorbers, thus contributing to UV-C photolysis and to the occurrence of secondary chain reactions [4]. Meanwhile, when the solution pH was above the pK_a, the absorbance of the dissociated form of the compound was lower (Table S2). Therefore, molar absorptivity and photolysis coefficients were also lower under these conditions. The quantum yield obtained at pH 5.5 for FRSM was 0.0294 mol Einstein⁻¹, which is in agreement with previously reported values (0.02200 ± 0.0028 mol Einstein⁻¹) [55].

The absorption spectrum (Figure S1) of CAF reveals that absorbance of this compound at 254 nm was reduced when compared to 205 nm and 273 nm, and to the absorbance of LP and FRSM at this wavelength. According to the molar

attenuation coefficients obtained at 254 nm (Table S2), the molar absorptivity of CAF did not change significantly with pH. This suggests that the structure of CAF is not influenced by the pH, which is in agreement with previous reports that the pKa of CAF is either above 10 [56] or “not observable within the pKa scale in water (0-14)” [10] (Table S1). Therefore, photolysis coefficients obtained for CAF in acidic and basic conditions were similar (Table 1). This testifies for the photostability of CAF over the tested pH range (Figure 1). The quantum yield obtained for CAF in this study was similar to the value reported in the literature ($0.0003 \text{ mol Einstein}^{-1}$) [12]. Carlson et al. [10] also reported insignificant photolysis of caffeine, thus confirming that this compound is not susceptible to UV-C photolysis. As the molar absorptivity was similar at pH 3, 5.5 and 9, the photolysis coefficients of CAF were low in all of the tested pH range, ranging from 1.9 to 4.1 mol Einstein^{-1} . Interestingly, the photolysis coefficients obtained for CAF were similar to those reported for carbamazepine ($C_p = 7$), which is also resistant to UV-C photolysis [4]. As caffeine and carbamazepine have been increasingly detected in water resources, their low susceptibility to photolysis would call for other alternative methods for their treatment in wastewater effluent or in drinking water treatment processes.

The absorbance of CBZ at 254 nm was relatively low (Figure S1). Thus, UV-C photolysis of this compound was expected to be relatively low in comparison to compounds that absorb strongly at this wavelength, such as LP. The slightly higher molar attenuation coefficients measured at pH 7 and 9 (Table S2), which are above the pKa (4.2), in comparison to that measured at pH 3, indicate that the substance more readily absorbs photons in its dissociated form. Quantum yield values (Table 1) obtained for CBZ confirm the stability of this compound

under UV-C irradiation (Figure 1). In addition, the quantum yields shown in Table 1 agree with the values reported previously [57, 58]. The slightly higher decay of CBZ observed at pH 9 in comparison to that at pH 3 or 7 is also in agreement with the molar absorptivity values (Table S2). As a consequence of the lower molar attenuation coefficient, the photolysis coefficients of CBZ at different pH are also negligible and comparative to those obtained for CAF. Similarities in the chemical structures (such as the imidazole moiety) of CBZ and CAF may explain the correspondence between the quantum yield and C_p values obtained for both compounds (Table 1, Figures 1C and D). In comparison to other pesticides such as atrazine and alachlor, CBZ is much more resistant to photolysis [4]. The higher photolysis of atrazine and alachlor in comparison to CBZ may be related to the de-chlorination of these compounds [59, 60], which does not occur in CBZ since it does not contain chlorine.

3.2 Degradation of target compounds via UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻

Profiles of the degradation of target compounds, pH values, and consumption of H₂O₂ and S₂O₈²⁻ over the courses of the UV-C AOP are shown in Figure 2. Control experiments consisted of H₂O₂ or S₂O₈²⁻ in the same concentration without UV-C irradiation, and showed neither removal nor mineralization of target compounds (Figure S2). The use of these oxidants in combination with UV-C irradiation increased the removal of all target compounds, especially for the photo-stable compounds CAF and CBZ, resulting in degradation of over 90% (Figure 2) with a dose of 300 to 600 mJ cm⁻² of UV irradiation, depending on the target compound.

Figure 2. Left: Degradation of each target compound by UV-C AOPs: UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻. Control experiments are also presented (UV-C photolysis, H₂O₂, or S₂O₈²⁻ alone). Molar ratio of H₂O₂ or S₂O₈²⁻: compound = 20:1 for LP, FRSM, and CAF, and 32:1 for CBZ; $I_0 = 2.41 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Right: consumption (%) of H₂O₂ ($C_0 = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$), S₂O₈²⁻ ($C_0 = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$), and pH values monitored during UV-C AOPs for each of the target compounds, as functions of incident energy per unit area (mJ cm^{-2}).

Experiments conducted with LP showed that UV-C photolysis alone achieved up to 85% removal in one hour (corresponding to 870 mJ cm^{-2}), while UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ and UV-C/H₂O₂ reached the same removal rate (Figure 2) after 290 and 620 mJ cm^{-2} incident energy, respectively, both achieving 98% removal by 870 mJ cm^{-2} . UV photolysis of FRSM reached 87% removal after 870 mJ cm^{-2} incident energy, while in the presence of H₂O₂ or S₂O₈²⁻, the same efficiency was achieved with 435 and 650 mJ cm^{-2} , reaching 98% and 93% removal, respectively, after one hour (Figure 2). Degradation rates of FRSM via UV-C only and UV-C/H₂O₂ determined in this study are in agreement with values reported in the literature [61]. After one hour of reaction (total incident energy 870 mJ cm^{-2}), both UV-C AOPs achieved efficient degradation of LP and FRSM, despite the maximum TOC removals being limited to 10% and 6%, respectively (Fig. S2). These results indicate the accumulation of organic transformation products in the system.

The limited consumption of H₂O₂ in the presence of LP and FRSM (10%) (Figure 2) probably occurred as a result of the molar attenuation coefficients of these compounds ($\epsilon_{254\text{nm, LP, pH 7}} = 11772 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $\epsilon_{254\text{nm, FRSM, pH 6}} = 3700 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$) (Table S2) being higher than that of H₂O₂ ($\epsilon_{254\text{nm, H}_2\text{O}_2} = 19.6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$) [4, 62]. The pharmaceuticals diclofenac and mecoprop, which are strong light absorbers, also impaired the absorption of light by H₂O₂ during UV-C/H₂O₂ treatment [12], thus reducing the process efficiency; this effect is a problem known to occur in the

presence of strong photon absorbers [63]. One other reason for the low consumption of H_2O_2 in these systems, when compared to the consumption of $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ (25%), may be related to the lower rate constants for the self-scavenging effects of $\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}$ with $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ ($k_{\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}/\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}} = 6.6 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $k_{\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}/\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}} = 3.1 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) in comparison to those of $\text{HO}^{\bullet}$ toward H_2O_2 ($k_{\text{HO}^{\bullet}/\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} = 2.7 \times 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $k_{\text{HO}^{\bullet}/\text{OH}^{\bullet}} = 5.5 \times 10^9 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) [17, 64, 65].

