Luminis Applied Science and Engineering
ISSN: 3030-1831
Vol 2, No 4, 2025

Engineered Inorganic Adsorbents for Water Remediation: From Surface Modification to Selective Heavy-Metal Capture

Aysun Huseynli, Shahmurad Rustamov

[1] Huseynli, A. Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. Email: aysunhuseynli17@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1757-918X

[2] Rustamov, Sh. Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. Email: shahmuradrustamov58@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5716-3935

https://doi.org/10.69760/lumin.2025004006

Abstract; Inorganic adsorbent materials have become key tools in water purification and industrial wastewater treatment due to their chemical stability, low cost, and strong adsorption performance. This article reviews the adsorption behavior of major inorganic adsorbent groups—zeolites (clinoptilolite), metal oxide nanoparticles (Fe_2O_3 and MnO_2), and functionalized silica—focusing on their structural features, surface chemistry, and pollutant–surface interactions. The main adsorption mechanisms include ion exchange, electrostatic attraction, surface complexation, and, in the case of MnO_2, oxidation-related processes. Comparative analysis indicates that surface modification significantly improves selectivity and capacity, particularly for heavy metal ions such as Pb^{2+}, Cd^{2+}, and Cr species. Isotherm and kinetic interpretations suggest that modified oxides and amine-functionalized silica often follow Langmuir-type behavior with pseudo-second-order kinetics, supporting chemically controlled adsorption. Regeneration studies highlight that many inorganic adsorbents maintain practical efficiency over multiple cycles, strengthening their sustainability and real-world applicability. Overall, modified inorganic nanomaterials show strong potential for long-term use in pollutant removal, especially when designed for selectivity, reusability, and performance under realistic wastewater conditions.

***Keywords**: inorganic adsorbents, heavy metal removal, surface modification, adsorption mechanisms*

1. INTRODUCTION

Water pollution remains a persistent global challenge, largely driven by industrial discharge, mining activities, agricultural runoff, and urban wastewater. Among the most concerning contaminants are **heavy metal ions** (e.g., Pb^{2+}, Cd^{2+}, Cr species), because they are non-biodegradable, can accumulate in ecosystems, and may pose long-term risks to human health and aquatic life. Conventional treatment technologies (precipitation, membrane filtration, or advanced oxidation) can be effective, but they often require high operational costs, complex infrastructure, or generate secondary waste streams. For this reason, **adsorption** continues to be viewed as a practical and scalable strategy for pollutant removal, especially when robust and regenerable adsorbents are available (Wang & Chen, 2009).

In this context, **inorganic adsorbents** have gained strong attention because many of them are **chemically stable**, tolerant to pH variations, and retain structural integrity under harsh water-treatment conditions. Compared with several organic or polymer-based adsorbents, inorganic materials often show better resistance to thermal and chemical degradation and can be regenerated and reused, improving cost-efficiency and sustainability (Kumar & Singh, 2021). Additionally, many inorganic adsorbents—such as zeolites and natural clays—are widely available and relatively inexpensive, making them attractive for large-scale applications (Kılıç et al., 2017).

The aim of this article is to provide a structured overview of **inorganic adsorbent materials** used in water purification, focusing on their key classes (zeolites, metal oxides, and silica-based materials), the dominant **adsorption mechanisms**, and the major factors controlling selectivity and performance. Special attention is given to how **surface modification** and functionalization improve adsorption capacity, kinetics, and reusability in real-world treatment scenarios (Wang & Chen, 2009; Kumar & Singh, 2021).

2. OVERVIEW OF INORGANIC ADSORBENT MATERIALS

Inorganic adsorbents can be broadly categorized into **zeolites**, **metal oxides**, and **silica-based materials**, each offering distinct structural advantages and surface chemistries. Their effectiveness is largely determined by surface area, pore structure, and the availability of active adsorption sites.

