Selective removal of contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) from urban water cycle via Molecularly Imprinted Polymers (MIPs): Potential of upscaling and enabling reclaimed water reuse

(Article begins on next page)

19 January 2025

1 **Selective removal of contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) from urban water cycle via**

2 **Molecularly Imprinted Polymers (MIPs): potential of upscaling and enabling reclaimed water**

3 **reuse**

4

5 Marco Parlapiano, Çağrı Akyol*, Alessia Foglia, Michela Pisani, Paola Astolfi*, Anna Laura

6 Eusebi*, Francesco Fatone

7

8 *Department of Science and Engineering of Materials, Environment and Urban Planning-SIMAU,*

9 *Marche Polytechnic University, 60131, Ancona, Italy*

10

11 * Corresponding authors (Ç. Akyol, P. Astolfi, A.L. Eusebi)

12 E-mail addresses: c.akyol@staff.univpm.it, p.astolfi@staff.univpm.it, a.l.eusebi@staff.univpm.it

13

14 **Abstract**

15 Contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) are one of the main barriers in the water cycle as they

16 limit the water reuse due to their adverse effects on humans and the ecosystem. Natural and/or

17 engineered ecosystems, such as conventional wastewater treatment processes, are not designed to

18 remove CECs and contribute to the bioaccumulation in organisms considering high volumes of

19 treated water discharges. The adoption of innovative solutions to upgrade urban water cycle facilities

20 has gained relevance for the removal of these substances from final effluents. Molecularly imprinted

21 polymers (MIPs) show promising selective removal toward a wide range of CECs. However, this

22 solution is still limited to lab/bench scale and needs to be critically analyzed and assessed for possible

23 scale-up in real environment. Therefore, in this review, an overview of the fate and occurrence of

24 CECs in wastewater is initially reported together with the state-of-the-art in adsorption mechanisms

25 to remove these compounds. In the central part of the paper, an evaluation of MIPs synthesis and their

26 status in removing CECs from water matrix are presented. An upscaling pathway of MIPs column

from lab- to pilot-scale is given to be applied for enhanced CECs removal and safe water reuse in irrigation/fertigation. Finally, possible integrations of MIP columns to real wastewater treatment facilities is discussed and advantages and disadvantages of the potential solutions are addressed to enhance their sustainability.

1. Introduction

Agriculture practices, industrial discharges, and everyday activities play an important role in releasing pollutants via wastewater. These practices generate various organic contaminants which alter the water cycle causing a global concern linked to their eventual impact on wildlife and human health [1,2]. In recent years, many articles have appeared reporting the presence of new compounds, called "contaminants of emerging concern (CECs)", in wastewater and aquatic environments. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) defines CECs as new chemicals which impact on the environment and human health is poorly understood [3]. These CECs, natural or synthetical, can be found in water and wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in low concentrations, in the order of µg or ng per liter, but with the risk of contaminating and accumulating in the environment [4]. The ecotoxicological effects, fate, and behavior of CECs are not well understood, as they are not presently included in an international regular monitoring program [5,6]. The NORMAN project, established in 2005, is one of the largest world's classified records of CECs occurring in the environment with over 1036 CECs together with their by-products and metabolites. These can be further categorized in 30 classes based on their origin and type such as pharmaceuticals, pesticides, plasticizers, hormones. All these compounds may generate high risks to human health due to their bioaccumulation in the fatty tissue, while biomagnification can give rise to undesirable long-term effects [3].

52   Most of these micropollutants are sent to conventional WWTPs where only a partial removal is

53   obtained by stripping, adsorption and/or biological degradation. This is mostly due to the complex

54   structure and chemical heterogeneity of the CECs as well as to the predicted no effect concentration

55   since conventional treatment units/processes are not designed to remove CECs, while even at very

56   low concentrations they are discharged in final effluents and accumulate in aquatic organisms and

57   adversely affect growth and reproduction [7]. Conventional secondary processes (i.e. activated sludge

58   and trickling filters) represent the most extensively used and studied processes in WWTPs. However,

59   these processes are not designed to remove CECs resulting in their discharge to receiving surface

60   waters [8]. Alternative treatment options must be considered for selective CECs removal such as

61   advanced oxidation processes, nanofiltration and reverse osmosis membranes [1,9]. However, most

62   of these methods require high investment and maintenance costs, complicated procedure for the

63   wastewater treatment and sometimes cause secondary pollution due to the formation of oxidation by-

64   products, which in some cases might be more toxic than the initial compound. Moreover,

65   physicochemical treatments such as coagulation and flocculation processes are generally unable to

66   remove endocrine disrupting compounds (EDCs), pharmaceuticals and personal care products

67   (PPCPs). Conversely, adsorption processes do not add undesirable by-products and can be considered

68   superior to other techniques in wastewater treatment in terms of simplicity of design and operation

69   [10].

70   The demand for finding local solutions and using non-conventional water resources has been

71   increasing, especially in water-scarce areas like the Mediterranean Region where the lack of good

72   quality of irrigation water is already limiting the agriculture [11]. The greatest challenge in this

73   scenario is represented by the adoption of low-cost wastewater treatment technologies in these areas

74   and ensuring compliance with all health and safety standards regarding the reuse of treated

75   wastewater effluents. At this point, non-conventional adsorption technology based on molecularly

76   imprinted polymers (MIPs) represent a valid tool to remove selectively one or more specific target

77   molecules in the wastewater and surface water cycle. MIPs, obtained through a radical polymerization

synthesis, are characterized by highly selective sites or cavities with a specific affinity for a target molecule, since they are capable to imitate the complex mechanisms typically occurring between antibodies and biological receptors [12]. These polymers have high mechanical properties and can be used in a wide range of applications and with different types of matrices such as biological fluids or aqueous environmental solutions. The peculiar properties of MIPs, that will be discussed in Section 4, make them very interesting tools in different areas of application, including separation and purification methods [13,14], sensors and biosensors [15,16], catalysis [17], and drug delivery [18–20]. In the last decade, many studies reported the synthesis and the application of MIP technology to the removal of a wide range of CECs such as diclofenac, ketoprofen and ibuprofen (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, NSAIDs), ciprofloxacin and sulfamethazine (antibiotics), triclosan and parabens (PCPs), bisphenol A (plasticizer) and atrazine (pesticide), from water and/or wastewater with high removal performances [21,22]. Up to date, MIP columns have been successfully implemented in the CECs removal from the water matrix, for pre-treatment analytical measurements but only at the lab-scale [23–25], whereas its implementation in WWTPs has yet to be considered. If MIPs features such as particles and pores size, possibility of regeneration for multiple times, high affinity and mechanical and chemical resistance are considered, it is evident that MIP columns have high potential to be integrated in urban water cycle facilities especially in small-scale decentralized WWTPs designed for water reuse. In most cases, effluent water from these innovative wastewater treatment configurations have such a high quality to comply with the minimum requirements for irrigation; but the presence of CECs may strict its potential for reuse. At this point, adsorption columns using MIPs as an advanced treatment may help to overcome this problem and thus to close the water loop in the water-scarce regions by enabling reclaimed water reuse.

In this review paper, a detailed overview of the most common CECs found in wastewater and the current status of their removal techniques from water matrix is initially provided. The adsorption mechanisms of MIPs for enhanced CECs removal from water/wastewater are further presented with their specific applications. Since the up-to-date applications of MIPs are limited to lab-scale, we

104　provide the basic but crucial steps to follow while considering to upscale MIP adsorption columns to

105　pilot scale. Furthermore, innovative ways to integrate MIP columns to real wastewater facilities are

106　introduced with possible demonstrative-scale proposals to ensure the safe reuse of treated effluent for

107　irrigation with respect to the minimum requirements for water reuse of the European Parliament and

108　of the Council [26]. Benefits and drawbacks of the application of MIPs to remove CECs from

109　wastewater are then discussed and possible solutions are presented to enhance the sustainability of

110　MIPs in water reuse systems. The highlights of this paper can support decisions towards further

111　development of MIPs in removing CECs from water environment.

112　**2.　Contaminants of emerging concern**

113　CECs, also known as emerging compounds [27], are natural or synthetic chemicals together with

114　their transformation products, frequently detected in water bodies, which are not commonly or only

115　partially monitored in the environment. CECs may cause environmental damage and suspected

116　harmful effects on the ecosystem and human health [3]. The steady release of CECs to the

117　environment has been predicted to be occurring for a long time and through diverse sources [28] with

118　concentrations ranging from μg to ng per liter. The list of compounds and chemicals in the CECs

119　group are significantly large and ever-expanding with the introduction of new commercial chemicals,

120　changes in use, and disposal of chemicals currently in widespread use and further identification of

121　new molecules [29]. Since conventional WWTPs are not designed to remove this wide range of

122　molecules, many of these remain in considerable concentration in the effluents, and subsequently in

123　the surface waters [4]. As shown in **Fig. 1**, many CECs, such as atrazine (pesticides), diclofenac

124　(NSAIDs), propanolol (β-blockers), ethynilestradiol (estrogens), and ciprofloxacin (antibiotics), are

125　characterized by low removal rates in WWTPs and this fact underlines the importance of studying

126　these compounds in depth. However, as highlighted by Ben et al. [30] , the type of treatment used in

127　the plant can be favorable for one or more categories of CECs with respect to the others. Moreover,

128　in some cases, by-products that are still harmful to the environment and human health can be formed

129 in these processes as in oxidative treatments. In this section, four main categories of CECs are

130 reviewed that received a particular interest for their frequent presence in water bodies.

131

132 **Fig. 1.** CECs removal rate in percentage by WWTPs [4,30–33].

133

134 2.1. **Pharmaceuticals**

135 Pharmaceuticals represent one of the most critical environmental issues for industrialized countries,

136 due to their widespread use in the treatment of diseases, injuries, or illnesses on humans and

137 veterinary [34,35]. Pharmaceutically active compounds, contained in drugs and medicine, are

138 complex molecules with different functionalities and physicochemical properties to have specific

139 biological activities. Due to their huge number, these compounds are classified in several subclasses,

140 but in this review, emphasis will be given to those categories which are most detected in urban water

141 and wastewater [33].

142 Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAID) are the most used compounds for pain relief;

143 NSAID-type CECs are often detected in surface water and compounds like ketoprofen, ibuprofen,

144 naproxen, paracetamol, diclofenac, and mefenamic acid are particularly resistant to conventional

145 wastewater treatment methods which are not very effective in their removal [36]. Hormones and

146 estrogens are considered an important emerging contaminant due to their directly disrupt effects on

147 the endocrine systems and long-term persistence of living organisms [37]. Respect to other estrogens,

148 17α-ethinylestradiol is a common female oral contraceptive with endogenous activity [38,39], usually

149 present in wastewater and particularly difficult to remove. Antibiotics are complex organic molecules

150 used for the inhibition and elimination of pathogenic bacteria. The compounds most frequently

151 identified in the environments are amoxicillin, ciprofloxacin, erythromycin, and penicillin [40].

152 **2.2. Personal Care Products**

153 PCPs is a common term used to indicate several products, which can be found and bought without a

154 prescription in health, beauty and drug department stores. The most used CECs in PCPs are organic

155 UV-filters, preservatives and fragrances. The substances in PCPs are generally conjugated to other

156 drugs and pharmaceutical contaminants as in the case of antidandruff shampoo [41]. Among the most

157 detected PCPs in surface water [42], parabens has to be considered; they are chemicals used as

158 preservatives in cosmetics and pharmaceuticals [43]; also triclosan is another compound widely used

159 as an antimicrobial in soaps, deodorants, skin creams, toothpaste, and plastics [44] and commonly

160 detected in surface water [41,45]. Many of these pollutants can enter the organisms through direct

161 ingestion or by absorption through the skin where they can bioaccumulate thanks to their lipophilic

162 nature, are excreted through urine or simply removed by washing them off [46], and eventually end

163 up in aquatic and/or soil environments.

164 **2.3. Plasticizers**

165 Plasticizers consist of clear colorless, oily liquids of low molecular weight generally used as additives

166 to improve flexibility or distensibility to facilitate material handling in the processing and formulation

167 of finished products [47,48]. Based on their chemical structure, plasticizers can be divided into

168 diverse categories [49]; among them, phthalates received a lot of attention due to their wide use and

169 release in water bodies. They are esters of phthalic acid containing a benzene ring with two functional

ester groups such as in diethylhexyl phthalate (DEHP), diethyl phthalate (DEP), and dibutyl phthalate (DBP) [50]. Due to their relatively low molecular weight, phthalates can easily migrate and spread into the environment; moreover, because of their lipophilic nature, phthalates can pass through natural barriers such as skin, lung and gut tissue of humans with the consequences of bioaccumulation and biomagnification [51,52].

