

Magnetic Hollow Buoyant Alginate Beads
Achieving Rapid Remediation of Oil
Contamination on Water

Satya Candra Wibawa Sakti, Rizki Ainuna Wijaya,
Nindayu Indrasari, Mochamad Zakki Fahmi, Alfa
Akustia Widati, Abdulloh, Nuryono, Chun-Hu
Chen



PII: S2213-3437(20)31284-7

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2020.104935>

Reference: JECE104935

To appear in: *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*

Received date: 22 October 2020

Revised date: 5 December 2020

Accepted date: 9 December 2020

Please cite this article as: Satya Candra Wibawa Sakti, Rizki Ainuna Wijaya, Nindayu Indrasari, Mochamad Zakki Fahmi, Alfa Akustia Widati, Abdulloh, Nuryono and Chun-Hu Chen, Magnetic Hollow Buoyant Alginate Beads Achieving Rapid Remediation of Oil Contamination on Water, *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, (2020)
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2020.104935>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Magnetic Hollow Buoyant Alginate Beads Achieving Rapid Remediation of Oil Contamination on Water

Satya Candra Wibawa Sakti^{a,b,*}, Rizki Ainuna Wijaya^a, Nindayu Indrasari^a, Mochamad Zakki Fahmi^{a,b,*}, Alfa Akustia Widati^{a,b}, Abdulloh^{a,b}, Nuryono^c and Chun-Hu Chen^d

^a Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science and Technology, Universitas Airlangga, Campus C, Mulyorejo, Surabaya 60115, Indonesia

^b Supramodification Nano-Micro Engineering Research Group, Universitas Airlangga, Campus C, Mulyorejo, Surabaya 60115, Indonesia

^c Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Sekip Utara, Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia

^d Department of Chemistry, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaoshiung 80424, Taiwan

* Corresponding authors:

Satya Candra Wibawa Sakti, E-mail: satya.sakti@fst.unair.ac.id; Tel/Fax: +62-31-5922427

Mochamad Zakki Fahmi, E-mail: m.zakki.fahmi@fst.unair.ac.id; Tel/Fax: +62-31-5922427

Abstract

Oil spills are a worldwide concern because of their negative impact on the environment. Thus, the development of simple yet effective methods for oil pollution remediation remains a significant global challenge. Of remediation techniques for oil removal, those involving adsorption are superior, but most reported adsorbents sink in water and are, consequently, difficult to collect after adsorption, generating secondary pollution. Thus, we developed magnetic maleic anhydride–alginate graphene oxide hollow beads (GO-MAGB-MA). Here, we report the characterization of GO-MAGB-MA, involving scanning electron microscopy, energy dispersive X-ray spectrometry, Raman spectroscopy, Fourier transform infrared

spectroscopy, thermogravimetric analysis, and vibrating sample magnetometry. The experimental data fit the pseudo-second order kinetic model, having a chi-squared (χ^2) ≤ 0.0069 , average relative error (ARE) ≤ 0.4094 , and coefficient of determination (R^2) ≥ 0.9998 , and the Freundlich isotherm, having $\chi^2 \leq 3.33 \times 10^{-4}$, ARE ≤ 0.2349 , and $R^2 \geq 0.9966$, indicating that removal of oil was the rate-limiting step on heterogenous multilayer system. In comparison with other previous reported adsorbents, the GO-MAGB-MA shows superiority in term of adsorption process which was pH independent, rapid equilibrium adsorption and high adsorption capacity. GO-MAGB-MA also remained buoyant and magneto-responsive during adsorption process made it easy to be-recollected and regenerated while other reported adsorbents tend to sink during adsorption, and difficult to be re-recollected and ended as secondary pollutants. For future application, Combination with other technologies such as skimmer and continuous column adsorption experiment can be conducted for larger-scale oily water remediation.

Keywords: oil spill; alginate; magnetite; graphene oxide; buoyant; remediation

1. Introduction

The release of oil-contaminated water into the marine environment by human activities or natural disasters causes long-term environmental catastrophes. To minimize the detrimental effects of oil spills on the environment and economy, immediate action is required. The risk of oil spills has increased as the exploration, transportation, and consumption of petroleum have grown, and serious contamination of the marine environment and aquatic biota has occurred. In March 1989, grounding of the Exxon Valdez (an oil tanker owned by Exxon Shipping Company) resulted in the contamination of the Prince William Sound with at least 35,500 t of crude oil that eventually spread to the Gulf of Alaska area [1]. In 2010, the Deepwater Horizon accident contaminated the Gulf of Mexico with around 500,000 m³ of

crude oil, making it the second largest oil spill disaster after the Gulf War (1991) crude oil spill in the Persian Gulf, Kuwait [2,3].

A key problem is that untreated oil spills spread rapidly in the aquatic environment, resulting in contamination over a large area. Chemically, petroleum oil consists of straight and branched hydrocarbons, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, porphyrins, tar, and wax, which cause various levels of toxicity to humans and marine environments, including cytotoxicity, carcinogenicity, genotoxicity, and teratogenicity [4]. The layer of oil also forms a barrier that prevents sunlight and O_2 from penetrating deeper areas of water, which can disturb photosynthesis and plant growth.

Consequently, environmental scientists have attempted to develop technology to reduce the catastrophic impact of oil spills. Remediation technologies, including bioremediation [5], chemical dispersants [6], booms and skimmers [7,8], in situ burning [9], and adsorption [10,11] have been reported. Among them, adsorption is the most applicable technique because of its excellent adsorption capacity, simplicity, and cost-effectiveness. Adsorption techniques is reported as an effective method not only for oil removal but also for other types of pollutant such as heavy metal ion [12,13] and dyes [14]. A high removal rate can be achieved by placing an adsorbent in contact with the oil on the water surface. Several reports have described the development of conventional adsorbents for oil spill remediation, for example, chitosan [15], clay [16,17] and char [18]. Furthermore, to reduce costs, bio-materials including rice husks and banana and orange peels have also been explored [19]. However, some adsorbents sink in water, preventing effective contact with the oil on the water surface and making post-treatment separation difficult, thus resulting in seabed contamination.

As a potential adsorbent, graphene oxide (GO) has received considerable interest considering its high thermal and mechanical stability, high surface area, and high adsorption

site density. Generally, GO is prepared by the chemical oxidation of graphite, as reported by Hummer and Offeman [20], whose technique was subsequently optimized by changing the reaction time, temperature, chemicals, or routes [21–24]. GO is an amphiphilic substance because of its (i) hydrophilic oxygen-bearing moieties, including hydroxyl, epoxy, and carboxyl groups, at the edges and basal layers and (ii) hydrophobic polyaromatic of unoxidized benzene rings. This amphiphilicity enables GO to interact with various pollutants, making it suitable for water desalination [25] and the removal of heavy metal ions, dyes [26], and organic toxic and hazardous substances [27]. Despite its advantages, the intense inter-layer attraction results in the agglomeration and restacking of GO. Moreover, post-adsorption collection is challenging. This is achieved conventionally by filtration or centrifugation, but these techniques are not feasible for large scale contamination. However, the magnetic separation of adsorbent has been highlighted as a promising solution.

The introduction of magnetic particles such as Fe_3O_4 to conventional adsorbents endows magnetic properties. Fe_3O_4 is a common soft magnetic material, being easily magnetized and demagnetized. Structurally, in Fe_3O_4 , half the Fe^{3+} ions fill the tetrahedral sites and the other half of the Fe^{3+} ions join with Fe^{2+} to occupy octahedral sites, forming an inverse spinel crystal structure with cubic symmetry. Fe_3O_4 can be synthesized by hydrothermal methods, thermal decomposition, and co-precipitation, but the latter technique is the most common because of its simplicity. Crucially, Fe_3O_4 -based magnetic adsorbents are promising because of their magnetic properties and have been extensively used for the detoxification of polluted water; in particular, they have short separation time and do not generate secondary pollution [28–31]. Further, regeneration is favorable because loss of the magnetic adsorbent is avoided.

Fe_3O_4 -based adsorbents can also be encapsulated in a polymeric matrix to prevent oxidation, which leads to the loss of magnetic properties, and increase adsorption [17,30,32–

34]. Furthermore, dissolution of Fe_3O_4 in an acidic environment during adsorption can be avoided because of the protective matrix.

Alginate consists of a homopolymer unit of 1,4-connected (α -L-guluronic acid) (G block) and (β -D-mannuronic acid) (M block) and can be extracted from brown algae cell walls [35] or synthesized by bacteria [36]. The carboxylic groups of alginate can be crosslinked with divalent ions formed a unique “egg-box” like structure hydrogel with biocompatible, nontoxic, and biodegradable features [37]. These properties make alginate and alginate-based materials attractive for adsorbent preparation. In particular, the free carboxyl and hydroxyl groups on G and M blocks are responsible for electrostatic and complexation interactions with various toxic substances. Alginate is a natural polysaccharide that is suitable for Fe_3O_4 encapsulation.

