

| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

# **Conservation of Environment and Corrosion Inhibition by Calotropis**

### Jyoti Choudhary

Lecturer, Department of Civil, Govt. Polytechnic College, Alwar, India

**ABSTRACT**: Corrosion occurs as a result of the interaction of a metal with its environment. The extent of corrosion depends on the type of metal, the existing conditions in the environment and the type of aggressive ions present in the medium. For example, <sup>CO</sup><sub>3</sub><sup>-2</sup> and <sup>NO-3</sup> produce an insoluble deposit on the surface of iron, resulting in the isolation of metal and consequent decrease of corrosion. There are two ways to look at the relationship between corrosion and pollution: (i) corrosion of metals and alloys due to environmental pollution and (ii) environmental pollution as a result of corrosion protection. This paper encompasses the scenarios and possible remedies for various cases, using 'green' inhibitors obtained from plant extracts.

The effect of Calotropis plant extract on the corrosion of aluminium in molar sulphuric acid was studied by mass loss method. The alcoholic extract of *Calotropis* reduces the corrosion rate. The inhibition efficiency increases with additive concentration. Mass loss experiment was employed with mixture of hydrochloric acid and sulphuric acid. Calotropis plant shows inhibition efficiency up to 83%.

**KEYWORDS-** Calotropis, aluminium, Metal, Corrosion etc.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Corrosion is the destructive result of chemical reaction between metal and metal alloys and its environment[1]. Corrosion invades in almost every part of our lives. Hence corrosion is often regarded as a "necessary evil" to be tolerated. Corrosion reactions can be divided into two or more partial reaction[2-3]. One is the oxidation or de-electronation of metal and termed as anodic reaction. The second reaction is the electron consuming and is termed as cathodic, which can be of several types depending on the nature of metal

surrounding the metal. In acidic medium hydrogen evaluation reaction predominates. Well known as non-toxic compounds and due to their availability and relatively low coast, naturally products4 find various applications in many fields. The diversity of their structures plays a major role in their use as corrosion inhibitors. There are numerous naturally occuring substances like *Ficus variens5*, *Datura stramonium*[6], *Prosopis juliflora*[7], *Calotropis* procera and *Calotropis gigantean*[8], *Saponin*[9], Fenugreek[10], *Prosopiscineraria*[11], *Ficus relegeosa*[12], *Caparis deciduas*[13]. *Calotropis* treat common diseases such as fever, rheumatism, indigestion, cough, eczema, asthma, elephantiasis, nausea, vomiting and diarrhea.

#### II. EXPERIMENTAL

The sulphuric acid solution was prepared using doubly distilled water. The *Calotropis* extract was obtained by drying, then powdered and extracted with boiling alcohol. The solvent was vacuumed, distilled off and the residue treated with inorganic acid while the bases were extracted as their soluble salts. The free bases were liberated various solvents, e.g. Ether, Chloroform etc. The mixture of bases thus obtained is separated by various methods into the individual compounds. To clean the stuff obtained it was boiled with activated charcoal (2gm) to remove gung and pure plant extract is obtained.

#### SPECIMEN PREPARATION

Rectangular specimens of aluminium of dimension 2.5cm \*1.5cm \*0.02 cm containing a small hole of 2mm diameter near the upper edge were employed for the determination of corrosion rate. Specimens of aluminium were cleaned by



| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

buffing to produce a mirror finish with pumice powder and aluminium were cleaned with emery paper then degreased with acetone. The weight of the specimens before and after immersion was determined using a Schimadzu balance.

#### TEST SOLUTION PREPARATION MASS LOSS MEASUREMENT

The acidic solution was prepared by using doubly distilled water. All chemicals were used of analytical reagent quality. The percentage inhibition efficiency was calculated as [14]

Where  $\Delta Mu$  and  $\Delta Mi$  are the mass loss of the metal is uninhibited and inhibited solution respectively.

The degree of surface coverage ( $\theta$ ) can be calculated as

The corrosion rate is mmpy (milli meter penetration per year) can be obtained by the following equation 15

Corrosion rate = (Mass loss  $\cdot$  87.6)/ (Area Time Metal density)

Where mass loss is expressed in mg, area is expressed in  $cm^2$  of metal surface exposed, time is expressed in hours of exposure, metal density is expressed in gm/cm<sup>3</sup> and 87.6 is conversion factor.

#### THERMOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

Mylius introduced this technique and originally developed to determine the corrosiveness of metal. The method of Mylius has been proved to be of considered value and help in studying the corrosion behaviors of a number of surface active agents.

In this method, the variation of temperature is followed as a function of time. The test specimen is immersed in a cell containing the test solution along with the thermometer bulb, which is immersed in a Dewar flask. Initially the temperature of the system remains almost constant. Subsequently, it rises quickly to attain a maximum value and ultimately declines. The weight of the specimens before and after immersion will determine using a Schimadzu balance. Temperature changes will measure at intervals of one minute using a thermometer with a precision of  $\pm 0.5$ °C. The percentage inhibition efficiencies were calculated as [15].

Where  $RN_i$  and  $RN_f$  are the reaction number in the presence and absence of inhibitors respectively and RN (°C/min) is defined as [16].

Where mass loss is expressed in mg, area is expressed in  $cm^2$  of metal surface exposed, time is expressed in hours of exposure, metal density is expressed in  $gm/cm^3$  and 87.6 is the conversion factor.

#### **III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The inhibition efficiency (%) calculated from the mass loss measurement for sulphuric acid solution with inhibitors [Tables 1-4]. It is observed that the inhibition efficiency increases with increase in the concentration of inhibition and decreases with increases in

acid strength. The corrosion rate decreases with increases in concentration of inhibitor.

The inhibitors have shown the efficiency in the range. *Calotropis procera* shows minimum 44.23% and maximum 82.98% for 0.5N sulphuric acid solution but Calotropis

gigantea solution shows minimum 43.26% and maximum 82.82% inhibition efficiency.

*Calotropis procera* show minimum 48.58% and maximum 78.86% for 1.0N sulphuric acid solution whereas *Calotropis gigantea* solution shows minimum 48.69% and maximum 78.82% inhibition efficiency.

An attempt has been made to measure the corrosion rate of aluminum in mixture of

hydrochloric acid and sulphuric acid solution. The inhibition efficiency (%) calculated

from the mass loss measurement for mixture of sulphuric acid and hydrochloric acid

solution with inhibitors. The adsorbed plant extract parts act to slow corrosion process by either:

1. Increasing the anodic and/or cathodic polarization behaviour.



| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

2. Reducing the movement or diffusion of ions to the metallic surface.

3. Increasing the electrical resistance of the metallic surface.

Surface analysis shows the plant extract adsorbed on metal surface and decrease the surface area for corrosion reaction.

Organic corrosion inhibitors may function as:

- 1. Chemisorption of the molecule on the metallic surface.
- 2. Complexing of the molecule with the metal ion which remains in solid state.
- 3. Neutralising the corrodent.
- 4. Adsorbing the corrodent.
- 5. They offered large coverage due to the long hydrocarbon chain and by the presence of -OH group, being hydrophilic in nature, the -OH group counteracted the effects of chain length and ensured higher solubility.
- 6. Cathodic inhibitors slow down the reaction taking place at cathode (i.e. H<sub>2</sub> evolution) eg. Organic inhibitors like amine, substituted urea's, heavy metal soap etc. decreases H<sub>2</sub> evolution process. Aluminium salts deposits on cathode helps in decreasing the O<sub>2</sub> absorption process.
- 7. Absorption of oxygen- This type of corrosion occurs generally in aqueous solution.
- 8. The corrosion of aluminium and aluminium alloys precede through the following elementary reactions:

| Anodic reaction   | $AI \rightarrow AI^{3+} + 3e^{-}$      |                           |
|-------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Cathodic reaction | $O_2 + 2H_2O + 4e^- \rightarrow 4OH^-$ | (neutral/alkaline medium) |
|                   | $2H^+ + 2e^- \rightarrow H_2 \uparrow$ | (acidic medium)           |

All metal above the hydrogen in electrochemical series have a tendency to get dissolve in acidic solution releasing hydrogen.