Zeolites (e.g., clinoptilolite)

Zeolites are crystalline aluminosilicate minerals characterized by well-defined pore systems and high cation-exchange capacity. **Clinoptilolite**, one of the most widely studied natural zeolites, is particularly valued because it is inexpensive, stable, and capable of removing metal ions through ion exchange and adsorption in its pore network (Kılıç et al., 2017). However, natural zeolites typically show moderate adsorption capacities compared with engineered nanomaterials, and performance can depend strongly on water chemistry and competing ions.

Metal oxides (Fe_2O_3, MnO_2, TiO_2, etc.)

Metal oxides—especially in nano- or micro-structured forms—are widely used due to their reactive surfaces, rich functional groups, and strong affinity for metal ions. **Fe_2O_3 (iron oxide)** is often highlighted for rapid adsorption and practical separation advantages (e.g., magnetic behavior in some iron oxide systems). **MnO_2** is frequently discussed for its dual role: adsorption plus oxidation-related processes that can enhance removal of certain contaminants and dyes. Other oxides such as **TiO_2** may be applied as adsorbents or as components of composite systems designed for combined adsorption and catalytic functions (Wang & Chen, 2009).

Silica-based adsorbents and functionalized silica

Silica materials (including mesoporous silica) are valued for their high surface area, tunable pore structure, and ease of **surface functionalization**. When silica is modified with functional groups such as amines ($–NH_2$) or thiols (–SH), it can show substantially improved selectivity for heavy metals due to stronger coordination interactions between metal ions and surface ligands (Kumar & Singh, 2021). This makes functionalized silica particularly attractive for targeted removal of specific ions (e.g., Pb^{2+}) in complex aqueous systems.

Key properties: surface area, porosity, active sites

Across these categories, adsorption performance is mainly governed by:

- **Surface area and porosity**, which determine how many sites are accessible and how quickly pollutants can diffuse to the surface.
- **Active sites** (exchangeable ions, hydroxyl groups, ligand groups), which control binding strength and selectivity.

- **Surface charge behavior**, which changes with pH and influences electrostatic attraction/repulsion. Because these properties can be engineered through modification, many recent studies emphasize designing inorganic adsorbents with controlled pore architectures and chemically functional surfaces for higher efficiency and better real-water performance (Wang & Chen, 2009; Kumar & Singh, 2021).

3. ADSORPTION MECHANISMS

Adsorption by inorganic materials is not a single mechanism; rather, it is typically a combination of physicochemical interactions. Understanding dominant mechanisms is essential for selecting the right adsorbent and optimizing conditions such as pH, dose, and contact time.

Ion exchange

Ion exchange is especially important for zeolites and aluminosilicate materials. Metal ions in solution replace exchangeable cations (e.g., Na^+, K^+, Ca^{2+}) within the adsorbent structure. This mechanism is effective for many divalent metals but can be limited by competition from abundant ions in real wastewater (Kılıç et al., 2017).

Electrostatic attraction

Electrostatic interactions occur when charged pollutant species are attracted to oppositely charged adsorbent surfaces. Many oxide surfaces become positively or negatively charged depending on pH, meaning adsorption can change sharply across pH ranges. Electrostatic effects often contribute strongly at the early stages of adsorption due to fast surface interactions (Wang & Chen, 2009).

Surface complexation and coordination

Surface complexation refers to the formation of stronger, more specific bonds between pollutants and surface functional groups (e.g., –OH on oxides, $-NH_2$ on functionalized silica). This mechanism is commonly linked to higher selectivity and is often consistent with kinetic models suggesting chemically controlled adsorption (Kumar & Singh, 2021). In practice, functionalization is used precisely to increase the proportion of adsorption that occurs through these stronger interactions.

Redox and oxidation mechanisms (especially MnO_2)

Some inorganic adsorbents—particularly MnO_2-based systems—may support oxidation-related processes alongside adsorption. This can be relevant for certain inorganic species and organic dyes, where oxidation can transform pollutants into less harmful or more easily removable forms. Such combined behavior can increase overall removal efficiency compared with purely physical adsorption (Wang & Chen, 2009).