As shown in Figure 2 (left column), after 200 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy, the concentrations of LP and FRSM were reduced by a factor of 2. Therefore, competition for light decreased and H_2O_2 and $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ consumption subsequently increased (Figure 2, right). However, concentrations of both reagents were still high at this moment since consumption was lower than 5% of initial concentration ($9.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M}$ of remaining H_2O_2 and $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$) (Figure 2, right column). As regeneration of hydrogen peroxide from hydroxyl radicals via self-scavenging occurs more readily than the regeneration of $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ from sulfate radicals, the final consumption of H_2O_2 at the end of treatment was limited to a maximum of 10% of initial concentration after 850 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy, when compared to nearly 30% consumption of $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ in the presence of LP and FRSM (Figure 2, right column).

During LP degradation, 30% of initial $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ were consumed after 430 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy (Figure 2, right column), while H_2O_2 consumption was limited to 10%. Assuming stoichiometric conversion of reagents to oxidative radicals $6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M}$ of sulfate radicals were generated when compared to $2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M}$ of hydroxyl radicals, thus explaining the faster LP degradation via UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ (98% within 430 mJ cm^{-2}) when compared to the degradation via UV-C/ H_2O_2 (70% within 430 mJ cm^{-2}) (Figure 2, left). On the other hand, both UV-C AOPs and the UV-C

photolysis exhibited similar patterns in terms of FRSM removal and reagent consumption until 220 mJ cm⁻² of incident energy (Figure 2, left column), suggesting that photolysis was the predominant mechanism in the system, which is supported by the fact that FRSM is a strong light absorber (Section 3.1, Figure 1, Table 1). However, after reaching 430 mJ cm⁻² of incident energy, S₂O₈²⁻ consumption reached 21% while only 5% of the initial H₂O₂ had been consumed. Assuming stoichiometric conversions of S₂O₈²⁻ and H₂O₂ to oxidative radicals, nearly 4.2 x 10⁻⁴ M of sulfate radicals were formed in the system, compared to 10⁻⁴ M of hydroxyl radicals. However, FRSM degradation via UV-C/H₂O₂ at this moment was 99%, while it was only 80% via UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ (Figure 2, left column). In contrast with LP, for which the degradation was higher in the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ system, this result suggests that FRSM is more reactive with hydroxyl radicals than with sulfate radicals, which may be related to differences in the chemical structures [3, 15].

CAF and CBZ did not undergo photolysis, which was expected due to their low quantum yields and molar absorption coefficients. In contrast, both UV-C AOPs achieved over 99% removal of CAF and CBZ (Figure 2, left column). CBZ degradation was faster via UV-C/H₂O₂, reaching 99% removal after 290 mJ cm⁻² of incident energy, in comparison to the 650 mJ cm⁻² required to achieve similar removal by UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻. Mineralization of CAF and CBZ in the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ process was more extensive (reaching 60% and 70%, respectively) than it was in the presence of hydroxyl radicals (reaching 25% and 35%, respectively) (Figure S2). The drop in pH from 9 to 8 during UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ (which was not observed in UV-C/H₂O₂) was due to the formation of SO₄²⁻ and H⁺ [16]. Higher mineralization rates through UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ can likely be explained by the greater

selectivity and lifespan of sulfate radicals in comparison to hydroxyl radicals as it is less reactive with inorganic species that may be formed during the degradation of target compounds (O_2 , Cl^- , NO_3^- and CO_3^{2-} , HCO_3^{2-}), and also towards $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ and sulfate radical itself (self-scavenging), thus increasing its persistence in the system. This was also reported with other compounds such as 2,4-D, carbamazepine, and azathioprine [14, 66-68]. In addition, the ability UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ to degrade carboxylic acids and intermediate products usually formed during oxidation processes has been previously confirmed [16].

As CAF and CBZ do not absorb UV-C light as extensively as LP and FRSM, irradiation is promptly absorbed by reagents in the UV-C AOPs, leading to higher and faster degradation when compared to UV-C photolysis (Figure 2, Table 2) and higher consumption of H_2O_2 in the UV-C AOPs, reaching 23% for CAF and 30% for CBZ (Figure 2). An increase in pH at the beginning of the reactions was observed during UV-C/ H_2O_2 treatments of CAF and CBZ (Figure 2 – right column), which likely contributed to higher consumption of H_2O_2 as cleavage is favored in alkaline conditions [69]. $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ consumption exhibited similar behavior to that of H_2O_2 during the degradation of CAF and CBZ.

Degradation data obtained during UV-C AOPs were fitted to a pseudo-first-order kinetics model ($R^2 > 0.95$), and apparent rate constants were calculated for each process for the different target compounds (Table 2). Electrical energy per order of removal (EE/O; kWh m^{-3}) was also calculated in order to compare the efficiencies of the different processes (Table 2). EE/O values represent the amount of energy required to decrease the concentration of the compound by one order of magnitude [66]. Therefore, higher k'_{app} values result in lower EE/O values, revealing the most efficient process in terms of lowest energy

consumption [70]. However, EE/O should not be considered alone when aiming to identify the most affordable process; reagent costs must also be considered, as, for example, persulfate is more expensive than H_2O_2 [71]. When compared to UV-C photolysis alone, k'_{app} values increased in the presence of hydroxyl and sulfate radicals. Regarding UV-C photolysis, the EE/O values (Table 2) were calculated using experimental data for FRSM, as this process reduced the concentration of this compound by one order of magnitude within 650 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy. In contrast, for LP, EE/O values were predicted using the k'_{UV-C} obtained for this compound. As UV-C photolysis of CAF and CBZ did not fit the pseudo-first-order model ($R^2 < 0.95$), it was not possible to estimate EE/O values for the photolysis of these compounds. Apparent rate constants values for the degradation of CAF via UV-C/ H_2O_2 agree with the values obtained by Shu et al. [12], who reported higher values of these constants for compounds with reduced quantum yields (caffeine and carbamazepine). Therefore, data on the photolysis coefficients and quantum yields of emerging contaminants present in water may be a valuable tool to predict their degradability via UV-C photolysis, or whether UV-C AOPs would need to be applied [3].

Apparent rate constants obtained for the UV-C/ H_2O_2 process were higher than those of the UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ process for all target compounds except LP. This is likely due to the higher reaction rate of this compound with sulfate radical than with the hydroxyl radical. A decrease in the concentration of LP by one order of magnitude occurred after 20 minutes (290 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy) for UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ (Figure 2), yet 45 minutes (650 mJ cm^{-2}) were required to achieve the same removal (Table 2) by UV-C/ H_2O_2 , as reflected in the k'_{app} and EE/O values. The lower k'_{app} values obtained for UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ compared to that of UV-C/ H_2O_2

during the degradation of FRSM, CAF, and CBZ may be related to the higher selectivity of $\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}$ when compared to that of $\text{HO}^{\bullet}$, since it acts preferentially via electron transfer whereas $\text{HO}^{\bullet}$ also reacts via addition and H-abstraction [72]. UV-C/ H_2O_2 required 20 minutes (290 mJ cm^{-2}) to reduce the FRSM concentration by one order of magnitude, while 45 minutes (650 mJ cm^{-2}) were required by UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$, thus explaining the higher EE/O of the former process (Table 2).

