

# Effect of Particulate Sizes and Temperature on The Bioleaching rate of Iron from Silica-Sand withAspergillusniger and Penecillumnotatium.

Nnam, R. E.\*<sup>1</sup>, Onyemachi V. C.<sup>1</sup>, Emerenin N J<sup>1</sup>, Okoro N. U.<sup>1</sup>, Chigbo D. C.<sup>1</sup> and Anozie J. K.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Food Technology, AkanuIbiam Federal Polytechnic Unwana, PMB 1007 Afikpo North LGA, Ebonyi State, Nigeria Corresponding author: Nnam Raphael Eze

Date of Submission: 01-10-2020 Date of Acceptance: 22-10-2020

ABSTRACT: The effect of temperature and particle sizeson the bioleaching of iron from silica sand with two fungal strains of Aspergillusniger and Penecillumnotatiumhas been studied with three particle size fractions of silica sand: +106-212um, +300-400µm +212-300µm, and over the temperature range 30 to 80°C for seven hours. The experimental data show that the particulate sizes of silica sand affect both the amount of iron present in the sand and the amount of iron the microorganisms are able to leach. The smallest particle size fraction (+106 - 212) converted the most quantity of iron present in their sand fraction (27.189% and 25.784%) for A. niger and P. notatum respectively. Particle size +212-300 µm for both A. niger and P. notatum converted 24.686% and 23.809% respectively while +300-400µm converted 23.627% and 21.941% for A. niger and P. notatum respectively. the also show that temperature positively affect the ability of A. niger and P. notatum to leach iron from silica sand with 70°Cas the optimal temperature for bioleaching process for both Aspergillusniger and Penecilliumnotatum, since at this temperature, the maximum percentage conversion was achieved irrespective of the sand size fraction. When the temperature was increased to 80°C, the amount of iron leached fell, not minding the sand size fraction.

**Keywords:** Silica sand, Aspergillusniger, Penecillumnotatium, Particle sizes, Temperature.

# I. INTRODUCTION

The growing world population has resulted in an increase in materials consumption and industrial expansion, causing unsustainable pressures on the planet's natural resource reserves and the environment. For this reason, investigation concerning the development of sustainable technologies and recycling strategies is becoming favoured (Monballiu, et. al., 2015). Mining and metallurgy have negative consequences for the environment (Maluckov B, et al 2017; Akcil and Koldas, 2006) and lead to changes in geological (Marschalko, et. al., 2010) and climatic conditions (Phillips J. 2016). Mining-metallurgy operations include the extraction, preparing of ores (crushing ore and flotation), processing of concentrates, and the disposal of waste rock and by-products. The main waste in mining and metallurgy are waste rocks, flotation tailings and slag, which often contain significant amounts of valuable metals; sometimes even more than the ore (Maluckov BS. 2017). Leaching is a critical operation in hydrometallurgy (FrankCrundwell2005).

Bacteria/Fungal leaching (bioleaching) process for extracting metals from their sulfide ores is a promising technology as an alternative to the traditional pyro-metallurgical process (Prabhu, et. al., 2019). As high-grade ore reserves are processed and in the absence of discoveries of new highgrade deposits, it is increasingly necessary to process ores of lower grade to meet demand. Mineral bioleaching is a method by which some low-grade ores can be processed economically. Metal extraction from low-grade sulfide ores and concentrates can be achieved with the assistance of acidophilic chemolithotrophic iron- and sulfuroxidizing microorganisms (Bosecker, 1997; Watling, 2006). In the last decades, interest in bioleaching has increased significantly (Bosecker, K., 1997; Krebs, et al. 1997). Microbial leaching is more efficient compared to chemical routes because it is environmentally friendly: it neither uses nor releases dangerous chemicals, uses far less energy since it operates at room temperature, reduces initial and operational costs and maintains



the crystal structure of clay to a large extent (Hajihoseini and Fakharpour, 2019).

In bioleaching, mineral-decomposing microorganisms are used to convert insoluble metal sulfides to soluble metal sulfates that can be readily recovered from the solution (Nkempaso, et. al., 2018: Seifelnassr and Abouzeid. 2013: Christelet al., 2018). The solubilization of metals can be accomplished by various species of bacteria and fungi and is based on three main mechanisms that simultaneously Acidolysis, can occur complexolysis, redoxolysis (H. Brandl, 2001; Mishra, et al., 2005). In the mineral-decomposing AspergillusnigerandPenecillumnotatium process, and their consortium are considered as the most important fungal (Ndukwe and Chikwendu, 2010). The important microorganisms are iron-oxidizing Leptospirilliumferrooxidans and L. ferriphilum, sulfur-oxidizing Acidithiobacillusthiooxidans and A. caldus, and iron- and sulfur-oxidizing A. ferrooxidans(Deshpande, et. al., 2018)