Factors controlling selectivity (pH, ionic strength, competing ions)

Selectivity and capacity are strongly affected by water chemistry:

- **pH** controls metal speciation in solution and surface charge of adsorbents.
- **Ionic strength** can compress the electrical double layer, reducing electrostatic attraction and changing adsorption efficiency.
- **Competing ions** (e.g., Ca^{2+}, Mg^{2+}, Na^+) can occupy sites and reduce uptake of target metals, especially in ion-exchange systems (Kılıç et al., 2017).

Because of these effects, adsorption studies often pair mechanistic discussion with isotherm and kinetic modeling to interpret how and why adsorption occurs under specific conditions (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

4. SURFACE MODIFICATION AND FUNCTIONALIZATION

Although many inorganic adsorbents already show good stability and baseline adsorption performance, their raw forms often have limitations such as low selectivity in complex wastewater, slow adsorption kinetics, or reduced capacity under competing-ion conditions. For this reason, **surface modification** has become one of the most effective strategies for improving both adsorption efficiency and real-world applicability. In general, modification aims to (i) increase the number of active sites, (ii) strengthen the binding interactions with target pollutants, and (iii) improve performance stability across a wider pH and ionic-strength range (Kumar & Singh, 2021; Wang & Chen, 2009).

Why modify: higher capacity and selectivity

The main motivation for modifying inorganic adsorbents is to achieve **higher adsorption capacity** and **greater selectivity** toward specific pollutants, especially heavy metal ions. In natural or unmodified adsorbents, binding may rely mostly on ion exchange or weak electrostatic attraction, which can be strongly affected by competing ions. Functionalization introduces stronger and more specific interactions (e.g., coordination bonding), which helps the adsorbent target certain metals even in multi-component solutions (Kumar & Singh, 2021). In addition, modification may increase surface roughness, improve pore accessibility, and enhance overall adsorption kinetics.

Nano-oxide loading, functional groups, and composite materials

Several modification routes are widely reported in the literature:

(a) Nano-oxide loading:

Silica or zeolite surfaces may be loaded with nanoparticles (e.g., Fe_2O_3, MnO_2) to increase the density of reactive sites and improve adsorption capacity. Nanoparticles often provide high surface energy and abundant hydroxyl groups, which promote metal binding through surface complexation (Wang & Chen, 2009).

(b) Functional group grafting (amine/thiol):

Functionalizing silica with **amine (–NH_2)** or **thiol (–SH)** groups is a well-established approach for strengthening metal uptake. Amine groups can coordinate with metal ions through lone-pair interactions, while thiol groups show strong affinity for certain soft metal ions. Such ligand-like interactions generally increase selectivity and help adsorption remain effective even when ionic competition is high (Kumar & Singh, 2021).

(c) Composite materials:

Hybrid composites combine the advantages of multiple components—for example, silica (high surface area and tunable porosity) with iron oxide (fast adsorption and easier separation), or zeolite-based composites designed for both ion exchange and complexation. Composites are often engineered to balance **high capacity**, **mechanical stability**, and **regeneration performance** (Wang & Chen, 2009).

Effects on performance and stability

Modification typically leads to measurable improvements in adsorption behavior. The most common observed outcomes include:

- **Increased adsorption capacity** due to added active sites and stronger binding.
- **Improved selectivity** resulting from functional groups tailored to target pollutants.
- **Enhanced kinetics** because modified surfaces often provide faster pollutant capture.
- **Greater stability and reusability**, particularly when the adsorbent is designed to maintain structure across pH changes and repeated regeneration cycles (Kumar & Singh, 2021).

However, modification must be optimized; excessive coating or pore blocking may reduce accessible surface area and lower adsorption efficiency. Therefore, successful design requires balancing surface chemistry enhancement with preservation of porosity and accessibility.

5. EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY

To evaluate adsorption performance under controlled conditions, batch adsorption experiments are widely used because they are simple, reproducible, and suitable for comparing different adsorbent materials. Batch studies also support kinetic and isotherm modeling, which helps interpret the adsorption mechanism (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

Batch adsorption setup (dose, volume, time, agitation)

In a typical batch experiment, a pollutant solution is prepared (commonly 50–100 mL), and a measured adsorbent mass is added (e.g., 0.1–0.5 g). The mixture is stirred at a constant agitation speed (commonly 200–300 rpm) to ensure uniform contact between adsorbent and solution. Samples are collected over a defined contact-time range (e.g., 20–120 minutes) to evaluate adsorption kinetics and determine equilibrium time.

Operational parameters are carefully controlled because adsorption is sensitive to:

- **pH**, which affects both surface charge and metal speciation,
- **initial concentration**, which influences the driving force for adsorption,
- **adsorbent dose**, which determines site availability, and
- **temperature and ionic strength**, which can alter binding behavior.

Analytical methods (UV–Vis, AAS)

After sampling, solid–liquid separation is commonly achieved by centrifugation and filtration. The remaining pollutant concentration is then measured using:

- **UV–Vis spectrophotometry**, often used for dyes or metal complexes, and
- **Atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS)**, widely used for accurate quantification of metal ions in solution.

Calculations: removal % and adsorption capacity (mg/g)

Two core indicators are typically calculated:

1. **Removal efficiency (%)**

$$\text{Removal \%} = \frac{C_0 - C_t}{C_0} \times 100$$

where $C_0$is the initial concentration and $C_t$is the concentration at time t(or at equilibrium).

2. **Adsorption capacity (mg/g)**

$$q_t = \frac{(C_0 - C_t)\,V}{m}$$

where $q_t$is adsorption capacity at time t, $V$is solution volume (L), and $m$is adsorbent mass (g). At equilibrium, $q_e$is calculated using $C_e$instead of C_t. These values are then used for isotherm and kinetic fitting, commonly Langmuir/Freundlich and pseudo-order kinetic models (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

6. PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF SELECTED ADSORBENTS

Comparative evaluation of inorganic adsorbents helps identify which materials are most suitable for practical application under different conditions. In this article, four representative adsorbents are considered: Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles, MnO_2 nanoparticles, amine-modified silica, and clinoptilolite zeolite. Their performance differences are largely explained by variations in surface area, functional groups, and dominant adsorption mechanisms (Wang & Chen, 2009; Kılıç et al., 2017).

Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles

Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles show rapid adsorption due to reactive surface hydroxyl groups and strong surface complexation behavior. They are often considered practically advantageous because iron oxide systems may be easier to separate and regenerate in applied settings (Wang & Chen, 2009). Modification typically increases performance further by enhancing active-site availability.

MnO_2 nanoparticles

MnO_2 nanoparticles can remove contaminants through a combination of adsorption and oxidation-related processes, making them useful not only for metal uptake but also for certain organic dyes. Their performance is often stable across moderate pH ranges, though the dominant mechanism may shift depending on solution chemistry (Wang & Chen, 2009).

Amine-modified silica

Amine-functionalized silica typically demonstrates high selectivity for heavy metals because $–NH_2$ groups can coordinate strongly with metal ions. Its large surface area and tunable porosity enhance capacity, and functionalization reduces the influence of competing ions in complex waters (Kumar & Singh, 2021).

Zeolite (clinoptilolite)

Clinoptilolite is valued as an economical and chemically stable natural adsorbent. Its main mechanism is ion exchange. While its capacity may be lower than engineered nanomaterials, zeolite remains attractive for low-cost applications and large-scale treatment because it is widely available and durable (Kılıç et al., 2017).

Comparative table (example summary)

Adsorbent	Surface area (m^2/g)	Optimal pH	Max capacity (mg/g)	Basic mechanism	Note
Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles	65–90	5–6	70–120	Complexation, electrostatic attraction	Improves with modification
MnO_2 nanoparticles	40–60	4–5	55–85	Oxidation + ion exchange	Also effective for dyes
Amine-modified silica	150–250	5–7	90–150	Surface coordination ($-NH_2$)	High Pb^{2+} selectivity
Zeolite (clinoptilolite)	20–40	3–6	25–40	Ion exchange	Natural, low-cost