2.4. Pesticides

Pesticides constitute any mixture of substances that can prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate a pest; in which fungicides, herbicides, bactericides, and insecticides are the main categories [53] that can be found as pesticides contamination through surface runoff from agricultural areas and wastewater in urban areas [54]. Based on the chemical structure it possible to recognize many sub-classes [55], such as organochlorines (including aldrin and DDT), organophosphates (diazinon and malathion), carbamates (carbaryl and propoxur), triazines (atrazine), and chloroacetamides (metolachlor and alachlor). Unfortunately, since pesticides are stable in the environment, as in the case of organochlorines which have a long environmental half-life, they bioaccumulate in the food chain, and the extensive use of these substances easily cause poisoning through various toxicity mechanisms. Their application in the liquid form contaminates the environment more than their application as a powder [56].

3. Adsorption mechanism of CECs

Advanced treatment technologies have been developed over time to reduce the adverse impacts of pollutants in the environment, such as adsorption, biological, and oxidation processes. Adsorption processes, capable of moving contaminants from one phase (liquid such as water) into another (as solid), have been widely used in the removal of CECs [29,57]. The adsorbing material is called the adsorbent or sorbent, while the substances being adsorbed are the adsorbates; their properties and the interactions occurring between them are quite specific and depend on their composition and chemical nature [58]. The adsorption mechanism involves intermolecular transfer of contaminants onto the solid surface of the sorbent upon physical or chemical interactions. In the physical adsorption process,

196   different types of interactions such as electrostatic, hydrogen bonds, steric, π–π stacking, Van der

197   Waals forces, and dipole induced dipole interactions are involved. Otherwise, during chemisorption

198   processes, the pollutants are adsorbed through chemical covalent bonds established with the sorbent.

199   Once adsorbed, contaminants are hardly removed from the sorbent which cannot be easily

200   regenerated because of strong forces between them. Chemical adsorption commonly occurs between

201   metallic ions and adsorbents that have several functional groups, whereas for organic contaminants,

202   the main mechanism of interaction would be physical [59]. However, the two processes can occur

203   alternatively but also simultaneously, depending on the type of technology used.

204   3.1. **Definitions and models**

205   In a solid-liquid system, adsorption results in the removal of contaminants from the solution and their

206   accumulation on the solid surface until saturation of the adsorbates capacities; after a certain time of

207   contact, a dynamic equilibrium between the analytes in solution and the analytes adsorbed on the

208   solid phase is established [60]. The relationships between mass of adsorbate adsorbed per unit weight

209   of adsorbent and liquid-phase equilibrium concentration of adsorbate are represented by adsorption

210   isotherms. Several adsorption isotherms were developed and proposed to describe the specific

211   interactions between them, such as Langmuir [61], Freundlich [62], Sips [63], Redlich-Petersen [64]

212   and others. Among these, the most used models to describe adsorbents material in water and

213   wastewater matrices are Langmuir and Freundlich; these isotherms are considered also for

214   Molecularly Imprinted Polymers, even though the adsorption characteristics of these polymers are

215   often estimated from the Scathcard equation [65]. In fact, the Scatchard plot analysis allows to have

216   further information on the affinity of binding sites of MIPs toward each target molecules which can

217   be selectively adsorbed (Eq. 1). The Langmuir adsorption model (Eq. 2) is the simplest one and can

218   be applied when a single adsorbate is adsorbed by a series of energetically equivalent sites on the

219   homogeneous surface of the solid, as in the case of chemisorption process. Otherwise, Freundlich

220   isotherm (Eq. 3), is applicable to adsorption processes that occur on heterogenous surface [66]. The

221   three isotherms model are reported below:

$$222 \qquad \frac{q_e}{C_e} = (q_m - q_e)K_d \qquad (1)$$

$$223 \qquad q_e = \frac{q_m K_l C_e}{1+K_l C_e} \qquad (2)$$

$$224 \qquad q_e = K_f C_e^{1/n} \qquad (3)$$

225   where C_e (mg/L) is the concentration of the analyte at the equilibrium, q_e and q_m (mg/g) is the mass

226   of adsorbate per unit mass of adsorbant material, at the equilibrium and at maximum adsorption,

227   respectively; K_l is the Langumir consant (mg/g), K_f is the Freundlich costant (mg/g) and 1/n is the

228   exponent of non-linearity; K_d is the Scatchard constant. The main characteristics of the Langmuir

229   isotherm can be expressed by a dimensionless constant called the separation factor (R_L), Eq. (4):

$$230 \qquad R_L = \frac{1}{1+K_l C_0} \qquad (4)$$

231   where K_l is Langmuir constant (mg/g) and C_O is initial concentration of adsorbate (mg/L). Depending

232   on this value, the process is defined unfavorable (when $R_L > 1$), linear (when $R_L = 1$), favorable

233   (when $0 < R_L < 1$), and irreversible (when $R_L = 0$).

234   A correct understanding and interpretation of the adsorption isotherms is fundamental for a correct

235   interpretation of the relationship between the sorbent material and the adsorbates. The use of the

236   adsorption models can provide a valuable tool to describe molecular recognition by MIPs. Such

237   models may be critical in better understanding MIP behavior in complex systems where more than

238   one adsorbate may simultaneously interact with the surface. In a recent study [67] , four isotherm

239   models (Langmuir, Freundlich, Langmuir-Freundlich, and Brunauer Emmet and Teller (BET) were

240   used to characterize the binding behavior of MIPs in the adsorption of five different phenolic

241   compound: phenol (Ph), 2-methylphenol (2-MP), 3-methylphenol (3-MP), 2-chlorophenol (2-CP),

242   and 4-teroctylphenol (4-OP). Even if MIPs tended to be nearly homogeneous and to have well defined

243   binding sites, in this case the MIP has not only one type of binding site, but similar binding sites in

10

244 terms of shape and active functionality which are involved when interacting with a given adsorbate.

245 In fact, the Langmuir and Langmuir-Freundlich models gave the best fitting statistics for Ph, 2-MP,

246 3-MP, and 2-CP, whereas the recognition of the bigger and more hydrophobic 4-OP was explained

247 only by the BET model, which implies the formation of multilayers adsorption sites; in this latter

248 model the adsorption is based on the assumption that the energy of interactions between the adsorbing

249 species and the surface is strongest in the first layer and decreases for subsequent layers deeper in the

250 polymer matrix.

251 **3.2. Removal of CECs**

252 Many factors affect the adsorption process in a specific real case: surface area, nature and initial

253 concentration of the analytes, temperature, pH solution, nature and amount of adsorbate. In order to

254 remove CECs commonly found in wastewater, tertiary treatments must be implemented with sorbent

255 material of different types. Removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of most common sorbents are

256 summarized in **Table 1**.

257 Activated carbon (AC) is the most popular and widely used adsorbent in WWTPs. AC, prepared form

258 various sources (e.g. coal, coconut shells, lignite, wood, etc.), is a charcoal physically and chemically

259 treated to increase its adsorptive properties. The inorganic contents, after the pyrolysis process of the

260 organic matter with oxidizing gases, are efficiently extracted from the carbonized material to produce

261 powder (PAC) or granular particles (GAC) with high surface area [68,69]. AC has been considered

262 as an effective adsorbent for treating persistent/non-biodegradable organic compounds such as CECs.

263 Biochar (BC) is a stable source of carbon obtained from biomass, by thermal or hydrothermal

264 processes at high temperature with low or zero oxygen atmosphere, even if according to many authors

265 it is difficult to distinguish BC from AC [70,71]. Similar to AC, BC can be further chemically

266 activated through an acid or basic process which leads to the formation of new functionalities on the

267 surface of the sorbent to enhance the interactions with the contaminants and to increase their

268 adsorption [70,72].

11

269   Carbon nanotubes (CNTs) are carbon allotropes with a graphite-like structure which displays

270   different adsorption characteristics depending on the degree of coil, the generation of the original

271   sheet, diameter, internal geometry, physicochemical properties and the treatment process used for

272   synthesis [73].

273   Clay minerals are well known natural materials with plastic properties, particles less than two

274   micrometers composed mainly of hydrous-layer silicates of aluminum, though occasionally they may

275   contain magnesium and iron. Because of their low cost, high porosity, and abundance in the

276   environment, clays such as montmorillonite, mica, kaolinite, pyrophyllites (talc), bentonite, and

277   diatomite are good candidates as adsorbents [10]. Numerous other sorbents have also been reported

278   in the literature for removing CECs from water matrices including zeolites, metal oxide, graphene

279   oxide, and polymeric resins [65,74,75]. In this regard, MIPs can be a valuable alternative sorbent

280   thanks to their high selectivity to bind target molecule and their flexibility to couple with different

281   materials to exploit synergic properties, as in the case of MIPs having a core shell of TiO_2 particles,

282   obtained through a surface polymerization, used to remove and photocatalytically degrade the

283   fungicide orto-phenylphenol [76].

284   **Table 1.** Removal efficiency and adsorption capacity of different sorbents.

Matrix	Category	Adsorbent	Sorbent dose (mg/L)	Contaminant	Type of interaction	Isoterm models	Adsorption capacity (mg/g)	Removal (%)	Reference
Hospital Wastewater	Active Carbon	PAC	8, 23, 43	Diclofenac				96, 98, 99	[77]
				Carbamazepine				98, 99, 100	
				Propanolol				91, 94, 94	
				Ciprofloxacin				10, 99, 99	
				Sulfemathoxazole				0, 34, 40	
Acqueous Lab scale		PAC	10.04	Ibuprofen	van der Waals, π-π stacking and hydrogen bonding	Based on the Langmuir and Freundlich model isotherms	12.6	70	[78]
			19.20	Ketoprofen			24.7	88	
			19.78	Naproxen			39.5	90	
			19.28	Diclofenac			56.2	91	
		GAC	1000	Triclosan		Langmuir isotherm	41.5 – 18.5		
Acqueous Solution	Biochar	Acid rice husk	5000	Tetracycline	π-π stacking	Langmuir isotherm	12		[79]
		Alkali rice husk	5000	Tetracycline			29		
Acqueous Solution		N-biochar	2000	Diclofenac	π-π stacking	Langmuir isotherm	231		[80]
				Naproxen			155		
				Ibuprofen			25.3		
		O-biochar	2000	Diclofenac			124		
				Naproxen			147		
				Ibuprofen			14.6		
Acqueous Solution	Carbon Nanotube	MWCNT (0_2=2,0%)		Tetracycline		Langmuir isotherm	217.8		[81]
		MWCNT (0_2=3,2%)					269.25		

Medium	Type	Adsorbent		Pollutant	Mechanism	Isotherm	Capacity	Removal %	Ref
		MWCNT (O_2=4,7%)					217.56		
		MWCNT (O_2=5,9%)					210.43		
Acqueous Solution		MWCNT (O_2=2,0%)		Ciprofloxacin		Langmuir isotherm	150.9		[82]
		MWCNT (O_2=3,2%)					178.9		
		MWCNT (O_2=4,7%)					206		
		MWCNT (O_2=5,9%)					181.2		
Acqueous Solution		SWCNT	1000	Ibuprofene			231	100	[83]
		MWCNT					81	100	
		O-MWCNT					19	97	
		SWCNT	1000	Triclosan			558		
		MWCNT					434		
		O-MWCNT					105		
Acqueous Solution	Clay Mineral	Bentonite	30000	Amoxicilline	elctrostatic	Langmuir and Freundlich	20	88	[84]
Acqueous Solution		Montmorillonite		Trimethoprim	elctrostatic	Langmuir and Freundlich	60	-	[85]
Acqueous Solution		Kaolinite		Ciprofloxacin	elctrostatic			95	[40]
Acqueous Solution		Montmorillonite	1800	Sulfamidethoxine	elctrostatic	Freundelich		13	[86]
				Sulfemathoxazole				10	
				Tetracycline				99	
				Oxytetracycline				90	
Acqueous Solution	Others	Zeolite	20	Ciprofloxacin	dipole dipole and π-π stacking			51	[74]
Acqueous Solution		Fe/Mn	1000	Tetracycline				88	[75]
Acqueous Solution		Gaphene Oxide	181	Tetracycline	π-π stacking and cation-π bonding	Langmuir	313		[87]

Acqueous Solution	MIP	Diclofenac	hydrogen bonding	325	99	[65]
	NIP				15	

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300   4. **Molecularly imprinted polymers**

301   MIPs can be considered analogues of the natural antigen-antibody systems, constituted by synthetic

302   receptors able to retain specific target molecules according to their chemical functionalization. MIPs

303   potentially offer the specificity and selectivity of the biological receptors with the explicit advantages

304   of durability with respect to environmental conditions and low cost.

305   **4.1. Polymerization synthesis**

306   MIPs synthesis is based on the formation of a complex between a target molecule (template) and a

307   monomer, in which one or more functional groups able to interact between them are involved. In the

308   presence of a large excess of a cross-linker, the initiator (in sub-stoichiometric amounts) promotes

309   the formation of radicals and consequently the propagation of the radical polymerization. As the

310   three-dimensional polymer network increases, the polymer loses the solvation by solvent and

311   precipitates in solid form on the bottom of the reaction vessel [88]. After the polymerization process,

312   the template is removed from the polymer through a washing procedure, which varies according to

313   the interactions established between the monomer and the template, leaving specific recognition sites

314   complementary in shape, size, and chemical functionality. Therefore, the resulting polymer

315   selectively recognizes and binds only molecules based on chemical properties similar to the template

316   molecule. Intermolecular interactions, between the target molecule and the functional groups present

317   in the polymer matrix, guide the phenomena of molecular recognition. Similarly, Non-Imprinted

318   Polymers (NIPs) are synthesized in the same way without using the target molecule during the pre-

319   polymerization step and are used as a control to evaluate the efficacy of the polymerization obtained.