Bioleaching is influenced by a wide range of parameters including physicochemical and microbiological factors. These affect both the growth of the microorganisms and their leaching behavior (Monballiu, et. al., 2015).Various researches have shown that microbial activities in dependent on various factors such as pH, temperature, particle sizes. Peyton et al., (2010) noted that lead, zinc, and copper sorption and the binding-site affinities of bioleaching microorganisms are highly dependent on pH and temperature; this agrees with Hajihoseini and Fakharpour, (2019) argument that the quantity of iron extracted by Aspergillusniger from kaolin is affected by temperature. Mustafa et. al., (2011) have shown that contact time, pH, incubation temperature and carbon source play important role in the bioleaching of iron from silica sand; this agrees with an earlier study by Ndukwe and Chikwendu (2010) and Ndukwe and Eze, (2017) who investigated the effect of temperature on the bioleaching of iron from silica-sand. They were able to show that temperature affects the ability of the microorganisms to bioleach.

For bioleaching to be successful, it is obvious that optimal growth conditions must be maintained and the microorganism must be able to leach the material. In addition, and most importantly, the microorganism must be resistant to the metals that are leached out (Lee, et. al., 2001).

Ndukwe and Eze, (2017) investigated the effect of particle size and temperature on the bioleaching of iron from silica-sand using one fungal strain but the present study used two strains

(A. niger and P. notatium). The results were then compared with those for the initial sample.

# II. MATERIALS AND METHOD.

Initial Concentration of Iron in the Silica Sand

2kg of naturally occurring silica sand was obtained from Unwana River in Afikpo North Local Government Area, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. The sample was washed with deionized water to remove clay particles and other unwanted materials adhering to the surface of the sand and dried for 3days and separated into different particle size fractions with the aid of a set of manual sieves. Three different particle size fractions +106 - $212\mu$ m,  $+212\mu$ m -  $300\mu$ m and +300 -  $400\mu$ m each for Aspergillusniger and Penecilliumnotatium,were selected for the experiments.

The presence of iron in each of the particle size fractions were determined by the Thiocyanide solution method. Standard solutions containing 0.5 to 2.5mg/ml of Iron (III) were prepared and the absorbance of the solutions was determined with the aid of a UV/Visible spectrophotometer. The relationship between concentration of iron in the standard solution and absorbance was established with the measured data, and used subsequently to determine the concentration of iron in the Silica sand and in the leachate. 100g of silica sand from the first particle size fraction (+106 -212µm) was weighed and transferred into a 500ml conical flask containing 25ml of 8M HNO<sub>3</sub> (KERMEC) and made up to 250ml with distilled water. The mixture was agitated for about 5 minutes and subjected to digestion for about 60 minutes. The solution was cooled and then filtered into 250ml standard flask, after which 10ml of it was pipetted and its absorbance determined using the UV/Visible spectrophotometer at a wavelength of 630nm. This experiment was repeated for the particle size fraction +212µm - 300µm, and +300 -400µm respectively. The results are given in table 1.

### Fungi Isolation, cultivation and Identification

The fungus was isolated from the soil at a refuse dump in Unwana, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. The culture Sabouraud Dextrose Agar (SDA) (TM, MEDIA, India) medium was prepared according to the manufacturer's instruction. 62g of the SDA was dissolved in 1000ml of distilled water and stirred thoroughly to ensure proper homogenization. It was allowed to soak for 10 minutes, mixed and sterilized by autoclaving at 121°C for 15minutes and was cooled to 45°C before pouring into sterile petri-dishes. 1g of the soil sample was weighed and dissolved in 9ml of sterilized formal saline. 0.1ml was pipetted out and spread evenly on solidified



SDA, and incubated at  $30^{\circ}$ C for 10 days, so that adequate number of spores formed. The fungal isolates wereidentified based on their morphology and colour of the surface of the colony using fungal identification guidelines described by Samson et al (2001).

For microscopic identification, wet mounts of the isolates were prepared using lactophenol cotton blue. A drop of the lactophenol cotton blue was placed on a sterile grease-free slide with a sterile dissecting needle. A small portion of the inoculum was collected and teased on the slide. The preparation was covered with a cover slip and examined under a microscope using low (x10) and high power (x10) objective with the Irish sufficiently closed to give a good contrast, for the purpose of observing hypha cells and spores.