Table 2 – Pseudo-first-order rate constants (min^{-1}) obtained for each process for the different target compounds, and EE/O values obtained for UV-C/ H_2O_2 and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ for the different target compounds

Pseudo-first-order rate constant (k' ; min^{-1})	LP	FRSM	CAF	CBZ
$k'_{\text{UV-C}}$	0.011 ± 0.005	0.056 ± 0.004	*	*
$k'_{\text{UV-C}/\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$	0.048 ± 0.0003	0.11 ± 0.01	0.100 ± 0.001	0.22 ± 0.01
$k'_{\text{UV-C}/\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}}$	0.0864 ± 0.0005	0.072 ± 0.002	0.085 ± 0.007	0.17 ± 0.04
EE/O (kWh m^{-3})				
UV-C	2.3 P**	1.5 P		
UV-C/ H_2O_2	1.5 P	0.67 P	0.5 P	0.25 P
UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$	0.6 P	1.5 P	0.5 P	0.33 P

*Did not fit the model due to low degradation ($R^2 < 0.95$). P is the lamp power (10 W)

**Estimated using the $k'_{\text{UV-C}}$ value.

The EE/O values obtained for CAF degradation were the same for both UV-C AOPs (0.5 P), indicating that the energy required to remove this compound in water using either H_2O_2 or $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ under UV-C irradiation was the same. This result agrees with the similarity between the kinetic rates obtained for each process (Table 2). For CBZ, both UV-C AOPs showed comparable k'_{app} and EE/O values (Table 2). The degradation of carbamazepine, another photo-resistant compound, via UV-C/ H_2O_2 and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ also led to similar EE/O values in a previous study [22]. Indeed, the quantum yield, photolysis coefficient, molar mass, and chemical composition of CAF and CBZ are all very similar, which might explain their comparable behavior when submitted to UV-C AOPs.

3.4 Evolution of acute toxicity

As shown in Figure 3, acute toxicity varied between treatments for all compounds, indicating the formation of toxic intermediates during UV-C AOPS, as has been reported in the literature for various emerging contaminants [23]. The LP solution was not toxic to *Allivibrio fischeri* ($a.T.u. = 0.26$), and no acute toxicity was observed during UV-C/H₂O₂ treatment. However, acute toxicity developed during the UV-C-only and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ processes, despite the high degradation efficiencies achieved during these processes (65% for UV-C and 98% for UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻). According to Adachi et al. [73], the cyanide ion is formed when LP is oxidized by sodium hypochlorite. Therefore, this ion could have been formed by oxidation during the UV-C AOPs, which may have contributed to the increase in acute toxicity. This difference between the degradation by sulfate and by hydroxyl radicals have been described in previous studies [24]. However, there is no report in the literature regarding the formation of toxic transformation products during UV-C photolysis and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ oxidation of LP, nor of other sartans with similar structures. In contrast, the EE/O values suggest that UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ is more efficient than UV-C/H₂O₂ in the removal of LP. This result indicates that it is not adequate to consider the EE/O values alone for identifying the optimal treatment method.

Figure 3. Acute toxicity of samples withdrawn during the degradation of target compounds via UV-C, UV-C/H₂O₂, and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ processes, shown as functions of the total incident energy received (mJ cm⁻²). The horizontal lines represent the threshold of 1.21 a.T.u.; bars crossing the line thus indicate toxic samples.

FRSM was reported to be non-toxic to *Allivibrio fischeri* [54], yet its products of

505 photolysis and electro-Fenton degradation are considered toxic [74, 75]. In the
506 present study, before treatment, the FRSM solution exhibited a beneficial
507 stimulatory effect, known as hormesis, upon the photobacteria (Figure 3). This
508 effect occurs with luminescent bacteria as a consequence of exposure to small
509 concentrations of toxic chemicals [76]. As shown in Figure 3, acute toxicity was
510 generated during the UV-C photolysis of FRSM, but was eliminated within 600
511 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy, when this process reached FRSM removal of 80%
512 (Figure 2). Meanwhile, there was no generation of toxicity during the UV-C/ H_2O_2
513 process. In contrast, UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ exhibited similar behavior to the UV-C-only
514 process, as toxicity was generated at the beginning of the reaction but was
515 eliminated within 300 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy, much less than that required
516 with the UV-C-only process (Figure 3).

517 Before treatment, the CAF solution exhibited an inhibitory effect ($\text{EC}_{50} = 76\%$;
518 $\text{a.T.u.} = 1.3$) on *Allivibrio fischeri*, as has been reported for similar tests using a
519 marine photobacterium as a bioindicator ($\text{EC}_{50} = 62.8\%$) [77]. Although a few
520 authors reported that there was no increase in CAF toxicity after AOP treatments
521 [78, 79], no reports on the effect of UV-C/ H_2O_2 or UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ on CAF toxicity
522 have been published. This is alarming since caffeine is detected in surface waters
523 in a wide variety of locations in concentrations up to $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ [34], and was even
524 considered for use as an indicator of illegal sewage disposal [37]. Both UV-
525 C/ H_2O_2 and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ increased CAF toxicity at the beginning of the treatment,
526 although the toxic effects were entirely eliminated toward the end of the
527 treatments when the concentration of CAF was below 10% of its initial
528 concentration (Figure 3). This suggests the formation and degradation of toxic
529 transformation products within both processes. With regards to UV-C photolysis,

for which only the final sample was analyzed due to the negligible effect of this process on the removal of CAF, an increase in toxicity during treatment was also observed.

As confirmed by the results shown in Figure 3, CBZ is known to be toxic to *Allivibrio fischeri* [80]. Similarly to what was observed for CAF, UV-C photolysis alone was not able to remove CBZ due to its low molar absorptivity and quantum yield. Consequently, UV-C photolysis had a negligible effect on the acute toxicity of CBZ. Meanwhile, both UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ eliminated the toxic effect of CBZ; as it was also observed by other irradiated AOPs under artificial and solar irradiation in another study [80]. During UV-C/H₂O₂, CBZ degradation occurred alongside the reduction in acute toxicity (Figure 3). In contrast, acute toxicity increased during the initial stages of the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ process and decreased toward the end, probably due to the formation of toxic transformation products. This result agrees with the EE/O values (Table 2), as less energy was required to reduce the toxicity of CBZ via UV-C/H₂O₂ compared to UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻.

3.5 Degradation of target compounds by UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ in surface water

In order to assess the impact of the water matrix on the degradation of target compounds, UV-C, UV-C/H₂O₂, and UV-C/ S₂O₈²⁻ treatments were applied to surface water and ultrapure water each spiked with 10 µM of each compound. Although degradation of all compounds occurred simultaneously, since all compounds were present in the same matrix, the degradation of each pollutant was quantified individually (Figure 3). Reduction in TOC and consumption of H₂O₂ and S₂O₈²⁻ were also monitored (Figure 4).