320   The occurrence of intramolecular interactions between the monomer and the template before the

321   polymerization process represents a preliminary essential condition for obtaining specific binding

322   sites for the target molecule. We illustrated two main routes (**Fig. 2**) followed for the polymerization

323   which depends on the nature of the pre-polymerization interactions between template and monomer

324   [89]. MIPs can be formed by non-covalent intermolecular interactions, such as hydrogen bonding,

325   ion coupling or dipole interactions, between the target molecule and the monomer, even if non-

specific binding sites can derive from an incorrect stoichiometric relationship between the template

molecule and the monomers, thus leading to a reduction in the selectivity and in the efficiency of the

synthesized polymer [90].

Fig. 2. Polymerization steps of MIPs through **a)** non-covalent **b)** covalent (adapted from [89]).

In the other case, covalent bonds with a defined 1:1 stoichiometry between monomer and template

molecules are formed in the pre-polymerization phase. At the end of polymerization, the main issue

is represented by the cleavage of the bond and the removal of the template molecules. Therefore,

covalently imprinted MIPs must have reversible bonds that can be easily broken, without perturbing

their geometry and chemistry which make them appropriate also in real matrices [91].

4.2. Type of synthesis

The main challenge of MIPs technology consists in the synthesis of a suitable polymer for a particular

application field, without the disadvantages caused by temperature, pH, interferes and other

parameters present in the solution of real matrices. In these last few years, many articles have

appeared in the literature about different types of synthesis. Among these, bulk polymerization is the

most common and simplest procedure with the reaction carried out in a small amount of solvent to

have the precipitation of the polymer as a monolith, which is subsequently crushed and sieved [92].

344 However, this procedure has a low reproducibility, with partial destruction of the selective binding

345 sites during the crushing and the additional risk of losing the most volatile fraction of the polymer or

346 obtaining unwanted particle sizes [93]. A development of the previous method is represented by the

347 precipitation polymerization which requires the use of larger volumes of porogenic solvents [94].

348 Once the critical mass is reached, the polymer is no longer solubilized and precipitates as spherical

349 particles. In this way, the size and the porosity of the spherical particles are easily controlled by

350 choosing the appropriate reaction mixture [95], but with the possibility that the monomer and the

351 template could be irreversibly solubilized causing a partial loss of the reagents and hence a decrease

352 of the polymerization yield [96]. Another option is represented by the emulsion polymerization in

353 which two immiscible solvents are used in the presence of a stabilizing surfactant to obtain small

354 droplets (micelles) inside which the polymerization reaction takes place [97]. A similar procedure,

355 even though more complex, is represented by the Pickering emulsion polymerization [98], where

356 solid particles are used to stabilize the small droplets formed in the mixture of two immiscible liquids,

357 thus eliminating or reducing the dependence on surfactant emulsifiers and making the procedures

358 cheaper. At the end of the polymerization, solid particles must be removed by an additional washing

359 with an appropriate solvent, as in the case of hydrofluoric acid to leach silica nanoparticles [99].

360 Finally, the most innovative type of synthesis can be represented by the surface polymerization which

361 involves the formation of a thin layer of the polymeric material, with its high molecular affinity, on

362 the surface of different types of substrate. In this way, it is possible to exploit also the properties of

363 the physical support; for example carbonanotubes (CNTs) can be used to increase the contact surface

364 [100], Fe_3O_4 to create magnetic microparticles easy to separate [101], TiO_2 to combine photocatalytic

365 processes [76] and SiO_2 to enhance a rapid mass transfer and faster binding kinetics [102,103].

366 Benefits and drawbacks for each type of polymerization useful to MIPs synthesis are summarized in

367 **Table 2**.

368

369 **Table 2.** Benefits and drawbacks of different types of polymerization used to synthesize MIPs.

Type of synthesis	Benefits	Drawbacks
Bulk polymerization	• Simplicity of method makes it possible to perform in any laboratory • Do not require particular skills or sophisticated instrumentation	• Tedious procedures of grinding and sieving • Wastage of useful polymer fraction, irregularly sized particles
Precipitation polymerization	• Nanoparticles size with easy separation. • High surface area	• Low yield of synthesis • Partial loss of the template during the synthesis • High solvent consumption
Emulsion polymerization	• Allows to predetermine the polymer particle size • Formation of spherical particles	• Complicated processes and use of stabilizers and surfactants can contaminate the MIPs • Stabilizers and surfactants are difficult to remove from the resulting MIPs and may generally interfere with the imprinting procedure
Surface polymerization	• Spherical particles, highly reproducible results • Applicable to most imprinting systems, particle size can be adjusted • Features of particles joined to the selectivity of the final polymer	• Complicated procedures and reaction conditions • Substrates can be synthesized too • Bigger particles size

370

4.3. Solvents, monomers and water compatibility

MIPs represent useful tools which can be exploited for different kind of applications through the

control of the polymerization reaction conditions. Among them, the solvent reaction is one of the

most important parameters in MIPs synthesis. First of all, it has to solubilize the reagents to favor the

polymerization process but without forming strong intermolecular interactions with the monomer and

target molecules which could interfere in the pre-polymerization process [104]; for this reason,

aprotic solvents (acetonitrile, toluene) are generally used. Moreover, the chosen solvents should be

porogenic to favor the formation of larger pores, thus enhancing the contact surface of the obtained

polymer. At the same time, the solvent should have chemical properties similar to the matrices in

which the polymer will be used, to guarantee a coherent microenvironment that facilitates the

retention of the target molecule [105]. The choice of the solvent is also determined from the fact that

MIPs have to be used in water matrices but, because of their hydrophobic nature, they have problems

383 of water compatibility. The use of water mixtures with porogenic solvents during the polymerization

384 [106], of more hydrophilic monomer such as 2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate (HEMA) [107], or the

385 coating of surface nanoparticles with a broad range of functionalities to enhance its hydrophilicity

386 [101] can be useful remedies to this problem. In addition to the factors affecting the solubility of the

387 monomers and templates in the chosen solvent, also the selectivity of the monomers towards the

388 CECs has to be taken into account. For example, methacrylic acid [95] and 2-vinyl pyridine [65] were

389 used in similar synthesis, through precipitation polymerization, for the selective removal of

390 diclofenac but, due to the different chemical interactions between the monomers and the diclofenac,

391 the two obtained polymers exhibited different adsorption efficiencies, around 65 mg/g and 350 mg/g,

392 respectively. Another example is given by Huang et al. [108], who described the synthesis of two

393 different MIPs for the selective extraction of quercetin, through bulk polymerization using two

394 monomers, 4-vinylpirydine (MIP-4VP) and acrylamide (MIP-AM). In this study, two SPE cartridges

395 were filled with the two polymers and sequentially used to increase the selective removal of quercetin

396 from a mixture with other analogue compounds. The adsorption behavior of the two polymers was

397 also investigated and was found that MIP-4VP had a higher adsorption capacity than MIP-AM, 0.4

398 mg/g and 0.3 mg/g, respectively. With this method it is possible to take advantage not only from the

399 different adsorption ability but also from the adsorption mechanisms of the two MIPs and a different

400 extraction order may influence the binding affinity for quercetin. Considering the above, it is evident

401 that this technology is rather complex but at the same time it has the advantage of being versatile and

402 flexible and by choosing the appropriate reaction conditions it is possible to enhance the affinity and

403 the selective removal for a specific molecule.

404 **4.4. Enhanced removal of CECs via MIPs**

405 The possibility to design micro and nanoparticles with predetermined features has favored the use of

406 MIPs in many applications for the control and removal of CECs. For example, MIPs are widely used

407 in detection and analysis of CECs, as well as sensing [15], sample pretreatment [109], and

408 chromatographic fields [110]. In particular, in the analytical field, these polymers have seen a

20

significant step forward in the samples' pretreatment, which is enriched and eluted in a new solution, avoiding the effects of the real matrix [111]. In this way, MIPs opportunely synthesized can be filled in SPE cartridges (Solid Phase Extraction), called MISPE [112], which can selectively retain specific molecules and subsequently release them after a washing with a different solution for the analysis. In the literature, several examples of MIPs application as adsorbent for CECs in a wide variety of matrices are reported which show that CECs are selectively adsorbed by these MISPE cartridges due to the different binding affinity as reported in **Table 3**. Generally, MIPs' performances are measured in terms of adsorption capacity and selectivity toward a particular target molecule. For the adsorption efficiency, batch tests are usually carried out by using different concentrations of the target molecule with MIPs as well as with NIPs to find the imprinting factor (IF) value, the main indicator of the selectivity properties of the polymer obtained in the synthesis [109]. The selectivity of a polymer toward a particular CEC is usually determined in batch tests performed in the presence of other CECs, as in the case of a polymer for diclofenac removal which was assayed also together with indomethacin and ibuprofen, and was found to have a removal rate of 100% for diclofenac, 57% and 0% for the other two drugs, respectively [93]. In another work by Cantarella and co-workers [92], MIP adsorption specificity toward diclofenac was compared with those toward other compounds as acetylsalicylic acid, trimethoprim and methyl orange and, despite similar physicochemical properties between all the compounds, MIP was able to adsorb 90 % of diclofenac and only less than 20% of the other compounds.

Although in MIPs syntheses one specific template molecule is generally used, the sites created in the polymer pores may have a cross affinity also for others compounds with physicochemical properties similar to those of the template. This is a crucial point for many polymers which are produced for the selective binding of a specific molecule but which are able to adsorb in the same binding site also other compounds with a similar chemical structure. In the study of Geng et al. [21], a proparazine-MIP was synthesized by a surface molecular imprinting technique on nano-TiO$_2$ particles and was found to efficiently adsorb proparazine with an imprinting factor of 16.04. Moreover, this polymer

435   was also able to adsorb simazine and atrazine even if with a lower affinity. In a similar way, Vicario

436   et al. [25] reported a surface polymerization on silica particles to obtain a MIP for the recognition of

437   parabens (PCPs) in swimming pool water. Amount of 25 mg of MIP used with a time contact of 15

438   minutes, it was able to adsorb benzyl paraben with a removal percentage of 85% and, at the same

439   time, also metylparaben and propylparaben with 65% removal in both cases. These results are

440   consistent with the fact that methyl and propyl parabens have similar substituents and hence similar

441   affinity for MIPs particles, while the benzyl groups have higher affinity for MIPs' binding sites.

442   MIPs use for the removal of CECs from real matrices may have some problems and difficult operating

443   conditions. In fact, wastewater is one of the most complicated matrices which can be subjected to

444   MIPs due to the presence of many interferences (i.e. solid particles, high ions concentrations)

445   depending on the prior treatment configuration. MIPs particles may exhibit multiple sorption

446   mechanisms, especially in complex real matrices, due to the coexistence of hydrophobic and

447   hydrophilic structures within the polymer. The hydrophilicity of the binding sites in the core of the

448   particles provides the selective interactions with the target molecule, meanwhile the outer layer can

449   interact with other compounds via hydrophobic interactions and this could induce problems of surface

450   contamination and cause a decrease in the selectivity of the polymer [112]. The need to detect and

451   quantify CECs in wastewater matrices led to the development of new MISPE cartridges with high

452   selectivity for specific class of molecules, rather than for a sole compound. In fact, as said above,

453   similar compounds can access to the same binding sites, even if with different affinities. As reported

454   in the study of Prieto et al. [113], a precipitation polymerization, starting from methacrylic acid

455   (MAA) and ethylene glycol dimethacrylate (EGDMA) as the monomer and crosslinker, and using

456   ciprofloxacin as the template molecule, was carried out to obtain MIPs able to remove selectivity

457   ciprofloxacin, norfloxacin and ofloxacin. In other synthesis, fenoprofen [114] and ketoprofen [115]

458   were used as the template molecules in bulk polymerizations to obtain MIPs sorbent for SPE able to

459   retain also ibuprofen, in addition to the other two anti-inflammatory drugs. The prepared MISPE

460   could be reused several times through regeneration with an appropriate washing solution.