# Table-1 Mass loss data for aluminium in 0.5N sulfuric acid with ethanolic extract of leaves, latex and fruit of calotropis procera.

| Inhibitor Concentration | Mass loss<br>(gm) | Inhibition efficiency<br>(%) | Corrosion rate<br>(mmpy) | Surface coverage<br>(θ) |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| the table to the        | 1042              |                              | 22.0                     |                         |
| Uninnibited             | 1842              |                              | 33.0                     |                         |
| Leaves                  |                   |                              |                          |                         |
| 0.12                    | 1012              | 45.00                        | 18.2                     | 0.4500                  |
| 0.24                    | 872               | 52.60                        | 15.7                     | 0.5260                  |
| 0.36                    | 653               | 64.51                        | 11.7                     | 0.6451                  |
| 0.48                    | 487               | 73.53                        | 8.77                     | 0.7353                  |
| 0.60                    | 348               | 81.08                        | 6.27                     | 0.8108                  |
| Latex                   |                   |                              |                          |                         |
| 0.12                    | 987               | 46.35                        | 17.7                     | 0.4635                  |
| 0.24                    | 856               | 53.47                        | 15.4                     | 0.5347                  |
| 0.36                    | 641               | 65.16                        | 11.5                     | 0.6516                  |
| 0.48                    | 465               | 74.72                        | 9.43                     | 0.7472                  |



| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

| 0.60  | 313  | 82.98 | 5.64 | 0.8298 |
|-------|------|-------|------|--------|
| Fruit |      |       |      |        |
| 0.12  | 1026 | 44.23 | 18.4 | 0.4423 |
| 0.24  | 898  | 51.19 | 16.1 | 0.5119 |
| 0.36  | 674  | 63.36 | 12.1 | 0.6336 |
| 0.48  | 465  | 74.72 | 8.38 | 0.7472 |
| 0.60  | 338  | 81.63 | 6.09 | 0.8163 |

Table-2 Mass loss data for aluminium in 0.5N sulfuric acid with ethanolic extract of leaves, latex and fruit of calotropis gigantea.

| Inhibitor Concentration | Mass loss | Inhibition efficiency | Corrosion rate | Surface coverage |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|
|                         | (gm)      | (%)                   | (mmpy)         | (θ)              |
| Uninhibited             | 1840      |                       | 33.1           |                  |
| Leaves                  |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1023      | 44.40                 | 18.4           | 0.4440           |
| 0.24                    | 851       | 53.73                 | 15.3           | 0.5373           |
| 0.36                    | 634       | 65.54                 | 11.4           | 0.6554           |
| 0.48                    | 465       | 74.72                 | 8.38           | 0.7472           |
| 0.60                    | 327       | 82.22                 | 5.89           | 0.8222           |
| Latex                   |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 951       | 48.31                 | 17.1           | 0.4831           |
| 0.24                    | 833       | 54.72                 | 15.0           | 0.5472           |
| 0.36                    | 627       | 65.92                 | 11.3           | 0.6592           |
| 0.48                    | 442       | 75.97                 | 7.96           | 0.7597           |
| 0.60                    | 316       | 82.82                 | 5.69           | 0.8282           |
| Fruit                   |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1044      | 43.26                 | 18.8           | 0.4326           |
| 0.24                    | 875       | 52.44                 | 15.7           | 0.5244           |
| 0.36                    | 653       | 64.51                 | 11.7           | 0.6451           |
| 0.48                    | 482       | 73.80                 | 8.68           | 0.7380           |
| 0.60                    | 319       | 82.66                 | 5.74           | 0.8266           |



| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

Table-3 Mass loss data for aluminium in 1.0N sulfuric acid with ethanolic extract of leaves, latex and fruit of calatropic process

| Inhibitor Concentration | Mass loss | Inhibition efficiency | Corrosion rate | Surface coverage |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|
|                         | (gm)      | (70)                  | (mmpy)         | (0)              |
| Uninhibited             | 2460      |                       | 44.3           |                  |
| Leaves                  |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1242      | 49.51                 | 22.3           | 0.4951           |
| 0.24                    | 935       | 61.99                 | 16.8           | 0.6199           |
| 0.36                    | 721       | 70.69                 | 12.9           | 0.7069           |
| 0.48                    | 663       | 73.04                 | 11.9           | 0.7304           |
| 0.60                    | 548       | 77.72                 | 9.87           | 0.7772           |
| Latex                   |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1263      | 48.58                 | 22.7           | 0.4858           |
| 0.24                    | 931       | 62.15                 | 16.7           | 0.6215           |
| 0.36                    | 748       | 69.59                 | 13.4           | 0.6959           |
| 0.48                    | 625       | 74.59                 | 11.2           | 0.7459           |
| 0.60                    | 520       | 78.86                 | 9.37           | 0.7886           |
| Fruit                   |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1186      | 51.78                 | 21.3           | 0.5178           |
| 0.24                    | 958       | 61.05                 | 17.2           | 0.6105           |
| 0.36                    | 712       | 71.05                 | 12.8           | 0.7105           |
| 0.48                    | 643       | 73.86                 | 11.5           | 0.7386           |
| 0.60                    | 574       | 76.66                 | 10.3           | 0.7666           |



| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

Table-4 Mass loss data for aluminium in 1.0N sulfuric acid with ethanolic extract of leaves, latex and fruit of calotronis gigantea

| Inhibitor Concentration | Mass loss | Inhibition efficiency | Corrosion rate | Surface coverage |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|
|                         | (gm)      | (70)                  | (1111)(111)    | (0)              |
| Uninhibited             | 2460      |                       | 44.3           |                  |
| Leaves                  |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1262      | 48.69                 | 22.7           | 0.4869           |
| 0.24                    | 957       | 61.09                 | 17.2           | 0.6109           |
| 0.36                    | 734       | 70.16                 | 13.2           | 0.7016           |
| 0.48                    | 641       | 73.94                 | 11.5           | 0.7394           |
| 0.60                    | 523       | 78.73                 | 9.42           | 0.7873           |
| Latex                   |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1244      | 49.43                 | 22.4           | 0.4943           |
| 0.24                    | 950       | 61.38                 | 17.1           | 0.6138           |
| 0.36                    | 763       | 68.98                 | 13.7           | 0.6898           |
| 0.48                    | 619       | 74.83                 | 11.1           | 0.7483           |
| 0.60                    | 521       | 78.82                 | 9.39           | 0.7882           |
| Fruit                   |           |                       |                |                  |
| 0.12                    | 1164      | 52.68                 | 20.9           | 0.5268           |
| 0.24                    | 934       | 62.03                 | 16.8           | 0.6203           |
| 0.36                    | 727       | 70.44                 | 13.1           | 0.7044           |
| 0.48                    | 651       | 73.53                 | 11.7           | 0.7353           |
| 0.60                    | 543       | 77.92                 | 9.78           | 0.7792           |



| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015





| Impact Factor: 5.442|| A Monthly Peer Reviewed & Referred Journal |

#### Vol. 4, Issue 9, September 2015

#### REFERENCES

- 1. H.H., Uligh, "Corrosion and corrosion control, an introduction to corrosion science and engineering" John Wiley and sons, New York, (1971).
- 2. J.C., Scully, "The fundamental of corrosion", 2nd Ed. Pergmann press London, 249 (1975).
- 3. F.N., Speller, "Corrosion cause and prevention" Mc Graw Hill, New York (1951).
- 4. P.B. Raja, and M.G., Sethuraman, Materials Letters, 62, 113-116 (2008).
- 5. T. Jain, R. Chowdhary, and S.P., Mathur, Materials and Corrosion 57, 422-426 253 (2006).
- 6. G.S. Verma, P. Anthony, and S.P., Mathur, J. Electrochem. Soc. India, 51, 173-255 177 (2002).
- 7. R. Chowdhary, and S.P., Mathur, J. Electrochem. Soc. India, 54, 1-10 (2005).
- 8. S. Kumar, S. Arora, M. Sharma, P. Arora, and S. P., Mathur, Journal of the 258 Chilean Chemical Society. 53, 83-88 (2009).
- 9. 'The useful plant of India' CSIR New Delhi, 'The wealth of India raw 260 materials' CSIR, New Delhi, (1986).
- 10. E.A., Noor, International. J. Electrochem. Sci. 2, 996-1017 (2007).
- 11. M.K. Sharma, P. Arora, S. Kumar, S. P. Mathur, and R. Ratnani, Corrosion 263 Engineering Sci. and Tech. 43, 213-218 (2008).
- 12. T. Jain, R. Chowdhary, and S. P. Mathur, J. Electrochem. Soc. India. 53, 33-39 265 2004.
- 13. P. Arora, S. Kumar, M.K. Sharma, and S.P., Mathur, E-Journal of chemistry, 4 267 (4), 450-456 (2007).
- 14. N. Saxena, S. Kumar, and S.P., Mathur, Chemical Engineering Communications, 269 196(12), 1451-1465 (2009).
- 15. M.K. Sharma, S. Kumar, R. Ratnani and S.P. Mathur, Bull. of Electrochem. 22 (2006) 69.
- 16. P.B. Raja, and M.G. Sethuraman, Pigment and Resin Tech., 38 (2009) 33.