Herein, floating magnetic alginate–GO hollow beads were prepared via simple ionic gelation in the presence of Ca^{2+} as a crosslinker and CaCO_3 and NaHCO_3 as cavity templates, followed by modification with maleic anhydride (MA), yielding a magnetic adsorbent for surface oil removal. GO-MAGB-MA showed efficient removal performance because of its flotation, which increased direct solid–liquid contact with the oil layer on the water surface. Static batch adsorption experiments were carried out to investigate the effects of contact time and initial pH and oil concentration on oil adsorption in freshwater and seawater. Several isothermal and kinetic models were used to fit the experimental data and determine the removal mechanism. The flotation and adsorption–desorption stability were also assessed to evaluate suitability for real oil-contaminated seawater remediation. The floating magnetic alginate–GO hollow beads modified with maleic anhydride remained floating for 30 days, were easily collected with an external magnet, and removed oil from seawater for 20 adsorption–desorption without loss in adsorptive performance, floatability, or magnetic collectability. Based on our knowledge, the study of self-floating alginate-based

magnetic adsorbents has not been conducted for the removal of oil from the surface of seawater. The buoyancy, collectability, recyclability, and magneto-responsiveness are key features of GO-MAGB-MA that make it an attractive adsorbent for oil-contaminated water remediation in comparison with other reported adsorbents. This report will also provide easy method on removal of oil from the surface of freshwater and seawater simply by applying magnetic field.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Materials

Pro-analysis grade materials were applied in this experiment without any additional purification. Sodium alginate ($\text{Na}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_6\text{O}_6)_n$, 300-400 cP), sodium bicarbonate (NaHCO_3 , 99,7%), hydrochloric acid (HCl , 37%), acetic acid (CH_3COOH , 98%), sodium hydroxide (NaOH , 97%), phosphorus pentoxide (P_2O_5 , 99%), potassium permanganate (KMnO_4 , >99%), and acetone ($\text{C}_3\text{H}_6\text{O}$, 99,5%) were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich, Germany. Maleic anhydride ($\text{C}_4\text{H}_2\text{O}_3$, 99%), calcium chloride ($\text{CaCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 100%), ethanol ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{OH}$, 97%), and sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4 , 98%) were purchased from Merck, Germany. Magnetite (Fe_3O_4) was obtained from Kishida Chemical Co., Ltd. (Japan). Graphite flakes were supplied by Alfa Aesar (Taiwan), and calcium carbonate (CaCO_3 , 99,5%) was purchased from Wako (Japan). Hexane (C_6H_{14} , 99,0%) was supplied by Fulltime (China). Crude oil with ρ value of 0.7973 and η value of 0.88 cP was used as adsorbate in adsorption experiments. Artificial seawater was prepared by dissolving seawater salt (Marine Art SF-1, Tomita Pharmaceutical Co.,Ltd, Japan) in deionized water and its chemical composition is presented in Table 1.

2.2. Entrapment of GO in floating magnetic alginate gel hollow beads

GO was obtained by the exfoliation of graphite in “preformed acidic oxidizing medium” (PAOM), as reported previously [38]. GO was added to deionized water and sonicated for 4 h to obtain a GO dispersion. Sodium alginate powder (0.75 g) was dissolved in 50 mL of deionized water at room temperature with continuous stirring until all was dissolved. The GO dispersion, magnetite, NaHCO_3 , and CaCO_3 were added to the sodium alginate solution and mixed until homogeneous. The resulting black, viscous suspension was then left at room temperature overnight to remove trapped air bubbles. The suspension was forced through a micropipette tip into 500 mL of 5 wt.% CaCl_2 solution, maintained for 24 h with gentle stirring, and washed with demineralized water several times. The obtained black beads were then immersed in 300 mL of 6% CH_3COOH solution overnight and washed with demineralized water several times. The product is GO-MAGB. MAGB was synthesized in a similar manner without the addition of GO addition.

2.3. Anchoring of the maleic anhydride moiety.

GO-MAGB-MA was prepared by placing GO-MAGB in contact with MA in acetone. Briefly, GO-MAGB was immersed in acetone with gentle stirring overnight to remove water inside the beads. The acetone-washed GO-MAGB was then immersed in gently stirred 0.05 M maleic anhydride in acetone solution for 30 min. The temperature of the mixture was then increased to 50 °C and maintained at this temperature for 3 h to complete the esterification reaction. Finally, the beads were washed with acetone, ethanol, and demineralized water and lyophilized. MAGB-MA was prepared in a similar manner using MAGB instead of GO-MAGB. The preparation of GO-MAGB and its modification with MA are illustrated in Scheme 1.

2.4. Methods

X-ray diffraction analysis of GO was performed using X-ray diffractometry (X-Pert MPD, Philips, Germany) from $2\theta = 5^\circ$ to 90° at 5° min^{-1} with Cu-K_α radiation ($\lambda = 1.54443 \text{ \AA}$). Raman spectra were recorded at a wavelength of 532 nm on a Raman spectrometer (InVia Raman, Renishaw, UK). The thickness of the prepared GO sheets was measured using atomic force microscopy (AFM, Dimension Icon, Bruker, Germany) in ScanAsyst mode. The morphology was investigated using scanning electron microscopy (SEM, FlexSEM-1000, Hitachi, Japan), energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy, and transmission electron microscopy (TEM, JEM-1400 JEOL, Japan). The magnetic properties of magnetic beads were examined under a magnetic field ranging from -8000 to 8000 Oe at room temperature on a vibrating sample magnetoanalyzer (Lake Shore 7400 series, USA). The bead size was measured using a digital caliper (Krisbow, Indonesia). Functional groups were identified by Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy (IRTracer-100, Shimadzu, Japan) using the KBr disk method from 4000 to 400 cm^{-1} with resolution 4 cm^{-1} . The thermal stability was determined using thermogravimetric analysis (TGA, TGA-4000, Perkin Elmer, USA). For these measurements, the samples were heated under continuous flow of N_2 at a heating rate of $5^\circ \text{C min}^{-1}$ to 900°C .

2.5. Swelling and flotation

For the swelling tests, a gram of lyophilized magnetic hollow bead was soaked in freshwater and seawater for 24 h. The swelled beads were collected using a magnet. The diameter before and after soaking were recorded. Flotation experiments were conducted by soaking 50 of lyophilized magnetic hollow beads in freshwater and seawater for 30 d. The

swelling degree (SD) and flotation degree (FD) of the magnetic hollow beads were calculated using Eqs. (1) and (2).

$$SD\% = \frac{\phi_w - \phi_d}{\phi_d} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

$$FD\% = \frac{n_{30}}{n_0} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

Here, ϕ_w and ϕ_d are the diameters of the wet and dry magnetic hollow beads, respectively, and n_0 and n_{30} are the numbers of floating beads at the start and after 30 d. For accuracy, swelling and flotation experiments were conducted in triplicate.

2.6. Use and reusability

Batch adsorption experiments of oil-contaminated freshwater and seawater was performed by placing 0.015 g of MAGB, MAGB-MA, or GO-MAGB-MA in contact with 15 mL deionized water or seawater containing 66.67 g L⁻¹ of oil. The influence of initial pH was examined by regulating the pH of the water–oil mixture with 0.01 mol L⁻¹ NaOH or HCl solution. For the analysis of the removal kinetics, the contact time with the water–oil mixture varied from 5 to 120 min. The adsorption data were then simulated with non-linearized pseudo-first order (PFO), pseudo-second-order (PSO), Elovich, and linear intraparticle diffusion (IPD) kinetic models. The adsorption isothermal behavior was studied with oil concentrations ranging from 40 to 120 g L⁻¹, and the Freundlich, Langmuir, Sips, and Redlich–Peterson (R-P) isotherms were employed to evaluate the adsorption data. The adsorption capacities of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA at equilibrium (q_e , g of oil/g of adsorbent) were computed using Eq. (3).

$$q_e = \frac{(m_0 - m_e)}{m_a} \quad (3)$$

Here, m_0 and m_e are the initial oil mass and equilibrium oil mass in solution (g), respectively, and m_a is the mass (g) of MAGB, MAGB-MA, or GO-MAGB-MA.

To estimate the reusability of the spent MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA, beads were loaded with oil in 20 mL of a mixture of 100 g L⁻¹ of oil in deionized water or seawater at pH 6 equilibrated on a mechanical shaker at room temperature for 2 h at 100 rpm. The oil-loaded beads were collected using a magnet and treated with n-hexane. Subsequently, the regenerated beads were sonicated in hexane, ethanol, and water several times before the next cycle. The regeneration of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA was carried out over 20 adsorption–desorption cycles in deionized water or seawater.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Physical characteristics of as-prepared GO

The morphology and topography of GO were observed using SEM-EDX, and TEM. As shown in Fig. 1, the obtained GO has an irregular, layer-like shape with a wrinkled surface. EDX analysis, as can be seen in Fig. 1(b), revealed the elemental composition of GO to be 47% carbon and 53% oxygen. No trace elements were detected. A high oxygen/carbon ratio indicates the presence of oxygen-bearing functional groups on the surface of the carbon structure. A high oxygen content affects the folding of the GO layers, as shown in the TEM micrograph (Fig. 1(c-d)). TEM analysis confirmed the thin layer structure, which is visible as a transparent area. The darker area corresponds to stacked or folded GO layers induced by the high content of oxygen, as quantified by EDX analysis. The morphology and topography of GO were then further analyzed using AFM, and the results are presented in Fig. 2 (a-b). The 3D-AFM micrograph shows that the maximum height of GO was 8 nm, and it was relatively flat.