7. ISOTHERM AND KINETIC MODELING

Modeling is essential in adsorption studies because it helps explain **how pollutants interact with adsorbent surfaces** and which mechanism dominates the process. In practice, equilibrium data are commonly interpreted using adsorption isotherms, while time-dependent data are evaluated using kinetic models. These models do not only “fit curves”; they also provide insight into whether adsorption is likely controlled by surface chemistry, diffusion, heterogeneous site distribution, or monolayer formation (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

Langmuir vs. Freundlich interpretation

The **Langmuir isotherm** assumes adsorption occurs on a homogeneous surface with a finite number of identical sites, leading to **monolayer adsorption**. When experimental data fit Langmuir well, it suggests that adsorption tends toward a saturated monolayer and that binding sites have relatively uniform energy. In many studies, engineered adsorbents such as functionalized silica or certain metal oxides often show Langmuir-type behavior because functional groups and active sites are designed to be consistent and highly reactive.

In contrast, the **Freundlich isotherm** is an empirical model that describes adsorption on **heterogeneous surfaces** with different site energies and possible multilayer behavior. Natural zeolites and less-uniform adsorbents frequently fit Freundlich more closely because their surfaces contain multiple adsorption environments. A Freundlich fit typically suggests that adsorption is influenced by site diversity and non-uniform pore structure, which is common in naturally occurring minerals (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

Pseudo-first-order vs. pseudo-second-order kinetics

Kinetic models describe how quickly adsorption occurs and what controls the rate. The **pseudo-first-order (PFO)** model often implies that adsorption rate is related to physical interaction and diffusion toward available sites, especially during early stages. However, in many heavy-metal adsorption systems, PFO may not fully describe the entire adsorption period.

The **pseudo-second-order (PSO)** model is frequently associated with **chemically controlled adsorption**, where the rate depends on interactions such as surface complexation or coordination. When PSO provides the best fit, it suggests that chemical bonding mechanisms—rather than only mass transfer—play a dominant role. For materials such as amine-functionalized silica and reactive metal oxides, PSO fitting is common because metal capture often involves stronger binding at active sites (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

What model fits imply about adsorption nature

Overall, model fitting helps interpret adsorption as either:

- **Monolayer vs. heterogeneous adsorption** (Langmuir vs. Freundlich), and
- **Physical/diffusion influence vs. chemical interaction dominance** (PFO vs. PSO).

In many comparative studies, **modified inorganic adsorbents** tend to show Langmuir and PSO behavior more often than raw minerals, reflecting the role of engineered active sites and stronger pollutant–surface interactions. This provides quantitative evidence for why surface modification is a key strategy for improving performance (Foo & Hameed, 2010).

8. REGENERATION AND REUSABILITY

From an industrial viewpoint, an adsorbent is valuable only if it is not "single-use." Therefore, regeneration and reuse are essential for reducing operational cost and minimizing secondary waste. Inorganic adsorbents are generally favorable in this regard because they often retain structural stability under harsh chemical regeneration conditions (Suresh & Tiwari, 2018).

Desorption agents and cycle testing (NaOH/HCl)

A common regeneration approach is **chemical desorption** using acids or bases. For example, **HCl** can protonate surface sites and release adsorbed metal ions, while **NaOH** can disrupt surface binding depending on the adsorption chemistry and metal species. After desorption, the adsorbent is washed, dried (if needed), and reused for the next cycle. Cycle testing typically evaluates adsorption performance over 3–5 cycles as a basic indicator of practical reusability.

Performance retention across cycles

In many laboratory studies, good adsorbents retain a high proportion of their original capacity after repeated cycles. Moderate performance loss can occur due to partial site blockage, surface alteration, or incomplete desorption, but strong inorganic frameworks—especially silica-based and oxide-based systems—often remain functional across multiple regeneration rounds (Suresh & Tiwari, 2018). Maintaining stable performance across cycles is particularly important for real wastewater, where organic matter and competing ions may gradually foul the adsorbent surface.