555 Figure 4. Degradation of LP, FRSM, CAF, and CBZ (10 μM each) in ultra-pure
 556 water and surface water by UV-C, UV-C/ H_2O_2 , and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ processes
 557 ($\text{C}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$ or $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-} = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$), shown as functions of total incident energy per area (mJ
 558 cm^{-2}).
 559

560 The presence of scavenger compounds that are naturally present in real surface
 561 water, including HCO_3^- , natural organic matter (NOM), and Cl^- , among others,
 562 may lead to a lower degradation of target compounds in practical applications
 563 [70]. NOM is mainly comprised of humic acids which present various functional
 564 groups that compete with the target compounds for hydroxyl and sulfate radicals
 565 [81, 82]. As shown in Figure 4, UV-C photolysis of CBZ in the surface water and
 566 in the presence of the other target compounds was similar to that observed in
 567 pure water, still exhibiting an insignificant decrease in concentration due to its
 568 lower quantum yield and molar absorptivity at 254 nm (Table 1). On the other
 569 hand, the UV-C photolysis of each of LP, FRSM, and CAF was slightly higher in
 570 surface water than in pure water. This likely happened due the formation of
 571 oxidative radicals from the natural constituents of the Lys River surface water,
 572 which presented a DOC of 1.2 mg L^{-1} ; O_2 concentration 8 mg L^{-1} ; NO_3^-
 573 concentration 22 mg L^{-1} ; PO_4^{3-} concentration 0.1 mg L^{-1} ; Cl^- concentration 20 mg
 574 L^{-1} ; and high alkalinity of $330 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \text{ HCO}_3^-$. A greater extent of photolysis of
 575 FRSM in natural waters than in pure water was also observed previously [61].
 576 When NOM, dissolved oxygen, and phosphate are submitted to UV-C_{254nm}
 577 irradiation, oxidative species such as $\text{NOM}^\bullet$, singlet oxygen ($^1\text{O}_2$), and $\text{PO}_4^{2-\bullet}$ may
 578 be formed [83, 84]. Although these radicals present lower redox potentials than
 579 $\text{HO}^\bullet$ and $\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}$, they may have contributed to the enhanced photolysis of LP,
 580 FRSM, and CAF [85]. Further, $\text{HO}^\bullet$ may also be formed from the irradiation of

NO₃⁻ present in surface waters [86, 87].

Lower degradations of LP and FRSM were observed during UV-C AOPs in surface water than in pure water. The high level of carbonate ions in surface water may have contributed to the quenching of hydroxyl and sulfate radicals involved in the degradation reactions. In contrast, for CAF and CBZ, the effect of matrix constituents on the oxidative radicals formed during the UV-C AOPs could not be observed, probably because their reaction rates with radicals are extremely high, as shown in Table 2. The relatively high content of chloride ions, which react strongly with sulfate radicals [88], may have influenced the effectiveness of the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ process, thus leading to the lower removal of target compounds in surface water than in pure water.

The consumption rates of H₂O₂ and S₂O₈²⁻ were below 25% in all of the tested conditions (Figure 5). H₂O₂ consumption in pure water was 13%, but 20% in surface water, thus confirming that a higher consumption of this reagent occurred in the presence of other matrix components. On the other hand, S₂O₈²⁻ consumption was very similar in pure water (20%) and in the presence of matrix components (24%). In addition, previous studies have confirmed that the performance of the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ process is not disturbed by carbonate ions (HCO₃⁻) to such an extent as is the performance of the UV-C/H₂O₂ process, probably due to the lower reaction constants for the reaction of SO₄^{-•} with HCO₃⁻ ($k_{\text{SO}_4^{\bullet-}, \text{HCO}_3^-} = 2.8 \times 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) than that of OH[•] with HCO₃⁻ ($k_{\text{HO}^{\bullet}, \text{HCO}_3^-} = 8.5 \times 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) [6, 14, 17-19]. Furthermore, the TOC removal (Figure 5) achieved by UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ (9% and 21% in pure water and surface water, respectively) was higher than that achieved by UV-C/H₂O₂ (5.7 and 14.9%, respectively) in both water matrices, thus corroborating the results reported earlier in this study (Section 3.3).

The higher mineralization efficiency in surface water than in pure water corresponds to the degradation of NOM via sulfate radicals, as reported previously [65].

Figure 5. Reagent consumption and TOC removal during UV-C AOPs in surface water (filled symbols) and pure water (empty symbols), as functions of total incident energy per area (mJ cm^{-2}) (Initial TOC in pure water 5.4 mg L^{-1} and in surface water 6.6 mg L^{-1}).

3.3 Identification of transformation products

The mass spectra of CAF before UV-C radiation (zero min) shows two peaks: protonated caffeine I ($[\text{caffeine}+\text{H}^+]$, $m/z = 195.08$) and another signal ($[\text{caffeine}+\text{Na}^+]$, $m/z = 217.07$) which refers to the sodium adduct (Figure 6A). The peak intensities corresponding to the transformation products detected during CAF oxidation, along with the mass spectra after 315 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy in the UV-C/ H_2O_2 (Figures 6B and C) and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ (Figures 6D and E) processes show that a higher number of transformation products were formed during UV-C/ H_2O_2 than during UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$, likely due to the higher selectivity of the sulfate radical than the hydroxyl radical. The oxidation of the six-membered ring in UV-C/ H_2O_2 first generated 2 main species which presented masses $m/z = 125.98$ and 142.06 (Figures 6B and C, at 50 mJ cm^{-2} , and Figure 7), with smaller peaks corresponding to $m/z 128.02$ and 168.04 (Figures 6B and C and Figure 7). However, after 300 mJ cm^{-2} of incident energy, species with $m/z = 110.01$, 128.02 , and 146.03 were identified in the UV-C/ H_2O_2 system (Figures 6B and C and Figure 7).

Figure 6. Mass spectra of (A) Caffeine solution in pure water, (B and D) signals corresponding to masses detected during UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ treatments, and (C and E) mass spectra obtained after UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ treatments with 300 mJ cm⁻² of total incident energy.

Meanwhile, the transformation products accumulated during UV-C/ S₂O₈²⁻ were different ($m/z = 164.92$ and 142.94 ; Figures 6D and E), thus suggesting a different transformation pathway which has not yet been reported for caffeine in the literature. These results are very relevant considering that the use of caffeine as an indicator of so-called 'fresh' contamination of surface waters has been suggested by some authors [35-37].

Considering the spectra obtained during the degradation of CAF via UV-C/H₂O₂, a possible degradation route was proposed, as shown in Figure 7. The signal at $m/z = 195.09$ (structure I) corresponds to the protonated adduct of caffeine. The oxidation process led to a decrease in intensity of the $m/z = 195$ signal and increases in the intensities of other signals associated to products of oxidation. ChemCalc [89] was used to assign a formula to the exact mass and then propose a structure based on these formulae. The two first products (II: $m/z = 142.06$ and III: $m/z = 125.98$) would be formed from a break of the pyrimidine moiety and the opening of the imidazole ring (Figure 7). A signal of $m/z 142$ was also detected by Dalmazio et al., (2005) [90] during the degradation of caffeine via UV-C/H₂O₂. However, considering the exact mass obtained here, the product proposed in the referred paper was not realistic in our case. Species of $m/z 128.02$ (III) and 146.03 (IV) would be formed from the further oxidation of II, leading to an isocyanate structure [80] and the formation of carboxylic acid moieties. Then, compound VI would later accumulate in the system as a product of oxidation of the intermediate compounds. However, no structure could be proposed for the

detected signals. No structures were proposed for the oxidation products of the UV/S₂O₈²⁻ process, as the formulae proposed for the mass obtained were not relevant for the process [89].