Fig. 2 (c) shows the Raman spectra of GO, showing the D, G, 2D, and D + G bands at 1348.69, 1595.49, 2543.45, and 2956.42 cm⁻¹, respectively. The D band corresponds to the

sp^3 -hybridized carbon bonds in GO arising from basal/edge defects or imperfection of its crystal structure, whereas the G band is associated with ordered sp^2 -hybridized carbon bonds in hexagonal graphitic structures such as graphene and its derivatives. The 2D band indicates agglomeration or stacking of GO layers. The defects in the as-prepared GO can be estimated from the ratio of the G and D band intensities (I_D/I_G). We obtained a value of 0.956, which suggests that the as-prepared GO has many defects in the layers.

X-ray diffractometry was used to determine the crystal structure of the obtained Fe_3O_4 and GO. As shown in Fig. 2(d), diffraction peaks associated to (220), (311), (400), (422), (511) and (440) plane are observed in diffractogram which indicated Fe_3O_4 spinel with cubic structure (JCPDS, No 79-0418). A significant peak is detected at $2\theta = 10.02^\circ$ (Fig. 1(f)), which corresponds to the GO (001) plane. The diffraction peak at $2\theta = 10.02^\circ$ indicates intraplanar spacing and crystallite size of 0.8992 and 2.1782 nm, respectively. The number of GO layers was found to be 2 or 3, suggesting stacked layers, as confirmed by TEM and AFM.

3.2. SEM and EDX analysis of GO-MAGB-MA

The magnetic alginate hollow beads were synthesized using $CaCO_3$ and $NaHCO_3$ as the cavity template. The carbonates were dispersed in an alginate solution containing Fe_3O_4 or a combination of Fe_3O_4 and GO. After the Ca^{2+} crosslinking step, carbonates were removed from the beads by immersion in weak acid, leaving a hollow structure, as shown by the reactions in Eqs. (4) and (5).



Acetic acid was used instead of a strong acid to prevent the dissolution of Fe_3O_4 . Initially, the beads sank, but, after carbonate removal, they floated to the surface. Thus, the formation of

an internal cavity resulted in buoyant magnetic alginate beads. The preparation method is illustrated in Scheme 1.

The average diameters of the as-prepared MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA beads are presented in Table 2. The incorporation of GO, followed by MA modification, slightly increased the bead diameter compared to those of the bare magnetic alginate hollow beads (MAGB). The microstructures of the MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA beads were studied by SEM analysis of individual lyophilized beads. The interior structure was evaluated by cutting the beads in half. Fig. 3 shows that MAGB has a smooth surface with folds, whereas MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA have relatively rough surfaces, making them suitable for modification with MA and GO. Additional smaller cavities can also be observed in the interior of MAGB. In contrast, the walls of GO-MAGB-MA are denser, and there are fewer small cavities because of the presence of GO. EDX mapping analyses (Fig. 4) were carried out to obtain the elemental distribution. C, O, and Fe were detected in the outer and inner surfaces of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA. The carbon content on the surface of MAGB increased by approximately 1.5% after MA modification (MAGB-MA) and 2.4% after the incorporation of GO followed by MA modification. Although EDX analysis cannot distinguish the source of carbon (i.e., alginate, GO, or MA), the increased carbon content is likely a result of MA modification and GO incorporation. A signal corresponding to Ca was detected, indicating the presence of the crosslinker Ca^{2+} and residual Ca^{2+} from the dissolution of carbonates in the internal and external parts of the magnetic alginate hollow beads.

3.3. FTIR spectroscopy

Characterization of material and its derivatives by infrared spectroscopy is essential to be conducted in order to obtain information related to the presence of organic groups [39].

The synthesis of the magnetic alginate hollow beads, incorporation of GO, and modification with MA were confirmed from the FTIR spectra of Fe_3O_4 , GO, MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA between 4000 and 400 cm^{-1} . As shown in Fig. 5(a), in the spectrum of Fe_3O_4 , a band at 3630 cm^{-1} associated with the O-H stretching of physically adsorbed water molecules was observed. In addition, bands corresponding to Fe-O stretching in the tetrahedral and octahedral sites of spinel ferrite were observed at 584 and 445 cm^{-1} , respectively. The FTIR spectrum of GO showed bands at 3603, 1739, 1602, and 1421 cm^{-1} , which can be assigned to O-H, carbonyl, epoxy C-O and the C=C sp^2 carbon network, and C-OH stretching vibrations, respectively. After the addition of alginate to Fe_3O_4 , extra bands at 1627, 1427, and 1018 cm^{-1} were observed. The bands at 1627 and 1427 cm^{-1} are associated with the C=O stretching vibrations (Lv et al., 2017), and the C-O vibration of the pyranose ring appear at 1018 cm^{-1} , indicating the successful coating of Fe_3O_4 by alginate. The modification of MAGB resulting in MAGB-MA was confirmed by the appearance of bands at 1816 and 1739 cm^{-1} associated with carbonyl symmetric and asymmetric stretches in MA. A similar pattern can also be observed in the FTIR spectra of GO-MAGB-MA with additional changes. The band at approximately 1600 cm^{-1} in the FTIR spectra of GO-MAGB-MA associated with the C=O vibration of the -COOH group became stronger, indicating the formation of hydrogen bonds between the -COOH group of the alginate backbone and the -COOH group of GO.

3.4. Effect of GO and MA on thermal stability

Next, TGA/DTG of MAGB, MAGB-MA GO-MAGB, and GO-MAGB-MA was carried out and the results are presented in Fig. 5(b-c). The TGA/DTG curves of Fe_3O_4 is relatively constant from room temperature to 800 °C, indicating high thermal stability. In contrast, non-magnetic AGB lost most of its mass during heating. The TGA/DTG curves of MAGB,

MAGB-MA, GO-MAGB, and GO-MAGB-MA are similar because of the shared alginate backbone.

Non-magnetic AGB decomposed around 10.62% at 192.7 °C of its mass because of water evaporation whereas MAGB and GO-MAGB lost around 7% of their masses at slightly higher temperature (196.88 °C). The MA-modified beads (MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA) showed lower mass loss (only around 2%) at higher temperature (201.35°C) than those of the unmodified beads (MAGB and GO-MAGB), suggesting that the MA moiety and GO increased the thermostability at this temperature. Around 20–22% of the masses of MAGB, MAGB-MA, GO-MAGB, and GO-MAGB-MA were lost in the second stage which is half that of AGB (around 47%) due to thermal-decomposition of alginate bead walls at 200–350 °C via pyranose ring opening, disintegration of the GO structure, and fragmentation of alginate–MA bonds [41]. The thermostability of Fe_3O_4 in MAGB, MAGB-MA, GO-MAGB, and GO-MAGB-MA is the main cause of this. At the carbonization stage, all beads lost 31–38% of their masses, whereas the non-magnetic AGB retained only 25% of its initial mass. The GO-containing beads (GO-MAGB and GO-MAGB-MA) showed smaller mass loss at this stage in comparison with the beads without GO addition (MAGB and MAGB-MA), indicating that GO increased thermostability at this temperature. The MAGB rapidly carbonized at 613.44 °C while GO-MAGB-MA carbonized at higher temperature (705.49 °C) which indicated that the GO-MAGB-MA was more thermally stable than GO-MAGB-MA. The TGA/DTG results show that the obtained magnetic hollow beads are thermostable below 150 °C, which is compatible with real conditions.

3.5. Vibrating sample magnetometry analysis

Magnetization analysis was performed at 8000 Oe at room temperature, and the magnetization ($M-H$) curves and parameters of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA are

shown in Fig. 6(a) and listed in Table 2, respectively. MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA achieved magnetization saturation in the applied external magnetic field. The M_s of GO-MAGB-MA is lower than those of MAGB and MAGB-MA because of the greater non-magnetic content in GO-MAGB-MA. Magnetite (Fe_3O_4) particles in the bead structure endow the magnetic behavior, whereas the alginate network, GO, and MA layers are non-magnetic and shield the Fe_3O_4 core, decreasing its magnetic performance in an applied magnetic field. However, MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA were paramagnetic, enabling collection using an external magnetic field as shown in Fig. 6(b-d), as reported for other magnetic materials coated with various matrices [14,30,42].

3.6. GO- and MA-dependent swelling and self-floating properties

Generally, alginate-based hydrogels swell in water; therefore, we investigated the effect of modification with GO and MA on the swelling of beads. Bare magnetic hollow beads with no GO or MA swelled significantly in freshwater and more so in seawater. With increase in GO content, the SD decreased because GO restricted the movement of the alginate backbone in the bead structure, and modification with MA further decreased the SD because MA bridges the M and G blocks in alginate via ester formation, resulting in a rigid, stable bead structure. As shown in Fig. 6(e), magnetic hollow beads with low GO contents had higher SD values in seawater than in freshwater. A high concentration of Na^+ and other monovalent ions in seawater replace the Ca^{2+} in the magnetic hollow beads by weakening the ion exchange mechanism and increasing bead size [43]. However, the addition of GO following MA modification can prevent such ion exchange by minimizing the movement of alginate and release of Ca^{2+} , resulting in unchanged bead size. Interestingly, magnetic hollow beads with 2-4% GO modified with MA remained floating after 30 days, unlike 0% and 1% GO beads, and most of the beads without GO and MA sank in the bottom of water as shown in Fig. 6(f).