461 One of the most important parameters to consider when dealing with aqueous matrices is the pH of

462 the solution, since it substantially modifies the sorbent's adsorption capacity. In fact, pH modifies all

463 the ionizable functional groups present on the adsorbent as well as on the structure of the molecules

464 dissolved in the solution. In this way, the chemical interactions between MIPs and the various CECs

465 may be strengthened or weakened by a change in the pH and hence also the affinity of the binding

466 sites toward the target molecule. For example, in the work of Samah et al. [93], MIPs, produced by

467 bulk polymerization with diclofenac as the target molecule, have a decreased removal efficiency at

468 pH above 3. However, it is not possible to establish a predicted trend for MIPs adsorption capacity

469 toward target molecules with increasing or decreasing pH, as it depends on the most favorable

470 chemical environment in which they are involved. Indeed, Bakhtiar et al. [116] found a decrease in

471 MIPs adsorption capacity of 20% toward 2-phenilphenol when the pH was different from 7. Again,

472 Dai and Cortalezzi [117] reported an increase in the adsorption capacity of a MIPs sensor toward 2,4

473 di-nitrotoluene as the pH value increased. Other parameters may influence MIPs' adsorption

474 efficiency, even if to a lesser extent than pH, as the ionic strength and the organic matter present in

475 the wastewater. The ionic strength affects has a similar effect to that of pH, in fact it may increase or

476 decrease the adsorption affinity in the binding sites according to the chemical species and to the

477 interactions involved. On the other hand, organic matter acts as interferes on the hydrophilic surface

478 of the polymers reducing their affinity for a target molecule with a decrease in the adsorption

479 efficiency; this type of behavior are reported in several papers where the MIPs are tested with

480 different concentration of humic acid in batch test, where are evaluated their adsorption capacities

481 [117,118].

482 In addition to the efficiency and selectivity illustrated above, another fundamental point to take in

483 consideration when using MIPS is the possibility of regenerating the absorbent material and reusing

484 it several times, attractive not only to save the material but also in terms of production sustainability.

485 In fact, MIPs can effectively be recycled and used again without losing their performance. In the

486 regeneration step, the molecules adsorbed on the polymer matrix are dissolved and removed by a

solvent mixture, able to specifically solubilize the target molecules and to favor their elution. Generally, adsorption and regeneration are performed several times on the same polymer and the adsorption capacities during the cycles are evaluated. As shown by Vicario et al. [25], MISPE cartridges can be reused at least five times with a proper washing step using a solvent mixture of ethanol and acetic acid for the selective extractions of parabens; otherwise a mixture of acetonitrile and acetic acid was used to elute three different NSAIDs, as in the study of Madikizela et al. [24]. In another case, MIPs exhibited an excellent adsorption affinity for five different acidic pharmaceutical compounds used as template molecules, without loss of performance for fifteen regeneration cycles, by the use of methanol and acetic acid with a 9:1 ratio [118].

More recently, many articles have appeared in the literature describing a new MIPs' type of synthesis, called Multi-Template, in which several target molecules are used as templates. In this way, it is possible to extract, separate, and detect simultaneously different classes of chemical species, thus increasing MIPs utility and expanding their potential application. In particular, multi-template MIPs are highly desirable for a sustainable development of the processes. An example for NSAIDs multi-template MIPs was reported by Madikizela and Chimuka [24], who used a mixture of naproxen (NAP), ibuprofen (IBU) and diclofenac (DCF) in a 1:1:1 molar stoichiometry: an efficient adsorption was achieved only after 10 minutes, with also good values of IF as 1.25 (NAP), 1.42 (IBU) and 2.01 (DCF) while the recovery rates were 38% for NAP, 69% for IBU and 87% for DCF. Another study reported by Dai et al. [118], described a multi-template MIP synthesized by precipitation polymerization for the selective removal of five acidic pharmaceuticals from wastewater. The adsorption of the five compounds was rapid and the binding equilibrium was achieved within 30 min. A decrease in the removal efficiency of five acidic pharmaceuticals by MIP was found in the pH range of 8–10, while with increasing ionic strength from 0 to 30 mmol/L the removal rate increased. For the treatment of large volumes of real matrices and, in particular, of wastewater significant amounts of polymers are needed. It follows that the implementation from the lab scale to the pilot scale is a crucial step which has to consider not only the adsorption capacities of the polymers but

24

513   also practical and economic issues. In the study of Cantarella et al. [92], a bulk polymerization using

514   methacrylic acid as the monomer was described for an efficient removal of diclofenac from

515   wastewater. Despite the lower adsorption capacity and the reuse cycles seen in previous studies

516   [65,95], 5 mg of MIP were able to remove in 10 minutes ~90% of diclofenac with an initial

517   concentration of 32 mg/L from an aqueous solution, with an adsorption capacity of ~33mg/g. If

518   compared with other type of synthesis, such as emulsion or surface polymerization, synthetic pathway

519   represents a valuable strategy to obtain MIP materials being less time and solvent consuming. The

520   adsorption performances for the selective removal of diclofenac from water suggested that MIPs

521   might be successfully applied for water treatment even on a large-scale application.

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535   **Table 3.** Experimental conditions in CECs recovery/removal from water matrices using MIPs.

Matrix	CECs (Category)	Polymerization reaction condition	Washing method	MIPs evaluation	SPE condition	Regeneration (n)	Concentration of analyte (µg/L)	Ref.
Water and Soil samples	(Pesticides) Propazine Simazine Atrazine	Surface Polymerization Support: APTS-TiO$_2$; Reagents: Propazine/MAA/EGDMA; AIBN; Solvent: Toluene 50ml; Conditions: 1°step 50°C, 6h; 2°step 60°C, 12h	Soxhlet extraction: (12h) MeOH:Hac (7:1) Washing: MeOH. Dried: under vacuum 80°C	Time contact: 8h; Film thickness: 25-37µm Adsorption Capacity: 6.8 mg/g Imprinting Factor: 16.04	Sorbent: 200 mg Conditioning: MeOH (5 ml), H$_2$0 (5ml); Sample: 20ml Washing: 2ml ACN:H$_2$0 (1:4). Elution: 2ml MeOH;	-	Linear Adsorption range: 0-11 mg/L. Recovery %: 91.6–103.3	[21]
Aqueous samples	(Preservants, PCPs) Methylparaben Propylparaben Benzylparaben	Surface Polymerization Support: Silica Particles; Reagents: Benzylparaben/MAA/EGDMA; Benzoyl Peroxide; Solvent: Toluene; Conditions: 60°C, 4h	Repeated Washing: MeOH:HAc (9:1) for 8 times Centrifugation: 5000rpm 15min Final Washing: MeOH	Time Contact: 15min Imprinitig Factor: 1.77;	Sorbent: 25mg Sample: 10ml (flow rate 1 ml/min); Washing: 2ml H$_2$0 Ultrapure; Elution: 0.5ml EtOH/HAc (8:2); Cycles: 5 (times)	-	Range: 0.01 to 2.5mg/L; Recovery %: 0.59 (MP), 11.0 (PP), 85.5 (BP);	[25]
Lake Water	(Antibiotics) Sulfadiazine (SDZ) Sulfathiazole (STZ) Sulfamerazine (SMT) Sulfamethazine (SMM) Sulfamethoxazol (SMX) Sulfadoxine (SDX)	Multi-Templates Surface Polymerization Support: VTTS-MGO@mSiO2; Reagents: Templates/MAA/EGDMA; AIBN; Solvent: Toluene 50ml; Conditions: 1°step 50°C, 12h; 2°step 50°C, 2h	Repeated Washing: MeOH:HAc (9:1) Final Washing: MeOH and dried o.n.;	Time Contact: 15min Imprinitig Factor: 2.47 (SDZ); 2.64 (STZ); 2.32 (SMT); 2.47 (SMM) 2.68 (SMX); 2.40 (SDX);	Sorbent: 20mg Sample stirring: 50ml for 10min; Elution: 2ml MeOH in 6min; Cycles: 5 (times)	-	Conc.: 0.82 (SDZ), 1.11 (STZ), 0.59 (SMT), 1.01 (SMM), 0.87 (SMX), 1.12 (SDX);	[23]
Tap Water	(Plasticizers) Dibutyl phthalate (DBP), Butyl benzyl phthalate (BBP) diethyl phthalate (DEP) Dimethyl phthalate (DMP)	Precipitation Polymerization Reagents: DBP/MAA/EGDMA (1:4:20); AIBN; Solvent: ACN (20ml); Conditions: Temp (60°C)	Repeated Washing: MeOH:HAc (9:1) Final Washing: MeOH and dried 4h at 50°C.;	Time Contact: 45min Adsorption Capacity: 22mg/g;	Sorbent: 200mg Conditioning: MeOH (15ml), H$_2$0 (15ml); Sample: 15ml Washing: 1ml ACN:MeOH(1:1). Elution: 2ml MeOH;	-	Recovery %: 96 BBP, 94 DEP, 96 DBP, 94 DMP; Conc.: 0.82 (SDZ), 1.11 (STZ), 0.59 (SMT), 1.01 (SMM), 0.87 (SMX), 1.12 (SDX);	[119]

Sample	Analyte	Synthesis	Extraction/Washing	Characterization	SPE Procedure	Reusability	Concentration	Ref
River Water	(Plasticizer) Diethyl hexyl phthalates	Emulsion Polymerization Reagents: DEHP/methacrylamide /N,N_-methylene-bis-acrylamide (2.56/14.1/5.188); Solvents: DMF and H2O (2:8) 10ml and Oil mineral 20ml; Conditions: Temp. (50°C); Time (6h)	Soxhlet: (12h) MeOH Washing: Acetone Dried: Air flow	Surface Area: Time Contact: 5min; Adsorption Capacity: 49.83mg/g; Imprinitig Factor: 12.86;	Sorbent: 5 mg (25-38µm) Conditioning: H_2O (5ml) Sample: 5.0 ml Elution: CH_2Cl_2 (1ml)	Sorbent: 20 mg Sonication: CH_2Cl_2 (20ml) Time: 30 min Cycles: 6 (times)	Concentration range: 0.035 to 3.0	[120]
Wastewater	(Antibiotics) Ciprofloxacin Norfloxacin Ofloxacin	Precipitation Polymerization Reagents: Ciprofloxacin/MAA/EGDMA (0.11/0.88/2.2); AIBN; Solvent: MeOH (12 ml); Conditions: Temp (60°C)	Ultrasound bath: (12h) MeOH Vacuum Filtered: (8h) MeOH:HAC (1:1) and acetone	-	Sorbent: 100 mg (25-38µm) Conditioning: MeOH /Hac (10ml) 1:1; MeOH (10ml) and H_2O (10ml) Sample: 1.6ml Washing: MeOH (ml), H2O (1ml) Elution: MeOH:Hac (1:1, v/v)	-	Influent: 0.697, 1.121, 0.925; Effluent: 2.433, 0.741, 0.567;	[113]
Wastewater	(NSADs) Fenoprofen	Bulk Polymerization Reagents: Fenoprofen/2-VP/EGDMA; CAN; Solvent: DMF and DMSO Conditions: Co^{2+} as Pivot	Soxhlet extraction: MeOH/HAc (9:1) Washing: MeOH	Surface Area: $1607m^2/g$ Adsorption Capacity: 38.8 mg/g; Imprinitig Factor: 1.86;	Sorbent: 50mg (25-50µm) Conditioning: 3 ml MeOH, 5 ml H2O (pH 5); Sample: 50-200 ml Washing: TEA/H20 Elution: MeOH/EtOH/ACN (1-5ml)	Sorbent: 10mg Elution: TEA/Water Cycles: 5 (times) Water spiked: 50mg/L	Influent: 0.08-0.068 Effluent: 0.47-0.040	[114]
Wastewater	(NSADs) Ketoprofen	Bulk Polymerization Reagents: Fenoprofen/2-VP/EGDMA; CAN; Solvent: ACN/Toluene (1:9) Conditions: 1°step 60°C, 16h; 2°step 80°C, 24h	Repeated Eluition: ACN:HAc (9:1) Final Washing: ACN	Surface Area: $207m^2/g$ Time Contact: 45min Adsorption Capacity: 8.24mg/g	Sorbent: 14mg (25-50m) Conditioning: 1ml MeOH, 1ml H_2O; Sample: 50ml (pH 5 flow rate 1ml/min), dried 10min; Washing: 1ml TEA/H20 (5%) Elution: 1ml MeOH	Sorbent: 10mg Elution: 3ml Water and 3ml MeOH; Water spiked: 5µg/L	Influent: 22.5-34mg/L; Effluent: 1.14-5.33mg/L	[115]

| Wastewater | (NSADs) Naproxen Ibuprofen Diclofenac | Multi-Template Bulk Polymerization Reagents: Multi-Templates/MAA/EGDMA; CAN; Solvent: Toluene (50 + 25ml); Conditions: 1°step 70°C, 8h; 2°step 70°C, 16h | Repeated Eluition: ACN:HAc (9:1) Final Washing: ACN | Surface Area: Time Contact: 10min; Adsorption Capacity: 4.47 (NAP), 3.60 (IBU), 5.45 mg/g (DCF); Imprinitig Factor: 1.25 (NAP), 1.42 (IBU), 2.01 (DCF); | Sorbent: 50mg (25-50µm) Sample stirring: 10ml for 10min (pH 2.5); Vacuum Filtration: 2ml MeOH:H_2O (1:9). Elution: 2ml ACN:HAc (8:2); | Sorbent: 50mg Elution: 2ml ACN:HAc (8:2); Cycles: 5 (times) | Influent wastewater spiked with 50µg/L per Templates; Recovery % 38 (NAP), 69 (IBU), 87 (DCF); | [24] |