Figure 7. Degradation pathway proposed for the formation of transformation products generated during the oxidation of caffeine via UV-C/H₂O₂

These analyses were also performed with samples withdrawn during the oxidation of LP, FRSM, and CBZ via UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻. However, as shown in Figures S3, S4, and S5, decreases in the signal intensities of the target compounds were observed, yet no other signals of significant intensity were detected. TPs could not be observed using this methodology as they would not have been ionized by the ESI used here.

4. Conclusion

In this study, the quantum yields and photolysis coefficients were calculated for target compounds, indicating that LP and FRSM are susceptible to photolysis in the UV-C range (80% removal of each LP and FRSM under UV-C photolysis alone at total levels of 800 and 600 mJ cm⁻² incident energy). In contrast, the UV-C photolysis of both CAF and CBZ by this process was negligible. UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ were extremely effective in the removal of all target compounds, achieving over 90% degradation in a pure water matrix under the same conditions. *k'*_{app} rates were obtained for UV-C/H₂O₂ on the degradation of FRSM, CAF, and CBZ, when compared to UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ due to the reactivity of hydroxyl radicals toward these compounds and their intermediates. On the other hand, mineralization rates and reagent consumption were higher in the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ system, probably due to the greater light absorption and lower self-scavenging

exhibited by sulfate radicals as compared to hydroxyl radicals. During acute toxicity analysis using *Allivibrio fischeri*, samples withdrawn during the UV-C-only and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ processes exhibited higher toxicity than those withdrawn during the UV-C/H₂O₂ process. Simultaneous degradation of target compounds in real surface water indicated higher stability of the UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ system in the presence of natural scavengers in comparison to that of the UV-C/H₂O₂ system. A lower number of transformation products were detected during CAF degradation via UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ as compared to UV-C/H₂O₂, confirming the higher selectivity of the sulfate radical than the hydroxyl radical, and suggesting distinct reaction mechanisms for each radical.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge Erasmus iBrasil, DOC2C's Interreg 2seas Project, CPER Climibio, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPQ), Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento Profissional de Nível Superior (CAPES), and Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais (FAPEMIG) for the funding.

References

- [1] S. Giannakis, M. Voumard, D. Grandjean, A. Magnet, L.F. De Alencastro, C. Pulgarin, Micropollutant degradation, bacterial inactivation and regrowth risk in wastewater effluents: Influence of the secondary (pre)treatment on the efficiency of Advanced Oxidation Processes, *Water Research* 102 (2016) 505-515.
- [2] E.A. Serna-Galvis, F. Ferraro, J. Silva-Agrede, R.A. Torres-Palma, Degradation of highly consumed fluoroquinolones, penicillins and cephalosporins in distilled water and simulated hospital wastewater by UV254 and UV254/persulfate processes, *Water Research* 122 (2017) 128-138.
- [3] D. Gerrity, Y. Lee, S. Gamage, M. Lee, A.N. Pisarenko, R.A. Trenholm, U. von Gunten, S.A. Snyder, Emerging investigators series: prediction of trace organic contaminant abatement with UV/H₂O₂: development and validation of semi-empirical models for municipal wastewater effluents, *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology* 2 (2016) 460-473.

- [4] D.R. Hokanson, K. Li, R.R. Trussell, A photolysis coefficient for characterizing the response of aqueous constituents to photolysis, *Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering* 10 (2016) 428-437.
- [5] J.C. Kruithof, P.C. Kamp, B.J. Martijn, UV/H₂O₂ Treatment: A Practical Solution for Organic Contaminant Control and Primary Disinfection, *Ozone: Science & Engineering* 29 (2007) 273-280.
- [6] C. Luo, J. Ma, J. Jiang, Y. Liu, Y. Song, Y. Yang, Y. Guan, D. Wu, Simulation and comparative study on the oxidation kinetics of atrazine by UV/H₂O₂, UV/HSO₅⁻ and UV/S₂O₈²⁻, *Water Research* 80 (2015) 99-108.
- [7] M.A. Tarr, *Chemical Degradation Methods for Wastes and Pollutantes*, New York, 2003.
- [8] G. Boczkaj, A. Fernandes, Wastewater treatment by means of advanced oxidation processes at basic pH conditions: A review, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 320 (2017) 608-633.
- [9] M.A. Oturan, J.-J. Aaron, *Advanced Oxidation Processes in Water/Wastewater Treatment: Principles and Applications. A Review*, *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology* 44 (2014) 2577-2641.
- [10] J.C. Carlson, M.I. Stefan, J.M. Parnis, C.D. Metcalfe, Direct UV photolysis of selected pharmaceuticals, personal care products and endocrine disruptors in aqueous solution, *Water Research* 84 (2015) 350-361.
- [11] R.F. Dantas, O. Rossiter, A.K.R. Teixeira, A.S.M. Simões, V.L. da Silva, Direct UV photolysis of propranolol and metronidazole in aqueous solution, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 158 (2010) 143-147.
- [12] Z. Shu, J.R. Bolton, M. Belosevic, M. Gamal El Din, Photodegradation of emerging micropollutants using the medium-pressure UV/H₂O₂ Advanced Oxidation Process, *Water Research* 47 (2013) 2881-2889.
- [13] M. Muruganandham, R.P.S. Suri, S. Jafari, Sillanp, M. , G.-J. Lee, J.J. Wu, M. Swaminathan, Recent Developments in Homogeneous Advanced Oxidation Processes for Water and Wastewater Treatment, *International Journal of Photoenergy* 2014 (2014) 21.
- [14] Y. Zhang, J. Zhang, Y. Xiao, V.W.C. Chang, T.-T. Lim, Kinetic and mechanistic investigation of azathioprine degradation in water by UV, UV/H₂O₂ and UV/persulfate, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 302 (2016) 526-534.
- [15] M.-S. Tsao, W.K. Wilmarth, *The Aqueous Chemistry of Inorganic Free Radicals. I. The Mechanism of the Photolytic Decomposition of Aqueous Persulfate Ion and Evidence Regarding the Sulfate-Hydroxyl Radical Interconversion Equilibrium*, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* 63 (1959) 346-353.
- [16] J. Criquet, N.K.V. Leitner, Degradation of acetic acid with sulfate radical generated by persulfate ions photolysis, *Chemosphere* 77 (2009) 194-200.
- [17] G.V. Buxton, C.L. Greenstock, W.P. Helman, A.B. Ross, Critical Review of rate constants for reactions of hydrated electrons, hydrogen atoms and hydroxyl radicals ($\cdot\text{OH}/\cdot\text{O}^-$ in Aqueous Solution, *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data* 17 (1988) 513-886.
- [18] O.P. Chawla, R.W. Fessenden, Electron spin resonance and pulse radiolysis studies of some reactions of peroxy sulfate (SO₄^{1,2}), *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* 79 (1975) 2693-2700.
- [19] M.G. Antoniou, H.R. Andersen, Comparison of UVC/S₂O₈²⁻ with UVC/H₂O₂ in terms of efficiency and cost for the removal of micropollutants from groundwater, *Chemosphere* 119 (2015) S81-S88.
- [20] S. Waławek, H.V. Lutze, K. Gröbel, V.V.T. Padil, M. Černík, D.D. Dionysiou, Chemistry of persulfates in water and wastewater treatment: A review, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 330 (2017) 44-62.
- [21] Y. Yang, J.J. Pignatello, J. Ma, W.A. Mitch, Effect of matrix components on UV/H₂O₂ and UV/S₂O₈²⁻ advanced oxidation processes for trace organic degradation in reverse osmosis brines from municipal wastewater reuse facilities, *Water Research* 89 (2016) 192-200.