The addition of a higher content of GO followed by MA modification helps the magnetic hollow beads maintain their initial shape and size in freshwater and seawater; thus, excess swelling and collapse can be avoided. Thus, GO addition and MA modification improved the swelling and floating properties of magnetic hollow beads.

3.7. Oil adsorption performance

3.7.1. Effect of pH

In oil spill remediation, the pH of the oil–water mixture has a strong impact on the adsorption efficiency, affecting not only the adsorption rate and capacity but also the adsorbent–mixture interface behavior. Thus, the amounts of oil adsorbed by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA at pH 3 to 10 at room temperature in freshwater and seawater were determined. As shown in Fig. 7(a,b), pH had little effect on oil adsorption by GO-MAGB-MA in freshwater and seawater, having a maximum adsorption capacity at pH 6; thus, the pH and salinity of water have little impact on the removal of oil, suggesting that non-electrostatic interactions are key to the removal mechanism. As shown in inset of Fig. 6(b-d), GO-MAGB-MA has a higher water contact angle in comparison with that of MAGB and MAGB-MA, demonstrating that GO-MAGB-MA is more hydrophobic than of MAGB and MAGB-MA. The non-oxidized basal plane of GO has been reported to attract oil through hydrophobic interactions [44]. Moreover, this interaction was improved by the presence of an MA layer in the beads. Thus, GO-MAGB-MA exhibited higher oil removal performance. This result indicates that the combination of GO and MA modification improved the adsorption capacity and pH tolerance of magnetic hollow beads in freshwater and seawater media. At pH > 10, the presence of a higher concentration of NaOH hydrolyzed oil by reaction with the acidic long hydrocarbon chain of oil. Therefore, to avoid saponification, adsorption at pH > 10 was not conducted.

3.7.2. Effect of contact time

The effect of contact time on the removal of oil by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA in freshwater and seawater was investigated using batch adsorption experiments at contact times of 5–120 min. The initial shaking speed, pH, and initial oil concentration, were maintained at 100 rpm, 6, and 66.67 g L⁻¹, respectively. As shown in Fig. 7(c,d), the amount of oil adsorbed by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA in seawater increased rapidly and reached equilibrium within 30 min, and there was no significant increased oil removal from 30 to 120 min. In the initial stages of adsorption, there are a large number of binding sites for oil. As these sites are saturated with oil, the rate of adsorption falls and equilibrium is achieved, i.e., the flat area in Fig. 7(c,d). This behavior was also observed for MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA in freshwater with no significant differences in adsorption capacity and equilibrium time. The time to equilibrium adsorption in freshwater and seawater was relatively short, making them promising agents for rapid oil adsorption.

3.7.3. Initial oil concentration dependence

In addition to contact time, the initial oil concentration was varied to understand how equilibrium was reached, as well as to determine the adsorption capacities. Batch adsorption experiments were conducted at pH 6 and a shaking speed of 100 rpm using a 1 g L⁻¹ adsorbent dose. The initial oil concentration was 40–120 g L⁻¹, and, to ensure that equilibrium was achieved, a contact time of 120 min was selected (although 30 min are adequate based on kinetic analysis). As shown in Fig. 8, in the low oil concentration range, the removal of oil from seawater by GO-MAGB-MA increased steadily as the initial concentration of oil increased. At higher initial concentrations of oil, the adsorption capacity

was reduced, and equilibrium was reached. A high ratio of vacant binding sites to oil molecules is responsible for the rapid increase in the adsorbed capacity of GO-MAGB-MA at low initial oil concentrations. At equilibrium, the binding sites were fully occupied, so the amount of oil adsorbed from the mixture became steady and no more oil molecules could be accommodated by GO-MAGB-MA. Because of the abundance of active binding sites, GO-MAGB-MA adsorbed more oil molecules than MAGB and MAGB-MA. Fig. 8 shows that the removal of oil in freshwater by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA followed a similar pattern, indicating that salinity had little effect on oil removal.

3.7.4. Kinetic modeling and effect of water type

The adsorption kinetics is controlled by complex, simultaneous processes involving mass transfer, diffusion, and the formation of physico-chemical interactions. To determine the mechanism of oil adsorption by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA, four kinetic models were used: PFO [45], PSO [46], Elovich [47], and IPD [48].

The simulated data with non-linearized PFO, PSO, Elovich, and linear IPD kinetic model are shown in Fig. 7(c-f) and all obtained kinetic parameters are listed in Table 3. The fitting of experimental data obtained for oil adsorption in freshwater and seawater to the PSO and Elovich models resulted in high ARE and χ^2 values and low R^2 values, demonstrating that neither model describes the oil adsorption mechanism by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA well. Contrarily, low ARE and χ^2 and high R^2 values were obtained by fitting the experimental data to the PSO model, suggesting that adsorption is the rate-limiting step. As shown in Table 3, the K_{PSO} for adsorption in seawater are only slightly different with K_{PSO} obtained from adsorption in freshwater, implying that the water type gives insignificant impact on adsorption rate.

In the IPD studies (Fig. 7(e,f)), two-stage oil adsorption was observed for MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA in freshwater and seawater. First, there is a rapid adsorption rate resulting in a sharp increase in adsorbed oil. Here, the oil passes through the boundary layer and occupies binding sites on the surfaces of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA. Adsorption rates are relatively slow in the second stage because of the interparticle diffusion of oil within the pores of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA; finally, equilibrium is reached. Thus, a two-stage mechanism for oil removal by MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA occurred via surface film adsorption followed by interparticle diffusion. The short time to equilibrium in freshwater and seawater is attractive from a practical and economic point of view, indicating that the application of the as-prepared magnetic hollow beads could be scaled up.

3.7.5. Isothermal studies of the effect of GO and MA at different temperatures

Isotherm modeling to understand the relationship between oil adsorption and the adsorption capacity of MAGB, MAGB-MA, and GO-MAGB-MA was carried out. Several isotherms have been developed, including the two-parameter Langmuir [49] and Freundlich [50] and three-parameters R-P [51] and Sips models. The non-linearized plot of all isotherms are presented in Fig. 5, and the calculated R^2 , χ^2 , and ARE as well as all isotherm parameters are listed in Table S1. The suitability of each model was determined by considering R^2 , χ^2 , and ARE values. At 25 °C, the Freundlich isotherm yielded the highest R^2 and lowest χ^2 and ARE values in freshwater and seawater, indicating that oil adsorption occurs via a multilayer mechanism on the heterogenous MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA surfaces. Because of the absence of GO and MA as additional adsorption site, adsorption on the MAGB surface followed the Langmuir model. Overall, based on R^2 , χ^2 , and ARE values, the data fit the isotherms in order: Freundlich > Sips > Langmuir > Redlich–Peterson (R-P)

for MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA. For MAGB, the order is $\text{Langmuir} > \text{Sips} > \text{Freundlich} > \text{Redlich-Peterson}$. Thus, the presence of GO and MA changed the adsorption of the beads from that of a monolayer homogenous system to multilayer heterogenous system.

As the temperature increased from 25 to 45 °C, the monolayer capacity of GO-MAGB-MA increased from 26.2276 to 23.5648 and from 27.5285 to 25.2591 g of oil/g of adsorbent in freshwater and seawater, respectively. Similar behavior was observed for MAGB and MAGB-MA. The increase in the adsorption capacity of all the adsorbent beads with increase in temperature is due to (i) the weakening of physical adsorption facilitated by non-electrostatic (hydrophobic) interactions between the beads and oil and (ii) the reduction in oil viscosity, which results in higher solubility of oil in water and the detachment of oil from the adsorbent during magnetic collection. This result is consistent with the behavior of other adsorbents [52,53]. However, even though the adsorption capacity decreased as the temperature increased, the adsorption capacity of GO-MAGB-MA at 45 °C in freshwater and seawater remained higher than those of other reported adsorbents at room temperature. Thus, GO-MAGB-MA is an effective and efficient adsorbent.

3.7.6. Practical evaluation

For environmental sustainability, practicality, and economic reasons, collection and regeneration, as well as high $q_{\max}$, short t_{eq} , and high M_s , are crucial. After adsorption, the oil-loaded GO-MAGB-MA remained floating and could be collected using an external magnet, which was rapid and simple because of the high M_s value (Fig. 10). The regeneration of the used GO-MAGB-MA was evaluated over 20 consecutive adsorption–washing–drying cycles in freshwater and seawater. As illustrated in Fig. 9, GO-MAGB-MA maintained a $q_{\max}$ of 98% compared to the first run, whereas MAGB and MAGB-MA lost

approximately 23% and 15% of their $q_{\max}$, respectively. Over 20 adsorption–washing–drying cycles, the flotation, magneto-responsiveness, and adsorptive performance of the GO-MAGB-MA was preserved in freshwater and seawater.