### Bioleaching

2.0g of silica sand from the particle size fraction, +106 - 212µm, was weighed into 250ml conical flask containing 150ml of prepared medium which contained Sucrose (KERMEC) 100g/l; NH4NO3 (AVIS Chemicals 99%) 450mg/l; KH2PO4 (KERMEC) 100mg/l: MgSO4.7H2O (KERMEC) 300 mg/l: FeSO4.7H2O (GFS Chemical) 0.1mg/l; ZnSO4 (KERMEC) 0.25mg/l as culture medium. The flask was plugged with a non-absorbent cotton and then sterilized in an autoclave (Searchtech YA-208A) for 20 minutes at 1210C. It was then inoculated with 2ml of Aspergillusnigerspore suspension (2 x 108 spores/ml) and agitated for 20 minutes to achieve a good degree of homogeneity between the fungi and the sand. The flask was incubated in an oven (DHG 9101-USA) at a temperature of  $30^{\circ}$ C and monitored for 7 hours. At a regular interval of 1 hour, 10ml of the leachate from the flask was obtained, filtered, and digested to stop further microbial actions. The concentration of iron leached out was then UV/ the determined with Visible spectrophotometer, after which the fractional conversion of the iron was calculated. The experiment was repeated at the temperatures of 40°C, 50°C, 60°C, 70°C, and 80°C. A similar experiment was done with +212um - 300um, and +300 - 400µm sand size fractions for both fungi strains. The results are given in tables 2, 3 and 4 for Aspergillusniger; 5, 6, 7 for Penecillumnotatium respectively. This is according to Ndukwe and Chikwendu, (2010); O. C. N. Ndukweet al., (2017).

#### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Effects of Temperature

Table 1 show that particulate sizes of silica sand affect the Iron inherent in it. The highest

amount of iron (48.045g/g sand) in the sand matrix was located in the smallest sand fraction (+106-212µm); the amount of iron identifiable decreased with increase in the size fraction. Since initial concentration of iron fell with increased sand size fraction, being 42.568mg/g sand for +212-300µm and 40.035 mg/g sand for  $+300-400 \mu \text{m}$ , the Aspergillusniger effectiveness of and Penecilliumnotatumin the removal of iron from silica sand will be enhanced by beneficiating the sand. Figures 1 and 2 show that temperature positively affect the ability of A. niger and P. notatumto leachiron from silica sand. The quantity of iron leachate from the process increased as the temperature of the process increased regardless of the fraction size not the fungi strain present. Though the rate of bioleaching of iron is approximately the same with all the size fractions, Aspergillusnigerextracted more quantity of iron from the sand than Penecilliumnotatumfor all temperature and particulate size fractions with their maximums extractable percentage beaning 27.189% and 25.784% for A. niger and P notatiumrespectively. The tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and figures 1 and 2 show that  $70^{\circ}$ C is the optimal temperature for bioleaching of iron from for bothAspergillusniger silica sand and Penecilliumnotatum, since at this temperature, the maximum percentage conversion was achieved irrespective of the sand size fraction. When the temperature was increased to 80°C, the amount of iron leached fell, not minding the sand size fraction. This agrees with earlier research by Ndukwe and Eze (2017)

# Effect of Particle Size

Figure 3shows that the particulate sizes of silica sand affect the amount of iron the microorganisms are able to leach. The smaller the particle sizes the more the microorganisms are able to leach the iron content of the sand for both A. niger and P. notatium. This is supported by (1982); Sessitschet. Cammen al.. (2001).Thesmallest particle size fraction (+106 212) converted the most quantity of iron present in their sand fraction(27.189% and 25.784%) for A. niger and P. notatum respectively. Particle size +212-300µm for both A. nigerand P. notatum converted 24.686% and 23.809% respectively while +300-400µm converted 23.627% and 21.941% for A. nigerand P. notatum respectively

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

The present study investigated the effect of particle size and temperature variations on the bioleaching of iron from silica-sand with two



different fungi stains. It can be concluded from the study that particle size fractions as well as temperature variations have effects on not just the leached iron but on the initial iron content of the sand even when they are from the same source. It was also deduced that the optimal operating temperature for the bioprocess is 70°C. This was where the maximum quantity of iron leachate was gotten.

## Table 1: Initial Concentrations of Iron in 100g Silica Sand of various Particle Sizes

PARTICLE (µm)	SIZE	INITIAL CONC. OF IRON (mg/g sand)
+106-212		48.045
+212-300		42.568
+300-400		40.035

Table 2: Conc time data for Aspergillusniger, iron conc. and % of iron leached	values with temperature
for particle size of +106-212µm	