- [22] L. Lian, B. Yao, S. Hou, J. Fang, S. Yan, W. Song, Kinetic Study of Hydroxyl and Sulfate Radical-Mediated Oxidation of Pharmaceuticals in Wastewater Effluents, *Environmental Science & Technology* 51 (2017) 2954-2962.
- [23] A. Sharma, J. Ahmad, S.J.S. Flora, Application of advanced oxidation processes and toxicity assessment of transformation products, *Environmental Research* 167 (2018) 223-233.
- [24] Y. Yang, X. Lu, J. Jiang, J. Ma, G. Liu, Y. Cao, W. Liu, J. Li, S. Pang, X. Kong, C. Luo, Degradation of sulfamethoxazole by UV, UV/H₂O₂ and UV/persulfate (PDS): Formation of oxidation products and effect of bicarbonate, *Water Research* 118 (2017) 196-207.
- [25] K. Yin, L. Deng, J. Luo, J. Crittenden, C. Liu, Y. Wei, L. Wang, Destruction of phenicol antibiotics using the UV/H₂O₂ process: Kinetics, byproducts, toxicity evaluation and trichloromethane formation potential, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 351 (2018) 867-877.
- [26] T. Olmez-Hanci, I. Arslan-Alaton, D. Dursun, B. Genc, D.G. Mita, M. Guida, L. Mita, Degradation and toxicity assessment of the nonionic surfactant Triton™ X-45 by the peroxymonosulfate/UV-C process, *Photochemical & Photobiological Sciences* 14 (2015) 569-575.
- [27] Q. Zhang, J. Chen, C. Dai, Y. Zhang, X. Zhou, Degradation of carbamazepine and toxicity evaluation using the UV/persulfate process in aqueous solution, *Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology* 90 (2015) 701-708.
- [28] E.S. Gonçalves, OCORRÊNCIA E DISTRIBUIÇÃO DE FÁRMACOS, CAFEÍNA E BISFENOL-A EM ALGUNS CORPOS HÍDRICOS NO ESTADO DO RIO DE JANEIRO, Departamento de Geociências da Universidade Federal Fluminense, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, RJ, 2012, pp. 197.
- [29] T. Heberer, Tracking persistent pharmaceutical residues from municipal sewage to drinking water, *Journal of Hydrology* 266 (2002) 175-189.
- [30] D.G.J. Larsson, C. de Pedro, N. Paxeus, Effluent from drug manufactures contains extremely high levels of pharmaceuticals, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 148 (2007) 751-755.
- [31] C.D.S. Pereira, L.A. Maranhão, F.S. Cortez, F.H. Pusceddu, A.R. Santos, D.A. Ribeiro, A. Cesar, L.L. Guimarães, Occurrence of pharmaceuticals and cocaine in a Brazilian coastal zone, *Science of The Total Environment* 548 (2016) 148-154.
- [32] M.A. Sousa, C. Gonçalves, V.J.P. Vilar, R.A.R. Boaventura, M.F. Alpendurada, Suspended TiO₂-assisted photocatalytic degradation of emerging contaminants in a municipal WWTP effluent using a solar pilot plant with CPCs, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 198 (2012) 301-309.
- [33] F. Stuer-Lauridsen, M. Birkved, L.P. Hansen, H.C. Holten Lützhøft, B. Halling-Sørensen, Environmental risk assessment of human pharmaceuticals in Denmark after normal therapeutic use, *Chemosphere* 40 (2000) 783-793.
- [34] M.C.V.M. Starling, C.C. Amorim, M.M.D. Leão, Occurrence, control and fate of contaminants of emerging concern in environmental compartments in Brazil, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* (2018).
- [35] S. Froehner, W. Piccioni, K.S. Machado, M.M. Aisse, Removal Capacity of Caffeine, Hormones, and Bisphenol by Aerobic and Anaerobic Sewage Treatment, *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution* 216 (2011) 463-471.
- [36] C.C. Montagner, W.F. Jardim, P.C. Von der Ohe, G.A. Umbuzeiro, Occurrence and potential risk of triclosan in freshwaters of São Paulo, Brazil—the need for regulatory actions, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 21 (2014) 1850-1858.
- [37] F.F. Sodré, M.A.F. Locatelli, W.F. Jardim, Occurrence of Emerging Contaminants in Brazilian Drinking Waters: A Sewage-To-Tap Issue, *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution* 206 (2010) 57-67.
- [38] M.K. Burkhardt, T.; Hean, S.; Schmid, P.; Haag, R.; Rossi, L.; Boller, M., Release of biocides from urban areas into aquatic systems, 6th International conference on sustainable techniques and strategies in urban water management (NOVATECH)Lyon, France, 2007.
- [39] M. Loewy, V. Kirs, G. Carvajal, A. Venturino, A.M. Pechen de D'Angelo, Groundwater contamination by azinphos methyl in the Northern Patagonic Region (Argentina), *Science of The Total Environment* 225 (1999) 211-218.