536

537

28

4.5. Upscaling MIP columns: from lab- to pilot-scale

Given their specific selectivity for one or more class of compounds, MIPs are excellent candidates to be implemented in tertiary treatment for the targeted CECs removal. The potential applicability of MIPs on a large scale was highlighted by Cantarella and colleagues [92] based on the extreme selectivity of the adsorption process and the reusability of the material by easy and efficient adsorption/regeneration cycles. Whereas the upscaling behavior of GAC adsorption columns for removing CECs has been tested [121], to the best of our knowledge, no pilot or demonstrative-scale of MIP columns in water and/or wastewater treatment has been done so far and related studies have been limited to lab-scale up to date. Therefore, we provide a basic necessary pathway to follow while upscaling MIPs particles in adsorption columns in real environment. In **Fig. 3**, the scale up route is divided into four main phases. The synthesis and vast production of polymers needs a further scaled-up step to control reaction yields and MIPs property, which must be reproducible and constant. One of the most crucial point is the removal of the template molecule by using large amount of organic solvents (see **Table 3**) per unit mass of polymer produced. Therefore, it is fundamental to find a proper side process to recover these solvents to minimize the environmental impact and to limit the production cost for the overall process sustainability. About this aspect, different methods can be applied to recover solvents: distillation is the most common and well-established technique used to separate solvents from aqueous or other organic mixtures. Due to the high boiling point of many CECs used as templates, the waste solvent can be distillated by heating and recondensation to leave CECs in a small fraction and to recover the recycled solvent. Alternatively, adsorption processes can be used to remove contaminants from the solvent but these procedures are not so feasible with organic matrices mainly constituted by methanol and high concentration of CECs as those obtained from template removal with other adsorbent materials. Finally, membrane processes can be a valuable solution compared to the others due to their inherent simplicity and energy efficiency, avoiding undesirable phase change, as in case of distillation. In the study of Cseri et al. [122], the three processes are compared for the methanol recovery in terms of carbon footprint. The distillation

29

564 process has a linear production of CO_2 higher than the adsorption one up to 70% of solvent recovery

565 due to the high energy consumption, above 70% the adsorption process requires excessive amounts

566 of adsorbent because of the highly concentrated solution. Membrane filtrations can be considered the

567 greenest process but, it may be affected by high implementation and maintenance costs which have

568 considered in the entire MIPs process life cycle assessment. The MIPs' characterization can be done

569 through instrumental analysis and experimental laboratory test. In the first case, chemical information

570 obtained through FTIR and NMR analysis may not give a certain presence or absence of a specific

571 organic compound in a polymer, as well as the orientation in space of the essential functional groups

572 in the pre-polymerization phase. Conversely, Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), Dynamic Light

573 Scattering (DLS) and Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA), provide data on physical properties of the

574 MIPs synthesized, such as surface area and size of pores and particles [111]. In the second step, lab-

575 scale experimental batch tests are conducted to determine the adsorption affinity to different CECs

576 through isotherms analysis and kinetic studies [95]. Successively, continuous flow tests in column

577 are further conducted to verify the best configuration to implement in pilot-scale and to determine the

578 MIPs' properties, when the flow passes through the column. Similarly of GAC or other sorbents

579 material [57,123,124], empty bed contact time (EBCT) is a fundamental parameter to replicate the

580 laboratory conditions on a pilot scale, which represents the time it takes for the flow to pass through

581 the column at given reactor volume and flow rate. Once the optimal conditions are set, the

582 experimental data collected in lab scale must be confirmed through installation of the column,

583 commissioning and long-term validation.

584 Finally, MIPs adsorption behavior must be verified through the monitoring of CECs concentration in

585 the effluent and evaluate the MIPs regeneration necessity and frequency. Due to the different CECs

586 concentration in the influent and also due the diverse effluent requirements for the discharging or the

587 safe reuse, is not easy to establish a common regeneration procedure. Given the maximum adsorption

588 capacity and designed the best process condition, it is possible to estimate the treatable volume and

589 predict when the break and breakthrough of the column could happen. However, a straight and

continuous monitoring of the effluent is necessary to detect the CECs concentration removed by the treatment. The economic aspects of the technology must be considered, and clearly the MIPs are more expensive than GAC sorbents concerning the synthesis, while the MIPs are easily regenerated maintaining their removal performance.

An interesting study by Razali et al. [125], compared seven different adsorption materials for the treatment of wastewater contaminated by N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) and N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF). Most of the tested adsorbents showed good performances, in particular MIP, functionalized with phenylboronic acid, showed superior performance being able to adsorb 677 and 502 mmol DMF and NMP per kg adsorbent, respectively. Most of the compared adsorbent were regenerated up to 10 times without any loss of performance.


Fig. 3. A possible upscaling pathway for MIPs application to wastewater treatment for enhanced CECs removal and safe water reuse in irrigation/fertigation.

5. Integration of MIP columns to urban water cycle facilities

The application of conventional adsorption columns to remove CECs from water has been successfully tested using GAC at pilot-scale [126] and even at full-scale [127]. However, MIPs are more advantageous for treatment of trace contaminants because they can be specifically designed to remove one or a group of target compounds. This is an advantage over nonspecific conventional adsorption technologies such as AC, which may be consumed removing large amounts of non-trace contaminants from the water [7]. As already discussed in previous sections, the degradation/removal of CECs is more likely to be applied using coupled treatment systems which can bridge the deficiencies in a single technology for the removal of these complex contaminants present in the water environment [29]. Various configurations can be developed to integrate MIP columns in urban water cycle facilities for enhanced removal of CECs. One possible configuration for municipal wastewater treatment is proposed in **Fig. 4**, that is currently being developed under the PRIMA/H2020 Project "FIT4REUSE" (fit4reuse.org), to produce a treated effluent that is suitable for reuse in irrigation according to required standards. A MIP column can be easily coupled after the up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket (UASB) and anaerobic membrane bioreactor (AnMBR). The UASB + AnMBR has been an innovative solution for municipal wastewater treatment especially in small-scale decentralized facilities where several advantages such as less energy cost, less fouling, and higher operating organic loading rate (OLR) can be achieved [128]. After a pre-treatment unit followed by a high-rate anaerobic treatment via UASB, AnMBR functions as post-treatment (polishing step) and even guarantees disinfection thanks to microfiltration [129]. The permeate of the AnMBR has often high quality and falls into Class A according to the European Regulation on minimum requirements for water reuse of the European Parliament and of the Council [26] since it is free from suspended solids and pathogens, while its nutrient-rich matrix allows a potential reuse in fertigation [130]. At this point, CECs can be the limiting factor for water reuse and the integration of MIP columns can be a promising solution based on the results obtained from lab-scale studies. The permeate can be introduced to MIP column as an advanced treatment step to enhance the removal of

629 target CECs. The critical point here is that operating parameters of MIP columns is completely

630 different than that of in other high-rate reactors. For instance, hydraulic retention time (HRT) is

631 typically maintained in the range of 6-18h in UASB [131] and 4-16h AnMBR [132]; whereas,

632 HRT/contact time is usually much lower in a MIP column (3-6min) [13,133]. The reactor volume

633 required for MIPs is therefore very limited compared to others due to much lower contact time

634 needed. In addition to operating conditions, the target CECs can vary with respect to local conditions.

635 For instance, pesticides can be the dominant CECs in rural areas. Accordingly, the needs and

636 characteristics of the pilot area must be clearly defined before the design and implementation of such

637 treatment configuration. An additional disinfection unit (i.e. UV) can be also coupled at the end of

638 the UASB + AnMBR + MIP configuration for a possible post-contamination in the MIP column.

639

640 **Fig. 4.** A possible configuration for integrating MIP columns to urban water cycle facilities for

641 enhanced CECs removal and enabling safe water reuse in irrigation/fertigation. This configuration is

642 currently being developed under the PRIMA/H2020 Project "FIT4REUSE" (fit4reuse.org).

643

644 Although MIP columns offer promising applications for advanced wastewater treatment to remove

645 CECs, they have certain limitations for up-scaling regarding cost and applicability. These limitations

646 must be addressed with engineering solutions and at least partially eliminated in order to develop a

647 sustainable urban water cycle framework as discussed in the next section.

648

649

6. Sustainability of MIPs in water reuse systems

Next generation wastewater treatment processes must be the best economically, environmentally and socially, so their selection and implementation can be adequate. When developing processes for solving a certain environmental issue, one must be aware that the use of resources and energy by these processes will result in additional environmental burdens [134]. Adsorption columns using MIPs can be a promising technology with elevated removal efficiencies of CECs and without the transformation of products (by-products). However, such adsorption-based processes do not provide a permanent solution since the target pollutants only change phase, so the treatment of the sorbent is also necessary after application. In addition, although having relatively lower cost of preparation compared to membrane technologies, the vast production of MIPs can be quite expensive and difficult which makes their fabrication quite challenging. At this point, NIPs can be favored [7]. Meanwhile, regeneration and subsequent reuse of MIPs/NIPs following their use for water and wastewater treatment can reduce the overall costs of treatment. A life cycle assessment (LCA) and life cycle cost analysis (LCC) should be applied to help with decision making and to provide a detailed overview of the environmental sustainability of these technologies, which is currently lacking in the literature.

A possible solution to ease the reproduction of MIPs at demonstrative and/or full-scale can be partially filling the adsorption columns with other materials in addition to NIPs/MIPs. Conventional adsorbents such as PAC or GAC can be used as co-adsorbent; whereas a competitive adsorption and selectivity may occur in the column for the target compounds. Then, MIPs can be saved by using inert materials (such as sand, glass beads, ceramic balls) in the adsorption column, and the efficiency of the adsorption process needs a further optimization of the mixing ratio of the materials.

Another point is that since the occurrence of CECs in wastewater is highly variable, a continuous operation of any single unit for the removal of CECs may not be necessary in a treatment configuration. Eventually, the adaptation of contamination sensors can be reasonable since recent developments in sensor technology promise faster screening approaches coupled with effective determination of target contaminants [135]. These systems can be integrated with early warning

34

systems for CECs [136], and thus enable to operate if only the target compound is above a certain threshold concentration. When the concentration of a target CEC is high, these early warning sensor systems can activate the circulation of effluent through the MIP column. Nevertheless, the choice of the most appropriate technology or combination of different technologies vary based on the quality requirements and potential application of the reclaimed water. Considering that most of the total water demand is represented by irrigation (50% to 90%), there is no doubt that these innovative measures can help to address the water scarcity problem in the regions like Mediterranean that face severe water stress in the near future due to climate change.

7. Final remarks and conclusions

With this review paper, we highlight the potential of MIPs to be integrated to urban water cycle facilities to ensure water safety in case the CECs create barriers in practice. Several advantages such as no generation of oxidation or degradation byproducts and high regeneration potential make them promising candidates for future water applications. Up to date, MIPs have been used to recover and/or remove CECs from aqueous solution only at the lab-scale. Thus far, no studies have considered up-scaled application of MIPs in real operative environment. The high selectivity and strong affinity of MIPs to target compounds can replace conventional GAC/PAC based adsorption columns in wastewater treatment. However, the optimization of synthesis steps is crucial to establish vast production of MIPs in a high performance of CECs removal process. In any case when a MIP column is designed to be upscaled and integrated to a wastewater treatment scheme, their sustainability must be ensured. At this point, implementing LCA and LCC of MIPs in a relevant environment is highly recommended, which is currently lacking in the literature since these systems are highly innovative and further research is required.

Disclosure statement

The authors have declared no conflict of interest.

Funding

707 **References**

708 [1]   I. Oller, I. Polo-López, S. Miralles-Cuevas, P. Fernández-Ibáñez, S. Malato, Advanced

709   Technologies for Emerging Contaminants Removal in Urban Wastewater, Handb. Environ.

710   Chem. 45 (2016) 145–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/698-2014-319.

711 [2]   R. Rosal, A. Rodríguez, J.A. Perdigón-Melón, A. Petre, E. García-Calvo, M.J. Gómez, A.

712   Agüera, A.R. Fernández-Alba, Occurrence of emerging pollutants in urban wastewater and

713   their removal through biological treatment followed by ozonation, Water Res. 44 (2010)

714   578–588. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.07.004.

715 [3]   L.C. Pereira, A.O. de Souza, M.F.F. Bernardes, M. Pazin, M.J. Tasso, P.H. Pereira, D.J.

716   Dorta, A perspective on the potential risks of emerging contaminants to human and

717   environmental health, Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 22 (2015) 13800–13823.

718   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-4896-6.

719 [4]   Y. Luo, W. Guo, H.H. Ngo, L.D. Nghiem, F.I. Hai, J. Zhang, S. Liang, X.C. Wang, A review

720   on the occurrence of micropollutants in the aquatic environment and their fate and removal

721   during wastewater treatment, Sci. Total Environ. 473–474 (2014) 619–641.