<b>30</b> °	Ъ			40	°C		50	°C			50°C			70°C			80°C	
Ti	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%
m	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC
e			L			L			L			L			L			L
(n																		
)	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Ŭ		00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00
	0									0								
	0									0								
	0																	
1	0	1.5	3.2	0.0	2.4	5.1	0.0	3.3	7.0	0.	4.2	8.9	0.0	5.4	11.	0.0	5.1	10
	•	/8	84	12	/8	22	16	/8	31	$\frac{0}{2}$	79	06	25	05	25	24	80	./ 82
	0									$\frac{2}{0}$					0			62
	8									U								
2	0	2.4	5.1	0.0	3.3	7.0	0.0	4.2	8.9	0.	5.4	11.	0.0	6.7	14.	0.0	6.0	12
		77	56	16	78	31	20	79	06	0	05	25	31	57	06	28	81	.6
	0									2		0			4			57
	1									5								
2	2	26	75	0.0	15	0.2	0.0	5 1	11	0	(7	1.4	0.0	7.4	15	0.0	60	14
3	0	3.0 04	7.5 01	0.0	4.5	9.3 77	0.0	5.4 05	11. 25	0.	0.7	14.	0.0	7.4	15. 46	0.0	0.9	14 1
	0	04	01	21	05	//	23	05	0	3	52	2	54	52	9	52	02	. <del>4</del> 01
	1								Ū	0		2			/			01
	7																	
4	0	4.9	9.5	0.0	5.8	12.	0.0	7.2	15.	0.	7.8	16.	0.0	9.0	18.	0.0	8.1	16
	•	54	62	27	56	18	33	07	00	0	83	40	41	09	75	37	08	.8
	0					9			1	3		8			1			76
	2									6								
5	0	69	14	0.0	78	16	0.0	87	18	0	94	19	0.0	10	21	0.0	96	20
		19	40	36	83	40	40	84	28	0	59	68	46	13	09	44	85	.1
	0		1			8			3	4		8		5	5			58
	3									3								
	2		<u> </u>			<u> </u>					<u> </u>						L	
6	0	7.8	16.	0.0	9.0	18.	0.0	9.9	20.	0.	11.	23.	0.0	11.	24.	0.0	11.	23

| Impact Factor value 7.429 | ISO 9001: 2008 Certified Journal Page 74



		83	40	41	09	75	45	10	62	0	26	43	53	71	37	52	48	.9
	0		8			1			6	5	1	8		2	7		6	07
	3									1								
	6																	
7	0	8.7	18.	0.0	10.	21.	0.0	11.	23.	0.	12.	25.	0.0	13.	27.	0.0	12.	26
		84	28	47	36	56	51	26	43	0	16	31	59	06	18	57	61	.2
	0		3		0	3		1	8	5	2	4		3	9		3	52
	4									5								
	0																	

Table 3: Conc.- time data for Aspergillusniger, iron conc. and % of iron leached values with temperature for particle size of +212-300µm

30	30°C T L IC %			40	°C		50	°C		60°	C .		70	°C		80	°C	
Т	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%IC	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%
i	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	L(%	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC
m			L			L			)			L			L			L
e																		
(																		
( h																		
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	00	00	00	0	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0	00	00	00	00	00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
				0									0					
				0									0					
1	0.0	1.3	3.1	0.	2.0	4.7	0.0	2.9	6.87	0.0	3.1	7.4	0.	3.8	8.9	0.0	3.3	7.9
	07	52	76	0	27	62	14	28	8	15	53	07	0	29	93	16	78	36
2	0.0	2.0	47	0	27	6.2	0.0	2.2	7.02	0.0	4.0	0.5	8	4.0	11	0.0	15	10
2	10	2.0	4.7	0.	$\frac{2.7}{02}$	0.5 47	16	5.5 78	7.93 6	10.0	4.0 54	9.5	0.	4.9	11. 67	21	4.5	10. 58
	10	25	57	1	02	Ψ/	10	70	0	1)	54	27	2	55	8	21	05	3
				3									3		0			5
3	0.0	2.9	6.8	0.	3.6	8.4	0.0	4.2	10.0	0.0	4.9	11.	0.	5.8	13.	0.0	5.4	12.
	14	27	76	0	04	66	20	79	52	23	55	64	0	56	75	25	05	69
				1								0	2		7			7
				7									7					
4	0.0	3.8	8.9	0.	4.5	10.	0.0	5.4	12.6	0.0	6.0	14.	0.	6.9	16.	0.0	6.7	16.
	18	28	93	0	05	58	25	05	97	28	81	28	0	82	25	30	32	81
				2		3						5	3		4			5
5	0.0	49	11	1	56	13	0.0	67	16.8	0.0	72	16	2	81	19	0.0	76	17
5	23	54	67	0.	31	$22^{13.}$	30	32	15	33	07	93	0.	08	$04^{17}$	35	58	99
		<i>.</i>	8	2	01	8	20	02	10	00	07	1	3	00	7	00		0
			-	6		-							7					-
6	0.0	6.0	14.	0.	6.7	15.	0.0	7.6	17.9	0.0	8.5	20.	0.	9.2	21.	0.0	8.7	20.
	28	18	13	0	57	87	35	58	90	39	59	10	0	34	69	40	84	63
			7	3		3						7	4		2			5
7	0.0	6.0	1.0	1	7.6	17	0.0	0.7	20.1	0.0	0.4	22	2	10	24	0.0	0.0	22
/	0.0	6.9 10	16. 25	0.	/.6 50	17.	0.0	8.3 50	20.1	0.0	9.4 50	22.	0.	10. 50	24.	0.0	9.9	23.
	32	19	23 4	3	50	99 0	37	39	07	43	39	0	4	50	8	43	10	0
			+	5		0						0	8	0	0			0
L	I	I	I	5	I	I	I	I	l	I	I	I	0	I	I	I	I	I