Comparison of GO-MAGB-MA, as well as the MAGB and MAGB-MA, with other reported adsorbents [53–65] were conducted to evaluate the magnetic performance (M_s), t_{eq} , $q_{\max}$, and reusability. GO-MAGB-MA had a relatively higher $q_{\max}$ and shorter t_{eq} compared to some adsorbents reported in other works (Table S2). Some other reported adsorbents are superior in terms of $q_{\max}$ than GO-MAGB-MA. However, their collection could be challenging because of the lack of magneto-responsiveness or low M_s values. In the case of conventional organic and inorganic adsorbents utilization, adsorbent tend to sink during adsorption of oil and contaminate sea sediment. Some of organic and inorganic adsorbents also reported to be toxic to the environment make the pollution of become more severe [66]. Smaller size of adsorbent such as in nanoscale size showed affinity toward oil. However, due to its small size, magnetic particle tend to oxidize resulting particle with low magnetization and the re-collection process will be troublesome [67]. The unique combination of buoyancy, high $q_{\max}$, and short t_{eq} in freshwater and seawater make GO-MAGB-MA suitable for large-scale oil-contaminated water remediation (see Scheme 2). Adsorbent preparation costs can be minimized because easy and simple collection and regeneration are possible. Moreover, alginate layer protected magnetite core inside the bead so then it can be applied up to 20 cycles without losing its magnetization.

4. Conclusions

In this study, self-floating alginate beads were prepared using CaCO_3 and NaHCO_3 as cavity templates, and Fe_3O_4 was incorporated into the hollow structure to yield magnetic beads. The buoyancy and swelling can be improved by the addition of GO following the

anchoring of MA. The carbon and oxygen-dominant sheet-like structure of GO was confirmed by SEM-EDX, TEM, AFM, XRD, and Raman analysis. The hollow structure of GO-MAGB-MA was confirmed by SEM and EDX mapping, which showed that C, O, Ca, and Fe were distributed equally on the rough outer surface. The FTIR spectra and TGA results confirmed the presence of 4.14 wt.% MA in MAGB-MA and 5.52 wt.% MA in GO-MAGB-MA. The average size of MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA were 2.93 ± 0.18 , 3.02 ± 0.23 , and 3.24 ± 0.16 μm with M_s values of 43.268, 43.134, and 26.371 emu.g^{-1} , respectively, implying strong magneto-responsivity. Oil removal was pH independent at $3 \leq \text{pH} \leq 10$ in freshwater and seawater, suggesting a non-electrostatic adsorptive mechanism. Kinetic modelling showed that equilibrium can be achieved within 30 min and initial adsorption is the rate-limiting step, as shown by the good fit to the PSO, having $R^2 \geq 0.9998$, $\chi^2 \leq 0.0069$, and $\text{ARE} \leq 0.4094$. The Freundlich isotherm, indicating a multilayer, heterogenous adsorption process, also fit the data well, having $R^2 \geq 0.9966$, $\chi^2 \leq 3.33 \times 10^{-4}$ and $\text{ARE} \leq 0.2349$. The presence of GO, MA, and Fe_3O_4 means that buoyancy, absorptivity, and magneto-responsiveness are retained even after 20 adsorption–washing cycles. The synergetic combination of pH independent, high adsorption rate and capacity, self-floating, and magneto-responsiveness make GO-MAGB-MA superior in comparison with other published adsorbents in the term of adsorption and re-collection. For future studies, preparation of the GO-MAGB-MA with bigger size maybe carried out to meet large-scale oil spill remediation requirement. Combination with other technology such as skimmer can be also conducted to enhance skimmer performance on oil-spill remediation. The continuous adsorption study by using adsorptive column filled with the GO-MAGB-MA would be great to be conducted for larger-scale remediation especially for emulsified oily water or wastewater.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

This project was supported by the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Republic of Indonesia through the PDUPT Project with contract No. 714/UN3.14/LT/2019. We also thank Dr. Hwei Voon Lee (Nanotechnology and Catalysis Research Centre, University of Malaya, Malaysia) for her support on VSM measurement. We are very grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions and comments.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Satya Candra Wibawa Sakti: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing-Original Draft **Rizki Ainuna Wijaya:** Investigation **Nindayu Indrasari:** Investigation **Mochamad Zakki Fahmi:** Supervision, Writing-Review & Editing, Funding Acquisition. **Alfa Akustia Widati:** Investigation, Funding acquisition **Abdulloh:** Investigation, Funding acquisition **Nuryono:** Supervision **Chun-Hu Chen:** Investigation, Writing-Review & Editing, Funding acquisition.

References

- [1] Z. Nixon, J. Michel, A Review of distribution and quantity of lingering subsurface oil from the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill, *Deep. Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.* 147 (2018) 79–86. doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2017.07.009.
- [2] J. Beyer, H.C. Trannum, T. Bakke, P. V. Hodson, T.K. Collier, Environmental effects of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill: A review, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 110 (2016) 28–51. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.06.027.
- [3] M.P. Arora, S. Lodhia, The BP Gulf of Mexico oil spill: Exploring the link between

- social and environmental disclosures and reputation risk management, J. Clean. Prod.* 140 (2017) 1287–1297. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.027.
- [4] K.A. Colvin, C. Lewis, T.S. Galloway, Current issues confounding the rapid toxicological assessment of oil spills, *Chemosphere*. 245 (2020) 125585. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.125585.
- [5] H.D.M. Villela, R.S. Peixoto, A.U. Soriano, F.L. Carmo, Microbial bioremediation of oil contaminated seawater: A survey of patent deposits and the characterization of the top genera applied, *Sci. Total Environ.* 666 (2019) 743–758. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.02.153.
- [6] S.H. Baharuddin, N.A. Mustahil, A.V.B. Reddy, A.A. Abdullah, M.I.A. Mutalib, M. Moniruzzaman, Development, formulation and optimization of a novel biocompatible ionic liquids dispersant for the effective oil spill remediation, *Chemosphere*. 249 (2020) 126125. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.126125.
- [7] A. Abidli, Y. Huang, P. Cherukupally, A.M. Bilton, C.B. Park, Novel separator skimmer for oil spill cleanup and oily wastewater treatment: From conceptual system design to the first pilot-scale prototype development, *Environ. Technol. Innov.* 18 (2020) 100598. doi:10.1016/j.eti.2019.100598.
- [8] Y. Shi, J. Wei, S. Li, S. Peng, B. Zhang, Experimental study on containment of moderate-viscous oil by floating boom subject to waves and currents, *Appl. Ocean Res.* 94 (2020) 102003. doi:10.1016/j.apor.2019.102003.
- [9] R.J. Bullock, R.A. Perkins, S. Aggarwal, In-situ burning with chemical herders for Arctic oil spill response: Meta-analysis and review, *Sci. Total Environ.* 675 (2019) 705–716. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.127.
- [10] L. Abou Chacra, M.A. Sabri, T.H. Ibrahim, M.I. Khamis, N.M. Hamdan, S. Al-Asheh, M. Alrefai, C. Fernandez, Application of graphene nanoplatelets and graphene

- magnetite for the removal of emulsified oil from produced water, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 6 (2018) 3018–3033. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2018.04.060.
- [11] A.K. Singh, K. Ketan, J.K. Singh, Simple and green fabrication of recyclable magnetic highly hydrophobic sorbents derived from waste orange peels for removal of oil and organic solvents from water surface, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 5 (2017) 5250–5259. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2017.09.060.
- [12] J. Ma, M. Xia, S. Zhu, F. Wang, A new alendronate doped HAP nanomaterial for Pb^{2+} , Cu^{2+} and Cd^{2+} effect absorption, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 400 (2020) 123143. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.123143.
- [13] S. Zhu, M. Asim Khan, F. Wang, Z. Bano, M. Xia, Rapid removal of toxic metals Cu^{2+} and Pb^{2+} by amino trimethylene phosphonic acid intercalated layered double hydroxide: A combined experimental and DFT study, *Chem. Eng. J.* 392 (2020) 123711. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2019.123711.
- [14] S.C.W. Sakti, R.N. Laily, S. Aliyah, N. Indrasari, M.Z. Fahmi, H.V. Lee, Y. Akemoto, S. Tanaka, Re-collectable and recyclable epichlorohydrin-crosslinked humic acid with spinel cobalt ferrite core for simple magnetic removal of cationic triarylmethane dyes in polluted water, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 8 (2020) 104004. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2020.104004.
- [15] B. Doshi, E. Repo, J.P. Heiskanen, J.A. Sirviö, M. Sillanpää, Sodium salt of oleoyl carboxymethyl chitosan: A sustainable adsorbent in the oil spill treatment, *J. Clean. Prod.* 170 (2018) 339–350. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.163.
- [16] K.G. Akpomie, C.F. Onyeabor, C.C. Ezeofor, J.U. Ani, S.I. Eze, Natural aluminosilicate clay obtained from south-eastern Nigeria as potential sorbent for oil spill remediation, *J. African Earth Sci.* 155 (2019) 118–123. doi:10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2019.04.013.