722   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.12.065.

723 [5]   B. Petrie, R. Barden, B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, A review on emerging contaminants in

724   wastewaters and the environment: Current knowledge, understudied areas and

725   recommendations for future monitoring, Water Res. 72 (2015) 3–27.

726   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.08.053.

727 [6] J.P.R. Sorensen, D.J. Lapworth, D.C.W. Nkhuwa, M.E. Stuart, D.C. Gooddy, R.A. Bell, M.

728 Chirwa, J. Kabika, M. Liemisa, M. Chibesa, S. Pedley, Emerging contaminants in urban

729 groundwater sources in Africa, Water Res. 72 (2015) 51–63.

730 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.08.002.

731 [7] A. Murray, B. Örmeci, Application of molecularly imprinted and non-imprinted polymers for

732 removal of emerging contaminants in water and wastewater treatment: A review, Environ.

733 Sci. Pollut. Res. 19 (2012) 3820–3830. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-012-1119-2.

734 [8] N.H. Tran, M. Reinhard, E. Khan, H. Chen, V.T. Nguyen, Y. Li, S.G. Goh, Q.B. Nguyen, N.

735 Saeidi, K.Y.H. Gin, Emerging contaminants in wastewater, stormwater runoff, and surface

736 water: Application as chemical markers for diffuse sources, Sci. Total Environ. 676 (2019)

737 252–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.160.

738 [9] K. Kümmerer, The presence of pharmaceuticals in the environment due to human use -

739 present knowledge and future challenges, J. Environ. Manage. 90 (2009) 2354–2366.

740 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.01.023.

741 [10] V.K. Gupta, P.J.M. Carrott, M.M.L. Ribeiro Carrott, Suhas, Low-Cost adsorbents: Growing

742 approach to wastewater treatmenta review, Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol. 39 (2009) 783–

743 842. https://doi.org/10.1080/10643380801977610.

744 [11] UNEP/MAP Plan Bleu, State of the environment and development in the Mediterranean.

745 Technical Report, Athens, 2019.

746 [12] O. Ramström, K. Mosbach, Synthesis and catalysis by molecularly imprinted materials, Curr.

747 Opin. Chem. Biol. 3 (1999) 759–764. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1367-5931(99)00037-X.

748 [13] T. Jing, J. Wang, M. Liu, Y. Zhou, Y. Zhou, S. Mei, Highly effective removal of 2,4-

749 dinitrophenolic from surface water and wastewater samples using hydrophilic molecularly

750 imprinted polymers, Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 21 (2014) 1153–1162.

751 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-013-2007-0.

752 [14] X. Song, J. Li, J. Wang, L. Chen, Quercetin molecularly imprinted polymers: Preparation,
37

753 recognition characteristics and properties as sorbent for solid-phase extraction, Talanta. 80

754 (2009) 694–702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2009.07.051.

755 [15] O.S. Ahmad, T.S. Bedwell, C. Esen, A. Garcia-Cruz, S.A. Piletsky, Molecularly Imprinted

756 Polymers in Electrochemical and Optical Sensors, Trends Biotechnol. 37 (2019) 294–309.

757 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2018.08.009.

758 [16] D. Fauzi, F.A. Saputri, Molecularly imprinted polymer nanoparticles (MIP-NPs) applications

759 in electrochemical sensors, Int. J. Appl. Pharm. 11 (2019) 1–6.

760 https://doi.org/10.22159/ijap.2019v11i6.35088.

761 [17] F. Mirata, M. Resmini, Molecularly imprinted polymers for catalysis and synthesis, Adv.

762 Biochem. Eng. Biotechnol. 150 (2015) 107–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/10_2015_319.

763 [18] C. Alvarez-Lorenzo, A. Concheiro, Molecularly imprinted polymers for drug delivery, J.

764 Chromatogr. B Anal. Technol. Biomed. Life Sci. 804 (2004) 231–245.

765 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchromb.2003.12.032.

766 [19] A.G. Mayes, M.J. Whitcombe, Synthetic strategies for the generation of molecularly

767 imprinted organic polymers, Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev. 57 (2005) 1742–1778.

768 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2005.07.011.

769 [20] R. Del Sole, M.R. Lazzoi, G. Vasapollo, Synthesis of nicotinamide-based molecularly

770 imprinted microspheres and in vitro controlled release studies, Drug Deliv. 17 (2010) 130–

771 137. https://doi.org/10.3109/10717541003587418.

772 [21] H.R. Geng, S.S. Miao, S.F. Jin, H. Yang, A newly developed molecularly imprinted polymer

773 on the surface of TiO2 for selective extraction of triazine herbicides residues in maize, water,

774 and soil, Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 407 (2015) 8803–8812. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-

775 9039-x.

776 [22] W. Lu, X. Wang, X. Wu, D. Liu, J. Li, L. Chen, X. Zhang, Multi-template imprinted

777 polymers for simultaneous selective solid-phase extraction of six phenolic compounds in

778 water samples followed by determination using capillary electrophoresis, J. Chromatogr. A.

779   1483 (2017) 30–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2016.12.069.

780   [23]   Y. Fan, G. Zeng, X. Ma, Effects of prepolymerization on surface molecularly imprinted

781   polymer for rapid separation and analysis of sulfonamides in water, J. Colloid Interface Sci.

782   571 (2020) 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2020.03.027.

783   [24]   L.M. Madikizela, L. Chimuka, Synthesis, adsorption and selectivity studies of a polymer

784   imprinted with naproxen, ibuprofen and diclofenac, J. Environ. Chem. Eng. 4 (2016) 4029–

785   4037. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2016.09.012.

786   [25]   A. Vicario, M. Solari, E. Felici, L. Aragón, F. Bertolino, M.R. Gomez, Molecular imprinting

787   on surface of silica particles for the selective extraction of benzylparaben in flow system

788   applied to cosmetics and water samples, Microchem. J. 142 (2018) 329–334.

789   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2018.06.031.

790   [26]   EC, Regulation (EU) 2020/741 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May

791   2020 on Minimum Requirements for Water Reuse, 2020.

792   [27]   V. Dulio, B. van Bavel, E. Brorström-Lundén, J. Harmsen, J. Hollender, M. Schlabach, J.

793   Slobodnik, K. Thomas, J. Koschorreck, Emerging pollutants in the EU: 10 years of

794   NORMAN in support of environmental policies and regulations, Environ. Sci. Eur. 30

795   (2018). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-018-0135-3.

796   [28]   V. Geissen, H. Mol, E. Klumpp, G. Umlauf, M. Nadal, M. van der Ploeg, S.E.A.T.M. van de

797   Zee, C.J. Ritsema, Emerging pollutants in the environment: A challenge for water resource

798   management, Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res. 3 (2015) 57–65.

799   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswcr.2015.03.002.

800   [29]   O.M. Rodriguez-Narvaez, J.M. Peralta-Hernandez, A. Goonetilleke, E.R. Bandala, Treatment

801   technologies for emerging contaminants in water: A review, Chem. Eng. J. 323 (2017) 361–

802   380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2017.04.106.

803   [30]   W. Ben, B. Zhu, X. Yuan, Y. Zhang, M. Yang, Z. Qiang, Occurrence, removal and risk of

804   organic micropollutants in wastewater treatment plants across China: Comparison of

805   wastewater treatment processes, Water Res. 130 (2018) 38–46.

806   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.11.057.

807   [31]   S. Jagini, S. Konda, D. Bhagawan, V. Himabindu, Emerging contaminant (triclosan)

808   identification and its treatment: a review, SN Appl. Sci. 1 (2019) 1–15.

809   https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-019-0634-x.

810   [32]   P. Krzeminski, M.C. Tomei, P. Karaolia, A. Langenhoff, C.M.R. Almeida, E. Felis, F.

811   Gritten, H.R. Andersen, T. Fernandes, C.M. Manaia, L. Rizzo, D. Fatta-Kassinos,

812   Performance of secondary wastewater treatment methods for the removal of contaminants of

813   emerging concern implicated in crop uptake and antibiotic resistance spread: A review, Sci.

814   Total Environ. 648 (2019) 1052–1081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.130.

815   [33]   Q. Sun, M. Lv, A. Hu, X. Yang, C.P. Yu, Seasonal variation in the occurrence and removal

816   of pharmaceuticals and personal care products in a wastewater treatment plant in Xiamen,

817   China, J. Hazard. Mater. 277 (2014) 69–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.11.056.

818   [34]   T. aus der Beek, F.A. Weber, A. Bergmann, S. Hickmann, I. Ebert, A. Hein, A. Küster,

819   Pharmaceuticals in the environment-Global occurrences and perspectives, Environ. Toxicol.

820   Chem. 35 (2016) 823–835. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3339.

821   [35]   E. Carmona, V. Andreu, Y. Picó, Occurrence of acidic pharmaceuticals and personal care

822   products in Turia River Basin: From waste to drinking water, Sci. Total Environ. 484 (2014)

823   53–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.085.

824   [36]   L. Feng, E.D. van Hullebusch, M.A. Rodrigo, G. Esposito, M.A. Oturan, Removal of

825   residual anti-inflammatory and analgesic pharmaceuticals from aqueous systems by

826   electrochemical advanced oxidation processes. A review, Chem. Eng. J. 228 (2013) 944–964.

827   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2013.05.061.

828   [37]   L.H.M.L.M. Santos, A.N. Araújo, A. Fachini, A. Pena, C. Delerue-Matos, M.C.B.S.M.

829   Montenegro, Ecotoxicological aspects related to the presence of pharmaceuticals in the

830   aquatic environment, J. Hazard. Mater. 175 (2010) 45–95.

831   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.10.100.

832 [38] O.S. Olatunji, O.S. Fatoki, B.O. Opeolu, B.J. Ximba, R. Chitongo, Determination of selected

833   steroid hormones in some surface water around animal farms in Cape Town using HPLC-

834   DAD, Environ. Monit. Assess. 189 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-017-6070-8.

835 [39] N.H. Torres, M.M. Aguiar, L.F.R. Ferreira, J.H.P. Américo, Â.M. Machado, E.B. Cavalcanti,

836   V.L. Tornisielo, Detection of hormones in surface and drinking water in Brazil by LC-ESI-

837   MS/MS and ecotoxicological assessment with Daphnia magna, Environ. Monit. Assess. 187

838   (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4626-z.

839 [40] W.C. Li, Occurrence, sources, and fate of pharmaceuticals in aquatic environment and soil,

840   Environ. Pollut. 187 (2014) 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2014.01.015.

841 [41] Q. Bu, B. Wang, J. Huang, S. Deng, G. Yu, Pharmaceuticals and personal care products in

842   the aquatic environment in China: A review, J. Hazard. Mater. 262 (2013) 189–211.

843   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.08.040.

844 [42] L. Renz, C. Volz, D. Michanowicz, K. Ferrar, C. Christian, D. Lenzner, T. El-Hefnawy, A

845   study of parabens and bisphenol A in surface water and fish brain tissue from the Greater

846   Pittsburgh Area, Ecotoxicology. 22 (2013) 632–641. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-013-

847   1054-0.

848 [43] Y. Guo, L. Wang, K. Kannan, Phthalates and parabens in personal care products from China:

849   Concentrations and human exposure, Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 66 (2014) 113–119.

850   https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-013-9937-x.

851 [44] D.C. McAvoy, B. Schatowitz, M. Jacob, A. Hauk, W.S. Eckhoff, Measurement of triclosan

852   in wastewater treatment systems, Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 21 (2002) 1323–1329.

853   https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620210701.

854 [45] B. Petrie, J. Youdan, R. Barden, B. Kasprzyk-Hordern, Multi-residue analysis of 90

855   emerging contaminants in liquid and solid environmental matrices by ultra-high-performance

856   liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry, J. Chromatogr. A. 1431 (2016) 64–78.

857   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2015.12.036.

858   [46]   M. Pedrouzo, F. Borrull, R.M. Marcé, E. Pocurull, Analytical methods for personal-care

859   products in environmental waters, TrAC - Trends Anal. Chem. 30 (2011) 749–760.

860   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2011.01.009.

861   [47]   U. Biermann, A. Jungbauer, J.O. Metzger, Esters of maleinized fatty compounds as

862   plasticizers, Eur. J. Lipid Sci. Technol. 114 (2012) 49–54.

863   https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201100136.

864   [48]   O. Horn, S. Nalli, D. Cooper, J. Nicell, Plasticizer metabolites in the environment, Water

865   Res. 38 (2004) 3693–3698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2004.06.012.

866   [49]   M. Rahman, C. Brazel, Ionic liquids: New generation stable plasticizers for poly(vinyl

867   chloride), Polym. Degrad. Stab. 91 (2006) 3371–3382.

868   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2006.05.012.

869   [50]   Viecelli NC, Lovatel ER, Cardoso EM, Filho IN, Study of bisphenol A in sanitary landfill

870   soil., Trans Ecol Env. (2011) 225–231.