Table 4: Conc time data for Aspergillusniger, iron conc. and % of iron leached	values with temperature
for particle size of +300-400µm	

<b>30°</b>				<b>40°</b> (	5		50°0			60°	С		<b>70</b> °	С		8	0°C	
Ti m e (h )	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% I C L	L A	IC L	% IC L
0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0 0 0 0 0	0.0 00 0	0 0 0 0 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0									
1	0.0 06	1.3 02	3.2 52	0 0 0 8	1.5 77	3.9 39	0.0	2.2 52	5.6 25	0.0 14	2.9 28	7.3 14	0.0 16	3.3 78	8 4 3 8	0.0 15	3.0 09	7.5 16
2	0.0 08	1.5 75	3.9 34	0 0 1 0	1.8 52	4.6 26	0.0 14	2.9 28	7.3 14	0.0 17	3.6 04	9.0 02	0.0 21	4.5 05	1 1 2 5 3	0.0 19	3.9 35	9.8 29
3	0.0 11	2.2 50	5.2 60	0 0 1 3	2.5 46	6.3 59	0.0 17	3.6 04	9.0 02	0.0 20	4.2 79	10. 68 8	0.0 25	5.4 05	1 3 5 0 1	0.0 23	4.8 61	12. 14 2
4	0.0 17	3.6 03	9.0 00	0 0 1 9	3.9 35	9.8 29	0.0 22	4.7 30	11. 81 5	0.0 25	5.4 05	13. 50 1	0.0 29	6.3 06	1 5 7 5 1	0.0 27	5.7 87	14. 45 5
5	0.0 22	4.7 30	11. 81 5	0 0 2 4	5.0 93	12. 72 1	0.0 27	5.8 56	14. 62 7	0.0 31	6.7 50	16. 86 0	0.0 34	7.4 32	1 8 5 6 4	0.0 33	7.1 76	17. 92 4
6	0.0 26	5.6 30	14. 06 3	0 0 2 8	6.0 19	15. 03 4	0.0 30	6.5 32	16. 31 6	0.0 35	7.6 58	19. 12 8	0.0 39	8.5 59	2 1 3 7 9	0.0 37	8.1 02	20. 23 7
7	0.0 29	6.6 23	16. 54 3	0 0 3 1	6.7 13	16. 76 8	0.0 33	7.2 07	18. 00 2	0.0 38	8.3 33	20. 81 4	0.0 43	9.4 59	2 3 6 2 7	0.0 41	9.0 28	22. 55 0

| Impact Factor value 7.429 | ISO 9001: 2008 Certified Journal Page 76



Table 5: Conc time data fo	r Penecillumnotati	um, iron conc. a	nd % of iron lea	ached values with									
temperature for particle size of +106-212µm													

<b>30°</b>	3			<b>40°</b>	C		50°			60°	С		70	°C		80	°C	
Ti m e (h )	L A	IC L	% I C L	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% I C L	L A	IC L	% IC L	L A	IC L	% IC L
0	0.0 00 0	0. 00 00	0. 0 0 0 0	0.0 00 0	0. 0 0 0 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0	0.0 00 0							
1	0.0 06	1. 30 2	2. 7 1 0	0.0 10	2.0 25	4.2 15	0.0 14	2.9 27	6.0 92	0.0 18	3.3 78	7. 0 3 1	0.0 23	4.9 53	10. 30 9	0.0 22	4.7 30	9.8 45
2	0.0 10	2. 02 5	4. 2 1 5	0.0 14	2.9 93	6.2 30	0.0 18	3.8 28	7.9 68	0.0 23	4.9 53	1 0. 3 0 9	0.0 29	6.6 23	13. 78 5	0.0 26	5.6 31	11. 72 0
3	0.0 15	3. 15 3	6. 5 6 3	0.0 19	3.9 35	8.1 90	0.0 23	4.9 54	10. 31 1	0.0 28	6.0 18	1 2. 5 2 6	0.0 32	6.9 82	14. 53 2	0.0 29	6.6 23	13. 78 5
4	0.0 20	4. 27 8	8. 9 0 6	0.0 25	5.4 05	11. 25 0	0.0 30	6.7 32	14. 01 2	0.0 34	7.4 32	1 5. 4 6 9	0.0 39	8.5 58	17. 81 2	0.0 34	7.4 32	15. 46 9
5	0.0 29	6. 62 3	1 3. 7 8 5	0.0 34	7.4 32	15. 46 9	0.0 37	8.1 02	19. 04 7	0.0 40	8.7 84	1 8. 2 8 3	0.0 43	9.4 59	19. 68 8	0.0 41	9.0 28	18. 79 1
6	0.0 33	7. 20 7	1 5. 0 0 1	0.0 39	8.5 58	17. 81 2	0.0 42	9.2 34	19. 21 9	0.0 48	10. 58 5	2 2. 0 3 1	0.0 50	11. 09 2	23. 08 7	0.0 48	10. 58 6	22. 03 4
7	0.0 37	8. 10 2	1 9. 0 4 7	0.0 44	9.6 85	20. 15 8	0.0 48	10. 58 6	22. 03 4	0.0 52	11. 48 7	2 3. 9 0 9	0.0 56	12. 38 8	25. 78 4	0.0 53	11. 71 2	24. 37 7