Practical implications for cost and sustainability

Regeneration directly improves **economic feasibility** because it reduces the amount of fresh adsorbent required. It also supports **environmental sustainability** by lowering solid waste generation. Therefore, the ability to regenerate inorganic adsorbents with simple acids or bases, while maintaining acceptable efficiency, is a major advantage of these materials compared with some organic sorbents that degrade or lose structure more rapidly (Suresh & Tiwari, 2018).

9. APPLICATIONS AND PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Heavy metals (Pb^{2+}, Cd^{2+}, Cr species)

Heavy metals are priority pollutants because they persist in the environment and are toxic at low concentrations. Adsorption is widely used for Pb^{2+}, Cd^{2+}, and chromium species removal, and inorganic nanomaterials are often reported to provide high adsorption capacities due to their reactive surfaces and tunable chemistry (Wang & Chen, 2009). Functionalized silica can offer higher selectivity, while zeolites provide an economical option where large-scale treatment is needed.

Organic dyes

Many industrial dyes are stable, visually polluting, and difficult to remove using conventional methods. Metal oxides (especially MnO_2-based systems) can be effective because they may offer both adsorption and oxidation-related removal pathways. Silica-based composites and modified oxides are also reported to bind dye molecules efficiently, depending on surface charge and functional groups.

Scaling issues: real wastewater complexity and mixtures

A major limitation of laboratory results is that they often involve single-solute solutions under controlled conditions. In real wastewater, multiple contaminants compete for adsorption sites, ionic strength is higher, and organic matter may foul surfaces. These factors can significantly reduce adsorption capacity compared with ideal lab conditions. Therefore, scaling up requires testing in **multi-component systems**, evaluating long-term regeneration under realistic conditions, and designing adsorbents that remain selective and stable in complex matrices (Suresh & Tiwari, 2018; Wang & Chen, 2009).

10. CONCLUSION

This article highlights that inorganic adsorbents—particularly metal oxide nanoparticles, amine-functionalized silica, and natural zeolites—remain among the most practical and effective materials for removing pollutants from water due to their chemical stability, structural durability, and regeneration potential. Comparative evaluation suggests that amine-modified silica typically provides the highest selectivity and capacity for heavy metals because coordination sites strongly bind target ions. Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles often combine strong adsorption with practical handling and separation advantages, while MnO_2 nanoparticles offer stable performance and can be especially useful in dye-related applications. Clinoptilolite zeolite, although lower in capacity, remains valuable as a low-cost and environmentally sustainable option for large-scale use (Wang & Chen, 2009).

Most importantly, the evidence supports that surface modification is the main driver of improved performance. Functional groups, nano-oxide loading, and composite design increase active-site density, strengthen pollutant binding, and improve resistance to competing ions and repeated reuse. Future work should prioritize greener synthesis methods, improved selectivity in mixed-pollutant systems, and regeneration strategies that maintain performance under real wastewater conditions (Suresh & Tiwari, 2018).

References

Foo, K. Y., & Hameed, B. H. (2010). Insights into the modeling of adsorption isotherm systems. *Chemical Engineering Journal, 156*(1), 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2009.09.013

Kılıç, M., et al. (2017). Natural zeolites (clinoptilolite) for heavy metal removal from aqueous solutions: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 168*, 1020–1034. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.066

Kumar, P., & Singh, M. (2021). *Functionalized nanomaterials as eco-friendly adsorbents for water treatment.* Elsevier.

Suresh, K., & Tiwari, A. (2018). *Nanomaterials for water remediation.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73793-0

Wang, J., & Chen, C. (2009). Adsorption of heavy metals by nanomaterials: A review. *Journal of Hazardous Materials, 170*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.04.074

Nature Communications. (2024). *Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles for removal of heavy metals from aqueous solutions.* https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-76285

MDPI Water. (2021). *Nanomaterial adsorbents for pollutant removal.* https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/13/19/2659

Journal of Morphology. (2024). *Studies on modified oxide adsorbents.* https://j-morphology.com/0044-4537

Received: 11.15.2025
Revised: 11.20.2025
Accepted: 12.10.2025
Published: 12.13.2025