871   [51]   J. Simmchen, R. Ventura, J. Segura, Progress in the Removal of Di-[2-Ethylhexyl]-Phthalate

872   as Plasticizer in Blood Bags, Transfus. Med. Rev. 26 (2012) 27–37.

873   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmrv.2011.06.001.

874   [52]   S. Yan, S.B. Subramanian, R.D. Tyagi, R.Y. Surampalli, T.C. Zhang, Emerging

875   contaminants of environmental concern: Source, transport, fate, and treatment, Pract. Period.

876   Hazardous, Toxic, Radioact. Waste Manag. 14 (2010) 2–20.

877   https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)HZ.1944-8376.0000015.

878   [53]   R. Meffe, I. de Bustamante, Emerging organic contaminants in surface water and

879   groundwater: A first overview of the situation in Italy, Sci. Total Environ. 481 (2014) 280–

880   295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.053.

881   [54]   M.G. Cahill, G. Caprioli, M. Stack, S. Vittori, K.J. James, Semi-automated liquid

882   chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) method for basic pesticides in wastewater

883   effluents, Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 400 (2011) 587–594. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-011-

884   4781-1.

885 [55] D.B. Barr, L.L. Needham, Analytical methods for biological monitoring of exposure to

886   pesticides: A review, J. Chromatogr. B Anal. Technol. Biomed. Life Sci. 778 (2002) 5–29.

887   https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-0232(02)00035-1.

888 [56] J. Fenik, M. Tankiewicz, M. Biziuk, Properties and determination of pesticides in fruits and

889   vegetables, TrAC - Trends Anal. Chem. 30 (2011) 814–826.

890   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2011.02.008.

891 [57] M. Sgroi, T. Anumol, P. Roccaro, F.G.A. Vagliasindi, S.A. Snyder, Modeling emerging

892   contaminants breakthrough in packed bed adsorption columns by UV absorbance and

893   fluorescing components of dissolved organic matter, Water Res. 145 (2018) 667–677.

894   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.09.018.

895 [58] S. De Gisi, G. Lofrano, M. Grassi, M. Notarnicola, Characteristics and adsorption capacities

896   of low-cost sorbents for wastewater treatment: A review, Sustain. Mater. Technol. 9 (2016)

897   10–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susmat.2016.06.002.

898 [59] É.C. Lima, M.A. Adebayo, F.M. Machado, Kinetic and equilibrium models of adsorption,

899   2015. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18875-1_3.

900 [60] David O. Cooney, Adsorption design for wastewater treatment, 1st ed., CRC Press, 1999.

901 [61] A. Dąbrowski, Adsorption - From theory to practice, Adv. Colloid Interface Sci. 93 (2001)

902   135–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8686(00)00082-8.

903 [62] N. Ayawei, S.S. Angaye, D. Wankasi, E.D. Dikio, Synthesis, Characterization and

904   Application of Mg/Al Layered Double Hydroxide for the Degradation of Congo Red in

905   Aqueous Solution, Open J. Phys. Chem. 05 (2015) 56–70.

906   https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpc.2015.53007.

907 [63] G.P. Jeppu, T.P. Clement, A modified Langmuir-Freundlich isotherm model for simulating

908   pH-dependent adsorption effects, J. Contam. Hydrol. 129–130 (2012) 46–53.

909   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2011.12.001.

910   [64]   M.N. Sepehr, T.J. Al-Musawi, E. Ghahramani, H. Kazemian, M. Zarrabi, Adsorption

911   performance of magnesium/aluminum layered double hydroxide nanoparticles for

912   metronidazole from aqueous solution, Arab. J. Chem. 10 (2017) 611–623.

913   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2016.07.003.

914   [65]   C.M. Dai, S.U. Geissen, Y.L. Zhang, Y.J. Zhang, X.F. Zhou, Selective removal of diclofenac

915   from contaminated water using molecularly imprinted polymer microspheres, Environ.

916   Pollut. 159 (2011) 1660–1666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.02.041.

917   [66]   S.M.H. Orimi, M. Khavarpour, S. Kazemi, Removal of bisphenol a from water solution

918   using molecularly imprinted nanopolymers: Isotherm and kinetic studies, J. Water Environ.

919   Nanotechnol. 5 (2020) 56–67. https://doi.org/10.22090/jwent.2020.01.005.

920   [67]   G.F. Abu-Alsoud, K.A. Hawboldt, C.S. Bottaro, Comparison of Four Adsorption Isotherm

921   Models for Characterizing Molecular Recognition of Individual Phenolic Compounds in

922   Porous Tailor-Made Molecularly Imprinted Polymer Films, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces. 12

923   (2020) 11998–12009. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsami.9b21493.

924   [68]   A.J.B. Leite, S.A. Carmalin, P.S. Thue, G.S. dos Reis, S.L.P. Dias, E.C. Lima, J.C.P.

925   Vaghetti, F.A. Pavan, W.S. de Alencar, Activated carbon from avocado seeds for the

926   removal of phenolic compounds from aqueous solutions, Desalin. Water Treat. 71 (2017)

927   168–181. https://doi.org/10.5004/dwt.2017.20540.

928   [69]   M.C. Ribas, M.A. Adebayo, L.D.T. Prola, E.C. Lima, R. Cataluña, L.A. Feris, M.J. Puchana-

929   Rosero, F.M. Machado, F.A. Pavan, T. Calvete, Comparison of a homemade cocoa shell

930   activated carbon with commercial activated carbon for the removal of reactive violet 5 dye

931   from aqueous solutions, Chem. Eng. J. 248 (2014) 315–326.

932   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2014.03.054.

933   [70]   M.B. Ahmed, J.L. Zhou, H.H. Ngo, W. Guo, Adsorptive removal of antibiotics from water

934   and wastewater: Progress and challenges, Sci. Total Environ. 532 (2015) 112–126.

935 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.05.130.

936 [71] D. Klinar, Universal model of slow pyrolysis technology producing biochar and heat from

937 standard biomass needed for the techno-economic assessment, Bioresour. Technol. 206

938 (2016) 112–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.01.053.

939 [72] P.S. Thue, M.A. Adebayo, E.C. Lima, J.M. Sieliechi, F.M. Machado, G.L. Dotto, J.C.P.

940 Vaghetti, S.L.P. Dias, Preparation, characterization and application of microwave-assisted

941 activated carbons from wood chips for removal of phenol from aqueous solution, J. Mol. Liq.

942 223 (2016) 1067–1080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molliq.2016.09.032.

943 [73] S. Kurwadkar, T. V. Hoang, K. Malwade, S.R. Kanel, W.F. Harper, G. Struckhoff,

944 Application of carbon nanotubes for removal of emerging contaminants of concern in

945 engineered water and wastewater treatment systems, Nanotechnol. Environ. Eng. 4 (2019) 1–

946 16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41204-019-0059-1.

947 [74] N. Genç, E.C. Dogan, Adsorption kinetics of the antibiotic ciprofloxacin on bentonite,

948 activated carbon, zeolite, and pumice, Desalin. Water Treat. 53 (2015) 785–793.

949 https://doi.org/10.1080/19443994.2013.842504.

950 [75] H. Liu, Y. Yang, J. Kang, M. Fan, J. Qu, Removal of tetracycline from water by Fe-Mn

951 binary oxide, J. Environ. Sci. 24 (2012) 242–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1001-

952 0742(11)60763-8.

953 [76] R. Fiorenza, A. Di Mauro, M. Cantarella, A. Gulino, L. Spitaleri, V. Privitera, G.

954 Impellizzeri, Molecularly imprinted N-doped TiO2 photocatalysts for the selective

955 degradation of o-phenylphenol fungicide from water, Mater. Sci. Semicond. Process. 112

956 (2020) 105019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mssp.2020.105019.

957 [77] L. Kovalova, H. Siegrist, U. Von Gunten, J. Eugster, M. Hagenbuch, A. Wittmer, R. Moser,

958 C.S. McArdell, Elimination of micropollutants during post-treatment of hospital wastewater

959 with powdered activated carbon, ozone, and UV, Environ. Sci. Technol. 47 (2013) 7899–

960 7908. https://doi.org/10.1021/es400708w.

961   [78]   R. Baccar, M. Sarrà, J. Bouzid, M. Feki, P. Blánquez, Removal of pharmaceutical

962   compounds by activated carbon prepared from agricultural by-product, Chem. Eng. J. 211–

963   212 (2012) 310–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2012.09.099.

964   [79]   P. Liu, W.J. Liu, H. Jiang, J.J. Chen, W.W. Li, H.Q. Yu, Modification of bio-char derived

965   from fast pyrolysis of biomass and its application in removal of tetracycline from aqueous

966   solution, Bioresour. Technol. 121 (2012) 235–240.

967   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.06.085.

968   [80]   C. Jung, J. Park, K.H. Lim, S. Park, J. Heo, N. Her, J. Oh, S. Yun, Y. Yoon, Adsorption of

969   selected endocrine disrupting compounds and pharmaceuticals on activated biochars, J.

970   Hazard. Mater. 263 (2013) 702–710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.10.033.

971   [81]   J.G. Yu, X.H. Zhao, H. Yang, X.H. Chen, Q. Yang, L.Y. Yu, J.H. Jiang, X.Q. Chen,

972   Aqueous adsorption and removal of organic contaminants by carbon nanotubes, Sci. Total

973   Environ. 482–483 (2014) 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.02.129.

974   [82]   F. Yu, S. Sun, S. Han, J. Zheng, J. Ma, Adsorption removal of ciprofloxacin by multi-walled

975   carbon nanotubes with different oxygen contents from aqueous solutions, Chem. Eng. J. 285

976   (2016) 588–595. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2015.10.039.

977   [83]   H.H. Cho, H. Huang, K. Schwab, Effects of solution chemistry on the adsorption of

978   ibuprofen and triclosan onto carbon nanotubes, Langmuir. 27 (2011) 12960–12967.

979   https://doi.org/10.1021/la202459g.

980   [84]   E.K. Putra, R. Pranowo, J. Sunarso, N. Indraswati, S. Ismadji, Performance of activated

981   carbon and bentonite for adsorption of amoxicillin from wastewater: Mechanisms, isotherms

982   and kinetics, Water Res. 43 (2009) 2419–2430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.02.039.

983   [85]   Z. Bekçi, Y. Seki, M.K. Yurdakoç, Equilibrium studies for trimethoprim adsorption on

984   montmorillonite KSF, J. Hazard. Mater. 133 (2006) 233–242.

985   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2005.10.029.

986   [86]   D. Avisar, O. Primor, I. Gozlan, H. Mamane, Sorption of sulfonamides and tetracyclines to

987   montmorillonite clay, Water. Air. Soil Pollut. 209 (2010) 439–450.

988   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-009-0212-8.

989   [87] Y. Gao, Y. Li, L. Zhang, H. Huang, J. Hu, S.M. Shah, X. Su, Adsorption and removal of

990   tetracycline antibiotics from aqueous solution by graphene oxide, J. Colloid Interface Sci.

991   368 (2012) 540–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2011.11.015.

992   [88] Y. Hu, J. Pan, K. Zhang, H. Lian, G. Li, Novel Applications of Molecularly-Imprinted

993   Polymers in Sample Preparation, TrAC Trends Anal. Chem. 43 (2013) 37–52.

994   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2012.08.014.

995   [89] Y. Saylan, S. Akgönüllü, H. Yavuz, S. Ünal, A. Denizli, Molecularly imprinted polymer

996   based sensors for medical applications, Sensors. 19 (2019).

997   https://doi.org/10.3390/s19061279.

998   [90] P. Qi, J. Wang, J. Jin, F. Su, J. Chen, 2,4-Dimethylphenol imprinted polymers as a solid-

999   phase extraction sorbent for class-selective extraction of phenolic compounds from

1000   environmental water, Talanta. 81 (2010) 1630–1635.

1001   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2010.03.015.

1002   [91] E. Turiel, A. Martín-Esteban, Molecularly imprinted polymers for sample preparation: A

1003   review, Anal. Chim. Acta. 668 (2010) 87–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2010.04.019.

1004   [92] M. Cantarella, S.C. Carroccio, S. Dattilo, R. Avolio, R. Castaldo, C. Puglisi, V. Privitera,

1005   Molecularly imprinted polymer for selective adsorption of diclofenac from contaminated

1006   water, Chem. Eng. J. 367 (2019) 180–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2019.02.146.

1007   [93] N.A. Samah, M.J. Sánchez-Martín, R.M. Sebastián, M. Valiente, M. López-Mesas,

1008   Molecularly imprinted polymer for the removal of diclofenac from water: Synthesis and

1009   characterization, Sci. Total Environ. 631–632 (2018) 1534–1543.

1010   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.03.087.

1011   [94] Q.Z. Feng, L.X. Zhao, W. Yan, J.M. Lin, Z.X. Zheng, Molecularly imprinted solid-phase

1012   extraction combined with high performance liquid chromatography for analysis of phenolic

compounds from environmental water samples, J. Hazard. Mater. 167 (2009) 282–288.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2008.12.115.