<b>30°</b> (	30°C Fi L IC 9			<b>40°</b> C			<b>50°</b>	C		6	Э°С		7	0°C		8	0°C	
Ti	L	IC	%	L	Ι	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	Ι	%
m	Α	L	IC	Α	С	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	С	IC
е			L		L	L			L			L			L		L	L
(h																		
)					-													
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
	00	00	00	00	•	00	00	00	00	0	00	00	00	00	00	00	•	00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
					0					0							0	
					0					0							0	
1	0.0	1.0	24	0.0	1	37	0.0	24	5.8	0	27	63	0.0	33	70	0.0	$\frac{0}{2}$	68
1	0.0	26	10	0.0	1	07	12	2. <del>4</del> 78	21	0.	$\frac{2.7}{02}$	0.5 47	16	78	36	1/	2	0.8 76
	05	20	10	00	5	07	12	70	21	1	02	7/	10	70	50	17	. 9	70
					7					3							2	
					8					-							7	
2	0.0	1.5	3.7	0.0	2	5.2	0.0	2.9	6.8	0.	3.6	8.4	0.0	4.5	10.	0.0	3	7.7
	08	78	07	11		90	14	27	76	0	04	66	21	05	58	19		10
					2					1					3		8	
					5					7							2	
					2												8	
3	0.0	2.4	5.8	0.0	3	7.4	0.0	3.8	8.9	0.	4.5	10.	0.0	5.4	12.	0.0	4	11.
	12	78	21	15	•	07	18	28	93	0	05	58	25	05	69	23	•	63
										2		3			1		9	8
					2					1							5	
1	0.0	33	79	0.0	3	89	0.0	19	11	0	56	13	0.0	65	15	0.0	4	1/
-	16	78	36	19	5	93	23	ч.) 54	63	0.	31	22	30	32	81	28	0	13
	10	10	50	17	8	/5	23	51	8	2	51	8	50	52	5	20	0	7
					2				U	6		Ũ			U U		1	
					8												8	
5	0.0	4.5	10.	0.0	5	12.	0.0	6.0	14.	0.	6.7	15.	0.0	7.6	17.	0.0	7	16.
	21	05	58	25		69	28	18	13	0	57	87	35	58	99	33		93
			3		4	7			7	3		3			0		2	1
					0					1							0	
			10	0.0	5	1.7	0.0		1.6	0	0.1	10		07	20		7	10
6	0.0	5.6	13.	0.0	6	15.	0.0	7.2	16.	0.	8.1	19.	0.0	8.7	20.	0.0	8	19.
	20	51	22 0	30	•	81 5	33	07	95	0	02	05	40	84	03 5	38	•	51
			0		2	3			1	3 7		3			3		2	0
					$\frac{3}{2}$												2	
7	0.0	6.7	15.	0.0	7	17.	0.0	8,1	19.	0.	9.0	21.	0.0	10.	23.	0.0	9	21.
	30	23	79	34		45	37	02	03	0	09	16	46	13	80	42	ĺ.	71
		_	4		4	9			3	4		4	-	5	9		2	6
					3					1							4	
					2												4	

Table 6: Conc.- time data for Penecillumnotatium, iron conc. and % of iron leached values with temperature for particle size of +212-300 $\mu$ m