- [17] W. Du, X. Wang, G. Chen, J. Zhang, M. Slaný, *Synthesis, property and mechanism analysis of a novel polyhydroxy organic amine shale hydration inhibitor*, *Minerals*. 10 (2020). doi:10.3390/min10020128.
- [18] K. AlAmeri, A. Giwa, L. Yousef, A. Alraeesi, H. Taher, *Sorption and removal of crude oil spills from seawater using peat-derived biochar: An optimization study*, *J. Environ. Manage.* 250 (2019) 109465. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109465.
- [19] B. Doshi, M. Sillanpää, S. Kalliola, *A review of bio-based materials for oil spill treatment*, *Water Res.* 135 (2018) 262–277. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.02.034.
- [20] R. Hummers, W. S.; Offeman, E., *Preparation of Graphitic Oxide*, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 208 (1957) 1937. <https://pubs.acs.org/sharingguidelines>.
- [21] Y. Hou, S. Lv, L. Liu, X. Liu, *High-quality preparation of graphene oxide via the Hummers' method: Understanding the roles of the intercalator, oxidant, and graphite particle size*, *Ceram. Int.* 46 (2020) 2392–2402. doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2019.09.231.
- [22] J. Park, Y.S. Cho, S.J. Sung, M. Byeon, S.J. Yang, C.R. Park, *Characteristics tuning of graphene-oxide-based-graphene to various end-uses*, *Energy Storage Mater.* 14 (2018) 8–21. doi:10.1016/j.ensm.2018.02.013.
- [23] M.S. Chang, Y.S. Kim, J.H. Kang, J. Park, S.J. Sung, S.H. So, K.T. Park, S.J. Yang, T. Kim, C.R. Park, *Guidelines for tailored chemical functionalization of graphene*, *Chem. Mater.* 29 (2017) 307–318. doi:10.1021/acs.chemmater.6b02885.
- [24] V.D. Ebajo, C.R.L. Santos, G. V. Alea, Y.A. Lin, C.H. Chen, *Regenerable Acidity of Graphene Oxide in Promoting Multicomponent Organic Synthesis*, *Sci. Rep.* 9 (2019) 1–12. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-51833-2.
- [25] Y. Mao, Q. Huang, B. Meng, K. Zhou, G. Liu, A. Gugliuzza, E. Drioli, W. Jin, *Roughness-enhanced hydrophobic graphene oxide membrane for water desalination via membrane distillation*, *J. Memb. Sci.* 611 (2020) 118364.

- doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2020.118364.
- [26] T.J.M. Fraga, M.G. Ghislandi, M.N. Carvalho, M.A. da Motta Sobrinho, *One step forward: How can functionalization enhance the adsorptive properties of graphene towards metallic ions and dyes?*, *Environ. Res.* 184 (2020) 109362. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109362.
- [27] N. Baig, Ihsanullah, M. Sajid, T.A. Saleh, *Graphene-based adsorbents for the removal of toxic organic pollutants: A review*, *J. Environ. Manage.* 244 (2019) 370–382. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.05.047.
- [28] J. Yang, L. Zhou, F. Ma, H. Zhao, F. Deng, S. Pi, A. Tang, A. Li, *Magnetic nanocomposite microbial extracellular polymeric substances@Fe₃O₄ supported nZVI for Sb(V) reduction and adsorption under aerobic and anaerobic conditions*, *Environ. Res.* 189 (2020) 109950. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109950.
- [29] T. Madrakian, A. Afkhami, M. Ahmadi, *Adsorption and kinetic studies of seven different organic dyes onto magnetite nanoparticles loaded tea waste and removal of them from wastewater samples*, *Spectrochim. Acta - Part A Mol. Biomol. Spectrosc.* 99 (2012) 102–109. doi:10.1016/j.saa.2012.09.025.
- [30] M.L. Iordache, G. Dodi, D. Hritcu, D. Draganescu, O. Chiscan, M.I. Popa, *Magnetic chitosan grafted (alkyl acrylate) composite particles: Synthesis, characterization and evaluation as adsorbents*, *Arab. J. Chem.* 11 (2018) 1032–1043. doi:10.1016/j.arabjc.2015.12.010.
- [31] Q. Wang, S.M. Shaheen, Y. Jiang, R. Li, M. Slaný, H. Abdelrahman, E. Kwon, N. Bolan, J. Rinklebe, Z. Zhang, *Fe/Mn- and P-modified drinking water treatment residuals reduced Cu and Pb phytoavailability and uptake in a mining soil*, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 403 (2021). doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.123628.
- [32] Y. Narita, S.C.W. Sakti, Y. Akemoto, S. Tanaka, *Ultra-rapid removal of cationic*

- organic dyes by novel single- and double-stranded DNA immobilized on quaternary ammonium magnetic chitosan, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 7 (2019). doi:10.1016/j.jece.2019.103308.
- [33] Nuryono, S. Mighfar, A. Kuncaka, S.C.W. Sakti, Functionalization of Fe₃O₄/SiO₂ with N-(2-Aminoethyl)-3-aminopropyl for Sorption of [AuCl₄]-, *Indones. J. Chem.* 16 (2016) 130–137. <https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/ijc/article/view/21155>.
- [34] W. Du, M. Slaný, X. Wang, G. Chen, J. Zhang, The inhibition property and mechanism of a novel low molecular weight zwitterionic copolymer for improving wellbore stability, *Polymers (Basel)*. 12 (2020) 708. doi:10.3390/polym12030708.
- [35] E. Hambali, S.C.W. Sakti, M.Z. Fahmi, F.E. Wahyudianto, Nuryono, P. Yessi, M. Yani, E. Sinurat, B.S. Pratama, Effect of extraction time and Na₂CO₃ concentration on the characteristics of alginate extracted from sargassum sp., *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.* 209 (2018). doi:10.1088/1755-1315/209/1/012033.
- [36] M. S, V.K. M, A.D. Tripathi, R.L. TS, Optimization and characterization of Alginic acid synthesized from a novel strain of *Pseudomonas stutzeri*, *Biotechnol. Reports*. (2020) e00517. doi:10.1016/j.btre.2020.e00517.
- [37] L. Cao, W. Lu, A. Mata, K. Nishinari, Y. Fang, Egg-box model-based gelation of alginate and pectin: A review, *Carbohydr. Polym.* 242 (2020) 116389. doi:10.1016/j.carbpol.2020.116389.
- [38] C.H. Chen, S. Hu, J.F. Shih, C.Y. Yang, Y.W. Luo, R.H. Jhang, C.M. Chiang, Y.J. Hung, Effective synthesis of highly oxidized graphene oxide that enables wafer-scale nanopatterning: Preformed acidic oxidizing medium approach, *Sci. Rep.* 7 (2017) 1–10. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-04139-0.
- [39] M. Slaný, L. Jankovič, J. Madejová, Structural characterization of organo-montmorillonites prepared from a series of primary alkylamines salts: Mid-IR and

- near-IR study, *Appl. Clay Sci.* 176 (2019) 11–20. doi:10.1016/j.clay.2019.04.016.
- [40] X. Lv, Y. Zhang, W. Fu, J. Cao, J. Zhang, H. Ma, G. Jiang, Zero-valent iron nanoparticles embedded into reduced graphene oxide-alginate beads for efficient chromium (VI) removal, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* 506 (2017) 633–643. doi:10.1016/j.jcis.2017.07.024.
- [41] J. Li, J. Ma, S. Chen, Y. Huang, J. He, Adsorption of lysozyme by alginate/graphene oxide composite beads with enhanced stability and mechanical property, *Mater. Sci. Eng. C.* 89 (2018) 25–32. doi:10.1016/j.msec.2018.03.023.
- [42] T.P. Armedya, M.F. Dzikri, S.C.W. Sakti, A. Abdulloh, Y. Raharjo, S. Wafiroh, Purwati, M.Z. Fahmi, Kinetical release study of copper ferrite nanoparticle incorporated on PCL/collagen nanofiber for naproxen delivery, *Bionanoscience*. 9 (2019) 274–284. doi:10.1007/s12668-019-00618-y.
- [43] Y. Zhuang, F. Yu, H. Chen, J. Zheng, J. Ma, J. Chen, Alginate/graphene double-network nanocomposite hydrogel beads with low-swelling, enhanced mechanical properties, and enhanced adsorption capacity, *J. Mater. Chem. A.* 4 (2016) 10885–10892. doi:10.1039/C6TA02738E.
- [44] A. Diraki, H.R. Mackey, G. Mckay, A. Abdala, Removal of emulsified and dissolved diesel oil from high salinity wastewater by adsorption onto graphene oxide, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 7 (2019) 103106. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2019.103106.
- [45] S. Lagergren, About the theory of so-called adsorption of soluble substance, *K. Sven. Vetenskapsakad. Handl.* 24 (1898) 1–39.
- [46] Y. Ho, The kinetics of sorption of divalent metal ions onto sphagnum moss peat, *Water Res.* 34 (2000) 735–742. doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(99)00232-8.
- [47] S.Y. Elovich, O.G. Larionov, Theory of adsorption from solutions of non electrolytes on solid (I) equation adsorption from solutions and the analysis of its simplest form,