- [40] S. Canonica, L. Meunier, U. von Gunten, Phototransformation of selected pharmaceuticals during UV treatment of drinking water, *Water Research* 42 (2008) 121-128.
- [41] I. Nicole, J. De Laat, M. Dore, J.P. Duguet, C. Bonnel, Utilisation du rayonnement ultraviolet dans le traitement des eaux: mesure du flux photonique par actinometrie chimique au peroxyde d'hydrogene, *Water Research* 24 (1990) 157-168.
- [42] J.F.F. ANDERSON, M.C.G. GERLIN, R.A. SVERSUT, L.C.S. OLIVEIRA, A.K. SINGH, M.S. AMARAL, N.M. KASSAB, Development and Validation of an Isocratic HPLC Method for Simultaneous Determination of Quaternary Mixtures of Antihypertensive Drugs in Pharmaceutical Formulations *Acta Chromatographica* 29(2017) (2016) 95–110.
- [43] EPA, Method 631: The Determination of Benomyl and Carbendazim in Municipal and Industrial Wastewater in: EPA (Ed.), EPA, 1993.
- [44] EPA, Method 1694: Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products in Water, Soil, Sediment, and Biosolids by HPLC/MS/MS EPA, 2007.
- [45] F.J. Beltran, G. Ovejero, J.F. Garcia-Araya, J. Rivas, Oxidation of Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Water. 2. UV Radiation and Ozonation in the Presence of UV Radiation, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 34 (1995) 1607-1615.
- [46] V.M. Amin, N.F. Olson, Spectrophotometric Determination of Hydrogen Peroxide in Milk1, *Journal of Dairy Science* 50 (1967) 461-464.
- [47] M.C.V.M. Starling, L.A.S. Castro, R.B.P. Marcelino, M.M.D. Leão, C.C. Amorim, Optimized treatment conditions for textile wastewater reuse using photocatalytic processes under UV and visible light sources, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 24 (2017) 6222-6232.
- [48] A.J. Poole, Treatment of biorefractory organic compounds in wool scour effluent by hydroxyl radical oxidation, *Water Research* 38 (2004) 3458-3464.
- [49] T. Olmez-Hanci, I. Arslan-Alaton, D. Dursun, Investigation of the toxicity of common oxidants used in advanced oxidation processes and their quenching agents, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 278 (2014) 330-335.
- [50] S. Kollipara, G. Bende, Y. Bansal, R. Saha, Stability-indicating Reversed-phase Liquid Chromatographic Method for Simultaneous Determination of Losartan Potassium and Ramipril in Tablets, *Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences* 74 (2012) 201-210.
- [51] R.A. Seburg, J.M. Ballard, T.-L. Hwang, C.M. Sullivan, Photosensitized degradation of losartan potassium in an extemporaneous suspension formulation, *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis* 42 (2006) 411-422.
- [52] S.J. Khan, J.E. Ongerth, Modelling of pharmaceutical residues in Australian sewage by quantities of use and fugacity calculations, *Chemosphere* 54 (2004) 355-367.
- [53] D.E. Moore, C.D. Burt, PHOTSENSITIZATION BY DRUGS IN SURFACTANT SOLUTIONS, *Photochemistry and Photobiology* 34 (1981) 431-439.
- [54] M. Isidori, A. Nardelli, A. Parrella, L. Pascarella, L. Previtera, A multispecies study to assess the toxic and genotoxic effect of pharmaceuticals: Furosemide and its photoproduct, *Chemosphere* 63 (2006) 785-793.
- [55] B.A. Wols, D.J.H. Harmsen, E.F. Beerendonk, C.H.M. Hofman-Caris, Predicting pharmaceutical degradation by UV (LP)/H2O2 processes: A kinetic model, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 255 (2014) 334-343.
- [56] D.W. Newton, R.B. Kluza, pKa Values of Medicinal Compounds in Pharmacy Practice, *Drug Intelligence & Clinical Pharmacy* 12 (1978) 546-554.
- [57] R. Panadés, A. Ibarz, S. Esplugas, Photodecomposition of carbendazim in aqueous solutions, *Water Research* 34 (2000) 2951-2954.
- [58] P. Mazellier, É. Leroy, B. Legube, Photochemical behavior of the fungicide carbendazim in dilute aqueous solution, *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry* 153 (2002) 221-227.
- [59] Y. Souissi, S. Bouchonnet, S. Bourcier, K.O. Kusk, M. Sablier, H.R. Andersen, Identification and ecotoxicity of degradation products of chloroacetamide herbicides from UV-treatment of water, *Science of The Total Environment* 458-460 (2013) 527-534.

- [60] H.-J. Choi, D. Kim, T.-J. Lee, Photochemical degradation of atrazine in UV and UV/H₂O₂ process: pathways and toxic effects of products, *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part B* 48 (2013) 927-934.
- [61] B.A. Wols, D.J.H. Harmsen, E.F. Beerendonk, C.H.M. Hofman-Caris, Predicting pharmaceutical degradation by UV (LP)/H₂O₂ processes: A kinetic model, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 255 (2014) 334-343.
- [62] J.H. Baxendale, J.A. Wilson, The photolysis of hydrogen peroxide at high light intensities, *Transactions of the Faraday Society* 53 (1957) 344-356.
- [63] S. Giannakis, S. Rtimi, C. Pulgarin, Light-Assisted Advanced Oxidation Processes for the Elimination of Chemical and Microbiological Pollution of Wastewaters in Developed and Developing Countries, *Molecules* 22 (2017) 1070.
- [64] T. Løgager, K. Sehested, J. Holcman, Rate constants of the equilibrium reactions $\text{SO}_3^- + \text{HNO}_3 \rightleftharpoons \text{HSO}_3^- + \text{NO}_3^-$ and $\text{SO}_3^- + \text{NO}_3^- \rightleftharpoons \text{SO}_2^- + \text{NO}_3^-$, *Radiation Physics and Chemistry* 41 (1993) 539-543.
- [65] M. Kwon, S. Kim, Y. Yoon, Y. Jung, T.-M. Hwang, J. Lee, J.-W. Kang, Comparative evaluation of ibuprofen removal by UV/H₂O₂ and UV/S₂O₈²⁻ processes for wastewater treatment, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 269 (2015) 379-390.
- [66] G.P. Anipsitakis, D.D. Dionysiou, Transition metal/UV-based advanced oxidation technologies for water decontamination, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental* 54 (2004) 155-163.
- [67] Y. Xiao, L. Zhang, W. Zhang, K.-Y. Lim, R.D. Webster, T.-T. Lim, Comparative evaluation of iodoacids removal by UV/persulfate and UV/H₂O₂ processes, *Water Research* 102 (2016) 629-639.
- [68] J. Deng, Y. Shao, N. Gao, S. Xia, C. Tan, S. Zhou, X. Hu, Degradation of the antiepileptic drug carbamazepine upon different UV-based advanced oxidation processes in water, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 222 (2013) 150-158.
- [69] O. Legrini, E. Oliveros, A.M. Braun, Photochemical processes for water treatment, *Chemical Reviews* 93 (1993) 671-698.
- [70] L. Zhou, M. Sleiman, C. Ferronato, J.-M. Chovelon, C. Richard, Reactivity of sulfate radicals with natural organic matters, *Environmental Chemistry Letters* 15 (2017) 733-737.
- [71] S. Miralles-Cuevas, D. Darowna, A. Wanag, S. Mozia, S. Malato, I. Oller, Comparison of UV/H₂O₂, UV/S₂O₈²⁻, solar/Fe(II)/H₂O₂ and solar/Fe(II)/S₂O₈²⁻ at pilot plant scale for the elimination of micro-contaminants in natural water: An economic assessment, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 310 (2017) 514-524.
- [72] H.V. Lutze, S. Bircher, I. Rapp, N. Kerlin, R. Bakkour, M. Geisler, C. von Sonntag, T.C. Schmidt, Degradation of Chlorotriazine Pesticides by Sulfate Radicals and the Influence of Organic Matter, *Environmental Science & Technology* 49 (2015) 1673-1680.
- [73] A. Adachi, T. Okano, Generation of Cyanide Ion by the Reaction of Hexamine and Losartan Potassium with Sodium Hypochlorite, *Journal of Health Science* 54 (2008) 581-583.
- [74] M. Isidori, M. Bellotta, M. Cangiano, A. Parrella, Estrogenic activity of pharmaceuticals in the aquatic environment, *Environment International* 35 (2009) 826-829.
- [75] H. Olvera-Vargas, N. Oturan, D. Buisson, E.D. van Hullebusch, M.A. Oturan, Electro-Oxidation of the Pharmaceutical Furosemide: Kinetics, Mechanism, and By-Products, *CLEAN – Soil, Air, Water* 43 (2015) 1455-1463.
- [76] N.S. Kudryasheva, T.V. Rozhko, Effect of low-dose ionizing radiation on luminous marine bacteria: radiation hormesis and toxicity, *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 142 (2015) 68-77.
- [77] V.L.K. Jennings, M.H. Rayner-Brandes, D.J. Bird, Assessing chemical toxicity with the bioluminescent photobacterium (*Vibrio fischeri*): a comparison of three commercial systems, *Water Research* 35 (2001) 3448-3456.
- [78] S. Rodriguez, A. Santos, A. Romero, Oxidation of priority and emerging pollutants with persulfate activated by iron: Effect of iron valence and particle size, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 318 (2017) 197-205.