30	0°C 40°C L IC % L I					50	°C		60	°C		7	70°C			<b>80°C</b>		
Т	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	IC	%	L	Ι	%	L	Ι	%
i	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	L	IC	Α	С	IC	Α	С	IC
m			L			L			L			L		L	L		L	L
e																		
(																		
h																		
)																		
0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	0.0	0.0	0.	0.0
	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0	00	00	00	00	00	00	0	00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	0	0	0	0
										0							0	
										0							0	
1	0.0	0.7	1.8	0.0	1.3	3.2	0.0	1.5	3.9	0.	2.2	5.6	0.0	2.	6.7	0.0	2.	5.6
	04	50	73	06	02	52	08	78	41	0	52	25	13	70	49	12	2	15
										1				2			4	
										1							8	
2	0.0	1.3	3.2	0.0	1.5	3.9	0.0	2.2	5.6	0.	2.9	7.3	0.0	3.	9.5	0.0	3.	8.4
	06	02	52	08	78	41	11	52	25	0	27	11	18	82	64	16	3	38
										1				9			7	
										4							8	
3	0.0	1.9	4.7	0.0	2.2	5.6	0.0	2.9	7.3	0.	3.6	9.0	0.0	4.	11.	0.0	4.	10.
	09	01	48	11	52	25	14	27	11	0	03	02	22	73	81	20	2	68
										1				0	5		7	8
_		2.1		0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	7			0.0	_			9	10
4	0.0	3.1	7.8	0.0	3.6	9.0	0.0	3.9	9.8	0.	4.7	11.	0.0	5.	14.	0.0	5.	12.
	15	53	76	17	04	02	19	35	29	0	30	81	26	63	06	24	0	72
										2		5		0	3		9	1
-	0.0		10	0.0			0.0	- 0	10	2	6.0		0.0	_	1.6		3	1.6
5	0.0	4.2	10.	0.0	4.7		0.0	5.0	12.	0.	6.0	15.	0.0	6.	16.	0.0	6.	16.
	20	79	68	22	30	51	24	93	12	0	19	03	51	75	8/	30	2	51
			ð			Э			1	2		4		/	δ		3	0
	0.0	5.0	10	0.0	5.0	14	0.0	50	14	8	60	17	0.0	7	10	0.0	2	10
6	0.0	5.0	12.	0.0	5.6	14.	0.0	5.8	14.	0.	0.9	1/.	0.0	/.	19.	0.0	/.	18. 56
	24	95	12	20	30	2	21	50	02 7		19	28	30	88	08	34	4	20 4
			1			3			/	2		2		U	2		2	4
7	0.0	50	14	0.0	6.6	16	0.0	67	16		76	10	0.0	8	21	0.0	2 8	20
/	0.0	5.0 56	14. 62	20	0.0	10. 54	30	0.7	10. Q1	0.	7.0 59	19.	40	0. 79	21. 04	28	0. 3	20. 81
	<i>∠1</i>	50	7	29	23	34	50	52	5	3	50	12 8	40	10	74 1	50	3	01 1
			/			3			5	5		0		4	1		3	4
										5							5	

Table 7: Conc.- time data for Penecillumnotatium, iron conc. and % of iron leached values with temperature for particle size of  $+300-400\mu m$ 





**Figure 1:** Conc.- time data for iron leached values by Aspergillusniger with temperature and different particle size fractions (a) represent particle size fraction of +106-212µm; (b) particle size fraction of +212-300µm; (c) represent size fraction of +300-400µm







**Figure 2:** Conc.- time data for iron leached values by Penecillumnotatium with temperature and different particle size fractions (a) represent particle size fraction of  $+106-212\mu$ m; (b) particle size fraction of  $+212-300\mu$ m; (c) represent size fraction of  $+300-400\mu$ m





Figure 3: % of Iron Conc. Leached at 70°C Vs Time for all the Sand Fractions; (a) represent bioleaching by Aspergillusniger; (b)representbioleaching by penecillumnotatium

#### REFERENCE

- A. A. S. Seifelnassr and A.Z. M. Abouzeid, (2013). "Exploitation of Bacterial Activities in Mineral Industry and Environmental Preservation: An Overview," J. Min., vol. 2013, pp. 1–13.
- [2]. Akcil A, Koldas S. (2006). Acid Mine Drainage (AMD): causes, treatment and case studies. J Clean Prod. 2006; 14(12–13):1139–1145.
- [3]. AnnickMonballiu, NeleCardon, Minh Tri Nguyen, ChristelCornelly, BoudewijnMeesschaert, and Yi Wai Chiang (2015). Tolerance of Chemoorganotrophic Bioleaching Microorganisms to Heavy Metal and Alkaline Stresses. Bioinorganic Chemistry and Applications Volume 2015, Article ID 861874, 9 pages http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2015/861874
- [4]. Brandl, H. (2001) "Microbial leaching of metals," in Biotechnology Set, H.-J. Rehm and G. Reed, Eds., Wiley-VCH, 2001.
- [5]. Bosecker, K., (1997). Bioleaching: metal solubilization by microorganisms. FEMS Microbiology Reviews 20, 591-604.
- [6]. D. Mishra, D. Kim, J. Ahn, and Y. Rhee, (2005). "Bioleaching: a microbial process of metal recovery; a review," Metals andMaterials International, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 249–256, 2005.
- [7]. Deshpande AA, et al. (2018) A Genetic Screen for Investigating the Human LysosomalCystineTransporter, Cystinosin. Sci Rep 8(1):3442