- (II) verification of the equation of adsorption isotherm from solutions, *Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, Otd. Khimicheskikh Nauk.* 2 (1962) 209–216.
- [48] W.J. Weberr, J.C. Moris, *Kinetics of adsorption on carbon from solution*, *J. Sanit. Eng. Div.* 89 (1963) 31–60.
- [49] I. Langmuir, *The adsorption of gases on plane surfaces of glass, mica and platinum.*, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 40 (1918) 1361–1403. doi:10.1021/ja02242a004.
- [50] H.M.. Freundlich, *Über die adsorption in losungen*, *Zeitschrift Für Phys. Chemie.* 57 (1906) 385–470.
- [51] O. Redlich, D.L. Peterson, *A useful adsorption isotherm*, *J. Phys. Chem.* 63 (1959) 1024–1026.
- [52] M.A. Mahmoud, *Oil spill cleanup by raw flax fiber: Modification effect, sorption isotherm, kinetics and thermodynamics*, *Arab. J. Chem.* 13 (2020) 5553–5563. doi:10.1016/j.arabjc.2020.02.014.
- [53] B. Zhang, R. Hu, D. Sun, T. Wu, Y. Li, *Fabrication of magnetite-graphene oxide/MgAl-layered double hydroxide composites for efficient removal of emulsified oils from various oil-in-water emulsions*, *J. Chem. Eng. Data.* 63 (2018) 4689–4702. doi:10.1021/acs.jced.8b00739.
- [54] H. Wang, K.Y. Lin, B. Jing, G. Krylova, G.E. Sigmon, P. McGinn, Y. Zhu, C. Na, *Removal of oil droplets from contaminated water using magnetic carbon nanotubes*, *Water Res.* 47 (2013) 4198–4205. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2013.02.056.
- [55] M. Anju, N.K. Renuka, *Magnetically actuated graphene coated polyurethane foam as potential sorbent for oils and organics*, *Arab. J. Chem.* 13 (2020) 1752–1762. doi:10.1016/j.arabjc.2018.01.012.
- [56] O. Guselnikova, A. Barras, A. Addad, E. Sviridova, S. Szunerits, P. Postnikov, R. Boukherroub, *Magnetic polyurethane sponge for efficient oil adsorption and*

- separation of oil from oil-in-water emulsions, *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 240 (2020) 116627. doi:10.1016/j.seppur.2020.116627.
- [57] M. Nazhipkyzy, A. Nurgain, M. Florent, A. Policicchio, T.J. Bandosz, Magnetic soot: Surface properties and application to remove oil contamination from water, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 7 (2019) 103074. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2019.103074.
- [58] N. Wang, Y. Zhang, F. Zhu, J. Li, S. Liu, P. Na, Adsorption of soluble oil from water to graphene, *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 21 (2014) 6495–6505. doi:10.1007/s11356-014-2504-9.
- [59] O. Bagoole, M.M. Rahman, S. Shah, H. Hong, H. Chen, A. Al Ghaferi, H. Younes, Functionalized three-dimensional graphene sponges for highly efficient crude and diesel oil adsorption, *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 25 (2018) 23091–23105. doi:10.1007/s11356-018-2248-z.
- [60] Z. Rahmani, A.M. Rashidi, A. kazemi, M.T. Samadi, A.R. Rahmani, N-doped reduced graphene oxide aerogel for the selective adsorption of oil pollutants from water: Isotherm and kinetic study, *J. Ind. Eng. Chem.* 61 (2018) 416–426. doi:10.1016/j.jiec.2017.12.041.
- [61] Z. Rahmani, M. Shafiei-Alavijeh, A. Kazemi, A.M. Rashidi, Synthesis of MIL-101@nanoporous graphene composites as hydrophobic adsorbents for oil removal, *J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Eng.* 91 (2018) 597–608. doi:10.1016/j.jtice.2018.06.015.
- [62] S. Songsaeng, P. Thamyongkit, S. Poompradub, Natural rubber/reduced-graphene oxide composite materials: Morphological and oil adsorption properties for treatment of oil spills, *J. Adv. Res.* 20 (2019) 79–89. doi:10.1016/j.jare.2019.05.007.
- [63] S. Javadian, M. khalilifard, S.M. Sadrpour, Functionalized graphene oxide with core-shell of Fe_3O_4 @oleic acid nanospheres as a recyclable demulsifier for effective removal of emulsified oil from oily wastewater, *J. Water Process Eng.* 32 (2019)

100961. doi:10.1016/j.jwpe.2019.100961.
- [64] A. Fossati, M. Martins Alho, S.E. Jacobo, Covalent functionalized magnetic nanoparticles for crude oil recovery, *Mater. Chem. Phys.* 238 (2019) 121910. doi:10.1016/j.matchemphys.2019.121910.
- [65] X. Lv, D. Tian, Y. Peng, J. Li, G. Jiang, Superhydrophobic magnetic reduced graphene oxide-decorated foam for efficient and repeatable oil-water separation, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 466 (2019) 937–945. doi:10.1016/j.apsusc.2018.10.110.
- [66] H. Singh, N. Bhardwaj, S.K. Arya, M. Khatri, Environmental impacts of oil spills and their remediation by magnetic nanomaterials, *Environ. Nanotechnology, Monit. Manag.* 14 (2020) 100305. doi:10.1016/j.enmm.2020.100305.
- [67] K. Qiao, W. Tian, J. Bai, L. Wang, J. Zhao, Z. Du, X. Gong, Application of magnetic adsorbents based on iron oxide nanoparticles for oil spill remediation: A review, *J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Eng.* 97 (2019) 227–236. doi:10.1016/j.jtice.2019.01.029.

Captions for Tables, Schemes, and Figures

- Table 1:** Chemical composition of artificial seawater.
- Table 2:** Average bead size and magnetic-physical properties of MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA.
- Table 3:** Kinetics parameters of oil removal by MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA obtained from non-linearized pseudo-first, pseudo-second, Elovich and linearized Intraparticle diffusion models in freshwater (FW) and seawater (SW).
- Scheme 1:** Schematic illustration of preparation of maleic anhydride-alginate hollow bead reinforced with Fe_3O_4 and graphene oxide.
- Scheme 2:** Removal of oil spill on surface of water by the GO-MAGB-MA and its magnetic re-collection.
- Fig. 1:** (a) SEM image (inset: low magnetization image), (b) EDX elemental mapping, (c) Low magnification TEM image, (d) High magnification TEM image.
- Fig. 2:** (a) AFM image, (b) 3D-AFM image (c) Raman spectra of as-prepared graphene oxide and (d) X-ray diffractogram of GO and Fe_3O_4 .
- Fig. 3:** Outer surface SEM image of (a) MAGB. (b) MAGB-MA (c) GO-MAGB-MA and inner surface SEM image of (d) MAGB (e) MAGB-MA (f) GO-MAGB-MA.
- Fig. 4:** Outer surface EDX mapping of (a) MAGB. (b) MAGB-MA (c) GO-MAGB-MA and inner surface EDX mapping of (d) MAGB (e) MAGB-MA (f) GO-MAGB-MA.

- Fig. 5:** (a) FTIR spectra, (b) thermogravimetric analysis curves, (c) derivative thermogravimetric analysis curves.
- Fig. 6:** (a) M-H magnetization curves of the MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA, images of (b) MAGB, (c) MAGB-MA and (d) GO-MAGB-MA attracted by magnet (inset: contact angle). Influence of GO content in magnetic alginate hollow beads on (e) swelling and (f) self-floating property.
- Fig. 7:** Effect of initial pH on magnetic removal of oil by MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA in (a) freshwater and (b) seawater (experiment condition: C_0 : 66.67 g.L⁻¹, t: 2 h, T: 25 °C, adsorbent dose: 1 g.L⁻¹ and n: 3), kinetics experimental data of MAGB, MAGB-MA, GO-MAGB-MA fitted with non-linearized PFO, PSO and Elovich model in (c) freshwater and (d) seawater, linear IPD fitting of experimental data in (e) freshwater and (f) seawater (experiment condition: C_0 : 66.67 g.L⁻¹, pH 6, T: 25 °C, adsorbent dose: 1 g.L⁻¹ and n: 3).
- Fig. 8:** Non-linearized fitting of experimental data to Langmuir, Freundlich, Sips and Redlich-Peterson model for magnetic removal of oil by MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA in freshwater at (a) 25 °C, (b) 35 °C (c) 45 °C and in seawater at (d) 25 °C, (e) 35 °C (f) 45 °C (experiment condition: pH 6, adsorbent dose: 1 g.L⁻¹, t: 2 h, n: 3).
- Fig. 9:** Recycle test of MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA for magnetic removal of oil in freshwater (FW) and seawater (SW) at (a) 25 °C, (b) 35 °C, and (c) 45 °C (experiment condition: C_0 : 100 g.L⁻¹, t: 2 h, adsorbent dose: 1 g.L⁻¹ and n: 3).
- Fig. 10:** Photograph of (a) oil spill in seawater, (b) oil-GO-MAGB-MA interaction and (c) separation of oil-GO-MAGB-MA by magnet.

