Environmental Engineering and Management Journal

January 2021, Vol. 20, No. 1, 133-139 http://www.eemj.icpm.tuiasi.ro/; http://www.eemj.eu



"Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of lasi, Romania



ANALYTICAL METHODS COMPARISON FOR pH DETERMINATION OF COMPOSTING PROCESS FROM GREEN WASTES

Arthur Couto Neves^{1*}, Priscila da Costa², Claudia Aparecida de Oliveira e Silva², Flavio Rodrigues Pereira², Marcos Paulo Gomes Mol¹

¹Research Department, Ezequiel Dias Foundation (FUNED). Belo Horizonte, Brazil ²Instituto Octávio Magalhães Directory, Ezequiel Dias Foundation (FUNED), Belo Horizonte, Brazil

Abstract

Composting is the accelerated microbiological decomposition of organic waste. pH, temperature, and moisture are necessary to be monitored to ensure an adequate control of this process. pH can be a fundamental indicator of the degree of degradation, however, there are few specific analytical methods of its determination in samples originated from composting and, therefore, data can be difficult to interpret when consulting the literature. With the aim of evaluate extractant solutions (CaCl₂ 0.01 mol.L⁻¹ and KCl 1 mol.L⁻¹) and the universal solvent (water) used for pH determination, a comparison of four analytical methods was performed in samples originated from composting of leaf and garden waste. A descriptive statistical analysis, normality tests (Shapiro-Wilk), comparison of medians (Kruskal-Wallis with post-hoc by Nemenyi) and linear regressions with robust variance were performed (software R 3.4.2). Statistical analysis showed significant differences, suggesting CaCl₂ and H₂O methods tend to be more indicated when is desired to apply the final compound directly on the soil. KCl tends to be the solution with the greatest extraction capacity of H⁺ ions. Therefore, the waste characteristics and the purpose of the monitoring parameters must be evaluated for the determination of the appropriated pH methodology.

Keywords: green waste, leaf and garden waste, microbiological degradation, organic waste, pH analytical methodologies

Received: March, 2020; Revised final: June, 2020; Accepted: September, 2020; Published in final edited form: January, 2021

^{*} Author to whom all correspondence should be addressed: e-mail: coutoarthur@gmail.com; Phone: +55 31 9 9866 8587