- [8]. E. Y. Lee, S.-R. Noh, K.-S. Cho, and H. W. Ryu, (2001). "Leaching of Mn, Co, and Ni from manganese nodules using an anaerobic bioleaching method," Journal of Bioscience and Bioengineering, vol. 92, no. 4, pp. 354– 359, 2001.
- [9]. Frank Crundwell(2005). The leaching number: Its definition and use in determining the performance of leaching autoclaves. reactors and Minerals Engineering.Volume 18. 13 -Issues 14, November 2005, Pages 1315-1324
- Jalal Hajihoseini&MahsaFakharpour (2019): Effect of Temperature on Bioleaching of Iron Impurities from Kaolin by Aspergillus. Niger Fungal, Journal of Asian Ceramic Societies, DOI: 10.1080/21870764.2019.1571152
- [11]. John E. Aston, William A. Apel, Brady D. Lee, Brent M. Peyton (2010). Effects of cell condition, pH, and temperature on lead, zinc, and copper sorption to Acidithiobacilluscaldus strain BC13. Journal of Hazardous Materials 184 (2010) 34–41
- [12]. Leon M. Cammen (1982). Effect of Particle Size on Organic Content and Microbial Abundance Within Four Marine Sediments. Marine Ecology - Progress Series. Vol. 9: 273-280, 1982
- [13]. Maluckov BS (2017). The catalytic role of Acidithiobacillusferrooxidans for metals extraction from mining - metallurgical resource. Biodiversity Int J. 2017;1(3):109–119



- [14]. Marschalko M, Hofrichterova L, Lahuta H.(2010) Enginering-Geological Conditions of the Effect of a Landslide from Mining Activity. Slovak J Civ Eng. 2010; 18(4):8–16.
- [15]. Mustafa, M. K. A., Bader, D. N., Khachiek, T. V., Fleah, I. K., &Issa, I. G. (2011). Biobeneficiation of Silica Sand for Crystal Glass Industry from Ardhuma Location, Iraqi Western Desert. IraqiBulletin of Geology and Mining, 7(1), 77-86.
- [16]. Ndukwe, O. C., &Chikwendu, C. (2010). Bioleaching of Silica Sand with the Fungi FosariumOxysporum, Peninicilliumnotatum, Aspergillusnigerand Rhizopus, Advances inScience and Technology, 4(2), 125-130.
- [17]. Ndukwe OCN and T. F, Eze (2017). Effect of Temperature on The Bioleaching of Iron from Silica Sand with AspergillusnigerCorrelated with Shrinking Core and Mixed Kinetic Models.; Saudi J. Eng. Technol.; Vol-2, Iss-5(May, 2017):197-204
- [18]. O. C. Nkemnaso, E. F. Ejovwokoghene, and C. U. Innocent, (2018) "Bio-mining: The Past, the Present and the Future 2 . Characteristics of Microbes," Biosci. Bioeng., vol. 4, 2018, no. 3, pp. 52–60.
- [19]. Phillips J.(2006) Climate change and surface mining: A review of environmenthuman interactions & their spatial dynamics. ApplGeogr. 2016; 74:95–108.
- [20]. S. Christelet al., (2018) "Weak iron oxidation by Sulfobacillusthermosulfidooxidans maintains a favorable redox potential for chalcopyrite bioleaching," Front. Microbiol., vol. 9, 2018, no. DEC, pp. 1–12.

- [21]. S.VenkatesaPrabhu, G.Ramesh, Amare T. Adugna, Surafel M. Beyan, GizachewAssefa. K (2019). Kinetics of Iron Bioleaching using Isolated LeptospirillumFerriphilum: Effect of Temperature. International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (IJITEE) ISSN: 2278-3075, Volume-8 Issue-12, October 2019
- [22]. Samson, R. A., Houbraken, J., Summerbell, R. C., Flannigan, B., & Miller, J. D. (2001) Common and important species of fungi and actinomycetes in indoor environments, Microorganisms in Homeand Indoor Work Environments. CRC, 287–292.
- [23]. Sessitsch A, Weilharter A, Gerzabek MH, Kirchmann H, Kandeler E. (2001). Microbial population structures in soil particle size fractions of a long-term fertilizer field experiment. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2001 Sep;67(9):4215-24
- [24]. Tasić V, Kovačević R, Maluckov B, et al., (2017). The Content of As and Heavy Metals in TSP and PM10 Near Copper Smelter in Bor, Serbia. Water Air Soil Poll. 2017. p. 228–230.
- [25]. W. Krebs, C. Brombacher, P. P. Bosshard, R. Bachofen, and H. Brandl, (1997).
  "Microbial recovery of metals from solids," FEMS Microbiology Reviews, vol. 20, no. 3-4, pp. 605–617, 1997.
- [26]. Watling, H.R., 2006. The bioleaching of sulphide minerals with emphasis on copper sulphides - A review. Hydrometallurgy 84, 81-108.