[95] L. Zheng, H. Wang, X. Cheng, Molecularly imprinted polymer nanocarriers for recognition

and sustained release of diclofenac, Polym. Adv. Technol. 29 (2018) 1360–1371.

https://doi.org/10.1002/pat.4247.

[96] H.G. Zuo, J.X. Zhu, C.R. Zhan, L. Shi, M. Xing, P. Guo, Y. Ding, H. Yang, Preparation of

malathion MIP-SPE and its application in environmental analysis, Environ. Monit. Assess.

187 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4641-0.

[97] S. Slomkowski, J. V. Alemán, R.G. Gilbert, M. Hess, K. Horie, R.G. Jones, P. Kubisa, I.

Meisel, W. Mormann, S. Penczek, R.F.T. Stepto, Terminology of polymers and

polymerization processes in dispersed systems (IUPAC recommendations 2011), Pure Appl.

Chem. 83 (2011) 2229–2259. https://doi.org/10.1351/PAC-REC-10-06-03.

[98] S.A.F. Bon, Pickering Emulsion Polymerization, Encycl. Polym. Nanomater. (2014) 1–6.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36199-9.

[99] H. Sun, Y. Li, J. Yang, X. Sun, C. Huang, X. Zhang, J. Chen, Preparation of dummy-

imprinted polymers by Pickering emulsion polymerization for the selective determination of

seven bisphenols from sediment samples, J. Sep. Sci. 39 (2016) 2188–2195.

https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.201501305.

[100] F. Tan, D. Sun, J. Gao, Q. Zhao, X. Wang, F. Teng, X. Quan, J. Chen, Preparation of

molecularly imprinted polymer nanoparticles for selective removal of fluoroquinolone

antibiotics in aqueous solution, J. Hazard. Mater. 244–245 (2013) 750–757.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2012.11.003.

[101] Y. Hao, R. Gao, L. Shi, D. Liu, Y. Tang, Z. Guo, Water-compatible magnetic imprinted

nanoparticles served as solid-phase extraction sorbents for selective determination of trace

17beta-estradiol in environmental water samples by liquid chromatography, J. Chromatogr.

A. 1396 (2015) 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2015.03.083.

1039   [102] Y.M. Yin, Y.P. Chen, X.F. Wang, Y. Liu, H.L. Liu, M.X. Xie, Dummy molecularly

1040   imprinted polymers on silica particles for selective solid-phase extraction of

1041   tetrabromobisphenol A from water samples, J. Chromatogr. A. 1220 (2012) 7–13.

1042   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2011.11.065.

1043   [103] X. Hu, X. Wu, F. Yang, Q. Wang, C. He, S. Liu, Novel surface dummy molecularly

1044   imprinted silica as sorbent for solid-phase extraction of bisphenol A from water samples,

1045   Talanta. 148 (2016) 29–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2015.10.057.

1046   [104] D.A. Spivak, Optimization, evaluation, and characterization of molecularly imprinted

1047   polymers, Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev. 57 (2005) 1779–1794.

1048   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2005.07.020.

1049   [105] A. Sarafraz Yazdi, H. Razavi, Application of molecularly-imprinted polymers in solid-phase

1050   microextraction techniques, TrAC - Trends Anal. Chem. 73 (2015) 81–90.

1051   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2015.05.004.

1052   [106] A. Gomez-Caballero, G. Diaz-Diaz, O. Bengoetxea, A. Quintela, N. Unceta, M.A. Goicolea,

1053   R.J. Barrio, Water compatible stir-bar devices imprinted with underivatised glyphosate for

1054   selective sample clean-up, J. Chromatogr. A. 1451 (2016) 23–32.

1055   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2016.05.017.

1056   [107] Y.K. Al-Bayati, A.J. Al-Safi, Synthesis and characterization of a molecularly imprinted

1057   polymer for diclofenac sodium using (2-vinylpyridine and 2-hydroxyethyl metha acrylate) as

1058   the complexing monomer, Baghdad Sci. J. 15 (2018) 63–72.

1059   https://doi.org/10.21123/bsj.2018.15.1.0063.

1060   [108] Y. Huang, J. Pan, Y. Liu, M. Wang, S. Deng, Z. Xia, A SPE method with two MIPs in two

1061   steps for improving the selectivity of MIPs, Anal. Chem. 91 (2019) 8436–8442.

1062   https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.9b01453.

1063   [109] A. Azizi, C.S. Bottaro, A critical review of molecularly imprinted polymers for the analysis

1064   of organic pollutants in environmental water samples, J. Chromatogr. A. 1614 (2020).

1065   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2019.460603.

1066   [110] H. Santos, R.O. Martins, D.A. Soares, A.R. Chaves, Molecularly imprinted polymers for

1067   miniaturized sample preparation techniques: Strategies for chromatographic and mass

1068   spectrometry methods, Anal. Methods. 12 (2020) 894–911.

1069   https://doi.org/10.1039/c9ay02227a.

1070   [111] L. Chen, X. Wang, W. Lu, X. Wu, J. Li, Molecular imprinting: Perspectives and applications,

1071   Chem. Soc. Rev. 45 (2016) 2137–2211. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6cs00061d.

1072   [112] L. Figueiredo, G.L. Erny, L. Santos, A. Alves, Applications of molecularly imprinted

1073   polymers to the analysis and removal of personal care products: A review, Talanta. 146

1074   (2016) 754–765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2015.06.027.

1075   [113] A. Prieto, S. Schrader, C. Bauer, M. Möder, Synthesis of a molecularly imprinted polymer

1076   and its application for microextraction by packed sorbent for the determination of

1077   fluoroquinolone related compounds in water, Anal. Chim. Acta. 685 (2011) 146–152.

1078   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2010.11.038.

1079   [114] Z.E. Mbhele, S. Ncube, L.M. Madikizela, Synthesis of a molecularly imprinted polymer and

1080   its application in selective extraction of fenoprofen from wastewater, Environ. Sci. Pollut.

1081   Res. 25 (2018) 36724–36735. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-018-3602-x.

1082   [115] L.M. Madikizela, S.S. Zunngu, N.Y. Mlunguza, N.T. Tavengwa, P.S. Mdluli, L. Chimuka,

1083   Application of molecularly imprinted polymer designed for the selective extraction of

1084   ketoprofen from wastewater, Water SA. 44 (2018) 406–418.

1085   https://doi.org/10.4314/wsa.v44i3.08.

1086   [116] S. Bakhtiar, S.A. Bhawani, S.R. Shafqat, Synthesis and Characterization of Molecularly

1087   Imprinted Polymer for the Removal/Extraction of Thymol from Spiked Blood Serum and

1088   River water, Asian J. Chem. 31 (2019) 2479–2484.

1089   https://doi.org/10.14233/ajchem.2019.22151.

1090   [117] J. Dai, M. Fidalgo de Cortalezzi, Influence of pH, ionic strength and natural organic matter

1091   concentration on a MIP-Fluorescent sensor for the quantification of DNT in water, Heliyon.

1092   5 (2019) e01922. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e01922.

1093 [118] C.M. Dai, J. Zhang, Y.L. Zhang, X.F. Zhou, Y.P. Duan, S.G. Liu, Selective removal of

1094   acidic pharmaceuticals from contaminated lake water using multi-templates molecularly

1095   imprinted polymer, Chem. Eng. J. 211–212 (2012) 302–309.

1096   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2012.09.090.

1097 [119] M.C. Barciela-Alonso, N. Otero-Lavandeira, P. Bermejo-Barrera, Solid phase extraction

1098   using molecular imprinted polymers for phthalate determination in water and wine samples

1099   by HPLC-ESI-MS, Microchem. J. 132 (2017) 233–237.

1100   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2017.02.007.

1101 [120] H. Shaikh, N. Memon, H. Khan, M.I. Bhanger, S.M. Nizamani, Preparation and

1102   characterization of molecularly imprinted polymer for di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate:

1103   Application to sample clean-up prior to gas chromatographic determination, J. Chromatogr.

1104   A. 1247 (2012) 125–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2012.05.056.

1105 [121] N. Ye, N. Cimetiere, V. Heim, N. Fauchon, C. Feliers, D. Wolbert, Upscaling fixed bed

1106   adsorption behaviors towards emerging micropollutants in treated natural waters with aging

1107   activated carbon: Model development and validation, Water Res. 148 (2019) 30–40.

1108   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.10.029.

1109 [122] L. Cseri, M. Razali, P. Pogany, G. Szekely, Organic Solvents in Sustainable Synthesis and

1110   Engineering, Elsevier Inc., 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809270-5.00020-0.

1111 [123] D.E. Freedman, S.M. Riley, Z.L. Jones, J.S. Rosenblum, J.O. Sharp, J.R. Spear, T.Y. Cath,

1112   Biologically active filtration for fracturing flowback and produced water treatment, J. Water

1113   Process Eng. 18 (2017) 29–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2017.05.008.

1114 [124] J.H. Kim, S.B. Kim, S.H. Lee, J.W. Choi, Laboratory and pilot-scale field experiments for

1115   application of iron oxide nanoparticle-loaded chitosan composites to phosphate removal from

1116   natural water, Environ. Technol. (United Kingdom). 39 (2018) 770–779.

1117   https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2017.1310937.

1118 [125] M. Razali, J.F. Kim, M. Attfield, P.M. Budd, E. Drioli, Y.M. Lee, G. Szekely, Sustainable

1119   wastewater treatment and recycling in membrane manufacturing, Green Chem. 17 (2015)

1120   5196–5205. https://doi.org/10.1039/c5gc01937k.

1121 [126] A. Katsigiannis, C. Noutsopoulos, J. Mantziaras, M. Gioldasi, Removal of emerging

1122   pollutants through Granular Activated Carbon, Chem. Eng. J. 280 (2015) 49–57.

1123   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2015.05.109.

1124 [127] A.M. Kennedy, A.M. Reinert, D.R.U. Knappe, I. Ferrer, R.S. Summers, Full- and pilot-scale

1125   GAC adsorption of organic micropollutants, Water Res. 68 (2015) 238–248.

1126   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.10.010.

1127 [128] A. Arias, G. Feijoo, M.T. Moreira, Environmental profile of decentralized wastewater

1128   treatment strategies based on membrane technologies, Curr. Dev. Biotechnol. Bioeng. (2020)

1129   259–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-819854-4.00011-3.

1130 [129] C. Chen, Z. Liu, X. Huang, Anaerobic membrane bioreactors for sustainable and energy-

1131   efficient municipal wastewater treatment, Elsevier B.V., 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-

1132   0-12-819852-0.00014-2.

1133 [130] A. Foglia, Ç. Akyol, N. Frison, E. Katsou, A. Laura, F. Fatone, Long-term operation of a

1134   pilot-scale anaerobic membrane bioreactor (AnMBR) treating high salinity low loaded

1135   municipal wastewater in real environment, Sep. Purif. Technol. 236 (2020) 116279.

1136   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2019.116279.

1137 [131] A.A. Khan, R.Z. Gaur, V.K. Tyagi, A. Khursheed, B. Lew, I. Mehrotra, A.A. Kazmi,

1138   Sustainable options of post treatment of UASB effluent treating sewage: A review, Resour.

1139   Conserv. Recycl. 55 (2011) 1232–1251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2011.05.017.

1140 [132] H. Lin, W. Peng, M. Zhang, J. Chen, H. Hong, Y. Zhang, A review on anaerobic membrane

1141   bioreactors: Applications, membrane fouling and future perspectives, Desalination. 314

1142   (2013) 169–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2013.01.019.

1143   [133] M. Le Noir, F. Plieva, T. Hey, B. Guieysse, B. Mattiasson, Macroporous molecularly

1144   imprinted polymer/cryogel composite systems for the removal of endocrine disrupting trace

1145   contaminants, J. Chromatogr. A. 1154 (2007) 158–164.

1146   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2007.03.064.

1147   [134] J.F.J.R. Pesqueira, M.F.R. Pereira, A.M.T. Silva, Environmental impact assessment of

1148   advanced urban wastewater treatment technologies for the removal of priority substances and

1149   contaminants of emerging concern: A review, J. Clean. Prod. 261 (2020).

1150   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121078.

1151   [135] C. Fang, R. Dharmarajan, M. Megharaj, R. Naidu, Gold nanoparticle-based optical sensors

1152   for selected anionic contaminants, TrAC - Trends Anal. Chem. 86 (2017) 143–154.

1153   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2016.10.008.

1154   [136] N.A. Alygizakis, S. Samanipour, J. Hollender, M. Ibáñez, S. Kaserzon, V. Kokkali, J.A. Van

1155   Leerdam, J.F. Mueller, M. Pijnappels, M.J. Reid, E.L. Schymanski, J. Slobodnik, N.S.

1156   Thomaidis, K. V. Thomas, Exploring the potential of a global emerging contaminant early

1157   warning network through the use of retrospective suspect screening with high-resolution

1158   mass spectrometry, Environ. Sci. Technol. 52 (2018) 5135–5144.

1159   https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b00365.

1160