- [79] A.G. Trovó, T.F.S. Silva, O. Gomes, A.E.H. Machado, W.B. Neto, P.S. Muller, D. Daniel, Degradation of caffeine by photo-Fenton process: Optimization of treatment conditions using experimental design, *Chemosphere* 90 (2013) 170-175.
- [80] E.P. da Costa, S.E.C. Bottrel, M.C.V.M. Starling, M.M.D. Leão, C.C. Amorim, Degradation of carbendazim in water via photo-Fenton in Raceway Pond Reactor: assessment of acute toxicity and transformation products, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* (2018).
- [81] C. Tan, N. Gao, Y. Deng, Y. Zhang, M. Sui, J. Deng, S. Zhou, Degradation of antipyrine by UV, UV/H₂O₂ and UV/PS, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 260 (2013) 1008-1016.
- [82] C. Richard, G. Guyot, A. Rivaton, O. Trubetskaya, O. Trubetskoj, L. Cavani, C. Ciavatta, Spectroscopic approach for elucidation of structural peculiarities of Andisol soil humic acid fractionated by SEC-PAGE setup, *Geoderma* 142 (2007) 210-216.
- [83] A. Paul, R. Stösser, A. Zehl, E. Zwirnmann, R.D. Vogt, C.E.W. Steinberg, Nature and Abundance of Organic Radicals in Natural Organic Matter: Effect of pH and Irradiation, *Environmental Science & Technology* 40 (2006) 5897-5903.
- [84] U. Kalsoom, S.S. Ashraf, M.A. Meetani, M.A. Rauf, H.N. Bhatti, Degradation and kinetics of H₂O₂ assisted photochemical oxidation of Remazol Turquoise Blue, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 200 (2012) 373-379.
- [85] Y. Wang, F.A. Roddick, L. Fan, Direct and indirect photolysis of seven micropollutants in secondary effluent from a wastewater lagoon, *Chemosphere* 185 (2017) 297-308.
- [86] Y.-H. Guan, J. Ma, D.-K. Liu, Z.-f. Ou, W. Zhang, X.-L. Gong, Q. Fu, J.C. Crittenden, Insight into chloride effect on the UV/peroxymonosulfate process, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 352 (2018) 477-489.
- [87] R.G. Zepp, J. Hoigne, H. Bader, Nitrate-induced photooxidation of trace organic chemicals in water, *Environmental Science & Technology* 21 (1987) 443-450.
- [88] G.-D. Fang, D.D. Dionysiou, Y. Wang, S.R. Al-Abed, D.-M. Zhou, Sulfate radical-based degradation of polychlorinated biphenyls: Effects of chloride ion and reaction kinetics, *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 227-228 (2012) 394-401.
- [89] L. Patiny, A. Borel, ChemCalc: a building block for tomorrow's chemical infrastructure, *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (2013).
- [90] I. Dalmázio, L.S. Santos, R.P. Lopes, M.N. Eberlin, R. Augusti, Advanced Oxidation of Caffeine in Water: On-Line and Real-Time Monitoring by Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry, *Environmental Science & Technology* 39 (2005) 5982-5988.

953

954

955

956 Figure 1. Photolysis (UV-C_{254nm}) of LP (2.2 μM), FRSM (3.0 μM), CAF (5.2 μM),
 957 and CBZ (5.5 μM) in ultrapure water at acidic, natural (non-adjusted), and basic
 958 pH ($I_0 = 2.54 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, volume 3.5 mL) as a function of incident energy per area
 959 (mJ cm^{-2}).

Figure 2. Left: Degradation of each target compound by UV-C AOPs: UV-C/H₂O₂ and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻. Control experiments are also presented (UV-C photolysis, H₂O₂, or S₂O₈²⁻ alone). Molar ratio of H₂O₂ or S₂O₈²⁻: compound = 20:1 for LP, FRSM, and CAF, and 32:1 for CBZ; I₀ = 2.41 J m⁻² s⁻¹. Right: consumption (%) of

H_2O_2 ($C_0 = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$), $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ ($C_0 = 10^{-3} \text{ M}$), and pH values monitored during UV-C AOPs for each of the target compounds, as functions of incident energy per unit area (mJ cm^{-2}).

Figure 3. Acute toxicity of samples withdrawn during the degradation of target compounds via UV-C, UV-C/ H_2O_2 , and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ processes, shown as functions of the total incident energy received (mJ cm^{-2}). The horizontal lines

represent the threshold of 1.21 a.T.u.; bars crossing the line thus indicate toxic samples.

Figure 4. Degradation of LP, FRSM, CAF, and CBZ (10 μ M each) in ultra-pure water and surface water by UV-C, UV-C/H₂O₂, and UV-C/S₂O₈²⁻ processes ($C_{O_2H_2O_2}$ or $S_2O_8^{2-}$ = 10⁻³ M), shown as functions of total incident energy per area (mJ

cm⁻²).

Figure 5. Reagent consumption and TOC removal during UV-C AOPs in surface water (filled symbols) and pure water (empty symbols), as functions of total incident energy per area (mJ cm⁻²) (Initial TOC in pure water 5.4 mg L⁻¹ and in surface water 6.6 mg L⁻¹).

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044 Figure 6. Mass spectra of (A) Caffeine solution in pure water, (B and D) signals
1045 corresponding to masses detected during UV-C/ H_2O_2 and UV-C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$
1046 treatments, and (C and E) mass spectra obtained after UV-C/ H_2O_2 and UV-
1047 C/ $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ treatments with 300 mJ cm⁻² of total incident energy.

Figure 7. Degradation pathway proposed for the formation of transformation products generated during the oxidation of caffeine via UV-C/H₂O₂

1051

1052

1053