Table 1. Chemical composition of artificial seawater.

Component	Concentration (g.L ⁻¹)	Component	Concentration (g.L ⁻¹)
NaCl	22.1	NaF	3×10^{-3}
MgCl ₂ .6H ₂ O	9.9	LiCl	1×10^{-3}
CaCl ₂ .2H ₂ O	1.5	KI	8.1×10^{-5}
Na ₂ SO ₄	3.9	MnCl ₂ .4H ₂ O	6×10^{-7}
KCl	0.61	CoCl ₂ .6H ₂ O	2×10^{-6}
NaHCO ₃	0.19	AlCl ₃ .6H ₂ O	8×10^{-6}
KBr	9.6×10^{-2}	FeCl ₃ .6H ₂ O	5×10^{-6}
Na ₂ B ₄ O ₇ .10H ₂ O	7.8×10^{-2}	Na ₂ WO ₄ .2H ₂ O	2×10^{-6}
SrCl ₂	1.3×10^{-2}	(NH ₄) ₆ Mo ₇ O ₂₄ .4H ₂ O	1.8×10^{-5}

Table 2. Average bead size and magnetic-physical properties of MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA.


Magnetic Adsorbent	Component	Average Bead Size (mm)	Hc (G)	Ms (emu.g ⁻¹)	Mr (emu.g ⁻¹)
MAGB	Alginate, Fe ₃ O ₄	2.93±0.18	129.35	43.268	5.314
MAGB-MA	Alginate, Fe ₃ O ₄ , maleic anhydride	3.02±0.23	125.4	43.134	5.134
GO-MAGB-MA	Alginate, Fe ₃ O ₄ , maleic anhydride, GO	3.24±0.16	121.2	26.371	3.192

Table 3. Kinetics parameters of oil removal by MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA obtained from non-linearized pseudo-first, pseudo-second, Elovich and linearized Intraparticle diffusion models in freshwater (FW) and seawater (SW).


Kinetics	Medium	Parameter	MAGB	MAGB-MA	GO-MAGB-MA
Pseudo-first order (PFO)	FW	q^a	2.5226	8.7652	23.0905
		K_{PFO}^b	0.0602	0.0842	0.0825
		R^2	0.9894	0.9855	0.9850
		χ^2	0.0618	0.2285	0.5583
		ARE	5.1008	4.8323	4.8874
	SW	q^a	2.7241	9.1900	23.9819
		K_{PFO}^b	0.0617	0.0784	0.0772
		R^2	0.9917	0.9863	0.9868
		χ^2	0.0529	0.2409	0.5144
		ARE	4.4541	4.9864	4.8672
Pseudo-second order (PSO)	FW	q^a	2.9526	9.9405	26.2137
		K_{PSO}^c	0.0245	0.0114	0.0042
		R^2	0.9999	1.0000	0.9998
		χ^2	0.0005	0.0003	0.0069
		ARE	0.3990	0.1538	0.4094
	SW	q^a	3.1820	10.4778	27.3931
		K_{PSO}^c	0.0234	0.0099	0.0037
		R^2	0.9997	0.9999	1.0000
		χ^2	0.0012	0.0008	0.0011

Elovich	FW	ARE	0.6520	0.2391	0.1958
		α^f	0.4317	3.4644	8.6973
		β^g	1.5892	0.5559	0.2090
		R^2	0.9903	0.9849	0.9852
		χ^2	0.0406	0.1907	0.4906
	SW	ARE	4.4292	4.8300	4.7915
		α^f	0.4883	3.0089	7.4749
		β^g	1.4879	0.5091	0.1928
		R^2	0.9869	0.9857	0.9856
		χ^2	0.0576	0.1938	0.5178
Intraparticle Diffusion (IPD)	FW	ARE	5.0872	4.8032	4.8757
		K_{1-IPD}^d	0.3890	1.5071	3.9222
		C_{1-IPD}^e	0.0126	0.1934	0.5354
		R^2	0.9976	0.9910	0.9885
		K_{2-IPD}^d	0.1253	0.3200	0.8797
	SW	C_{2-IPD}^e	1.3508	5.9666	15.3548
		R^2	0.9509	0.9454	0.9162
		K_{1-IPD}^d	0.4271	1.5450	4.0256
		C_{1-IPD}^e	0.0220	0.1542	0.3322
		R^2	0.9981	0.9927	0.9936
	SW	K_{2-IPD}^d	0.1253	0.3541	0.9417
		C_{2-IPD}^e	1.5511	6.0430	15.5850
		R^2	0.9505	0.9377	0.9454

^a q_t in $g.g^{-1}$ ^b K_{PFO} in min^{-1} ^c K_{PSO} in $g.g^{-1}.min^{-1}$ ^d K_{IPD} in $g.g^{-1}.min^{-0.5}$ ^e C_{IPD} in $g.g^{-1}$ ^f α in $g.g^{-1}.min^{-1}$ ^g β in $g.g^{-1}$



Scheme 1. Schematic illustration of preparation of maleic anhydride-alginate hollow bead reinforced with Fe_3O_4 and graphene oxide.



Scheme 2. Removal of oil spill on surface of water by the GO-MAGB-MA and its magnetic re-collection.




Fig. 1. (a) SEM image (inset: low magnetization image), (b) EDX elemental mapping, (c) Low magnification TEM image, (d) High magnification TEM image.




Fig. 2. (a) AFM image, (b) 3D-AFM image (c) Raman spectra of as-prepared graphene oxide and (d) X-ray diffractogram of GO and Fe_3O_4 .




Fig. 3. Outer surface SEM image of (a) MAGB. (b) MAGB-MA (c) GO-MAGB-MA and inner surface SEM image of (d) MAGB (e) MAGB-MA (f) GO-MAGB-MA.




Fig. 4. Outer surface EDX mapping of (a) MAGB. (b) MAGB-MA (c) GO-MAGB-MA and inner surface EDX mapping of (d) MAGB (e) MAGB-MA (f) GO-MAGB-MA.




Fig. 5. (a) FTIR spectra, (b) thermogravimetric analysis curves, (c) derivative thermogravimetric analysis curves.




Fig. 6. (a) M-H magnetization curves of the MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA, images of (b) MAGB, (c) MAGB-MA and (d) GO-MAGB-MA attracted by magnet (inset: contact angle). Influence of GO content in magnetic alginate hollow beads on (e) swelling and (f) self-floating property.




Fig. 7. Effect of initial pH on magnetic removal of oil by MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA in (a) freshwater and (b) seawater (experiment condition: C_0 : $66.67 \text{ g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, t : 2 h, T : 25°C , adsorbent dose: $1 \text{ g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ and n : 3), kinetics experimental data of MAGB, MAGB-MA, GO-MAGB-MA fitted with non-linearized PFO, PSO and Elovich model in (c) freshwater and (d) seawater, linear IPD fitting of experimental data in (e) freshwater and (f) seawater (experiment condition: C_0 : $66.67 \text{ g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, pH 6., T : 25°C , adsorbent dose: $1 \text{ g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ and n : 3).




Fig. 8. Non-linearized fitting of experimental data to Langmuir, Freundlich, Sips and Redlich-Peterson model for magnetic removal of oil by MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA in freshwater at (a) 25 °C, (b) 35 °C (c) 45 °C and in seawater at (d) 25 °C, (e) 35 °C (f) 45 °C (experiment condition: pH 6, adsorbent dose: 1 g.L⁻¹, t: 2 h, n: 3).




Fig. 9. Recycle test of MAGB, MAGB-MA and GO-MAGB-MA for magnetic removal of oil in freshwater (FW) and seawater (SW) at (a) 25 °C, (b) 35 °C, and (c) 45 °C (experiment condition: C_0 : 100 g.L⁻¹, t: 2 h, adsorbent dose: 1 g.L⁻¹ and n: 3).





Fig. 10. Photograph of (a) oil spill in seawater, (b) oil-GO-MAGB-MA interaction and (c) separation of oil-GO-MAGB-MA by magnet.

Graphical Abstract



CRedit authorship contribution statement

Satya Candra Wibawa Sakti: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing-Original Draft
Rizki Ainuna Wijaya: Investigation **Nindayu Indrasari:** Investigation **Mochamad Zakki Fahmi:**
Supervision, Writing-Review & Editing, Funding Acquisition. **Alfa Akustia Widati:** Investigation,
Funding acquisition **Abdulloh:** Investigation, Funding acquisition **Nuryono:** Supervision **Chun-Hu
Chen:** Investigation, Writing-Review & Editing, Funding acquisition.

Declaration of interests

☒ *The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships*

that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐ *The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered*

as potential competing interests:

Journal Pre-proof

Highlights

- *Self-floating and magnetic hollow bead was prepared for oil spill remediation.*
- *GO and MA enhanced oil removal performance on fresh and seawater surface.*
- *Oil removal was rapid and less affected by pH and type of water.*
- *Simple surface separation can be achieved by magnet due to presence of Fe_3O_4 .*
- *The hollow bead could be regenerated and employed up to 20 cycles effectively.*