## PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

# Adsorption and desorption of agricultural wastederived DOMs in soil

To cite this article: H L Li et al 2017 IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. 61 012009

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

## You may also like

- <u>Scratch response and tribological</u> properties of TiAlSiN coatings deposited by reactive deep oscillation magnetron sputtering Y X Ou, H Q Wang, B Liao et al.
- <u>Search for Galactic Core-collapse</u> <u>Supernovae in a Decade of Data Taken</u> <u>with the IceCube Neutrino Observatory</u> R. Abbasi, M. Ackermann, J. Adams et al.
- <u>Letter of intent for KM3NeT 2.0</u> S Adrián-Martínez, M Ageron, F Aharonian et al.





DISCOVER how sustainability intersects with electrochemistry & solid state science research



This content was downloaded from IP address 3.131.13.165 on 13/05/2024 at 09:51

# Adsorption and desorption of agricultural waste-derived **DOMs** in soil

## H L Li, G H Yang, G Y Zhu, Z Q Sun and X Y Yu

School of Resources and Environment, University of Jinan, Jinan 250022, China ujn lihl@163.com

Abstract. The sorption and desorption of two forms of dissolved organic matter (DOM) extracted from agricultural wastes were studied by batch experiments. The adsorption of the two DOMs on the soil were well fitted to the Linear and Freundlich isotherms. DOM extracted from cow manure (MDOM) shows higher affinity to the soil than that extracted from wheat straw (SDOM). Significant desorption hysteresis was observed for both DOMs. Due to the desorption of some aromatic substances with larger molecular weight from the soil, the average molecular weight and aromaticity of the DOMs increased at sorption equilibrium compared with those before sorption.

## 1. Introduction

The incorporation of organic amendments such as straw and animal manure are common farming management practices in China and many other countries around the world [1], thus DOMs originated from these amendments will be released into soil environments. DOM can be bound to the soil via electrostatic adsorption, ligand exchange, complexation, hydrophobic interaction, hydrogen bonding and cation bridging mechanisms [2]. Since DOMs play an important role in the transport of pollutants in soils, their fate has been a subject of considerable interest in recent years.

There are several studies on the sorption of DOMs in soils. For example, Kaiser et al. [3] investigated the sorption of total, hydrophilic, and hydrophobic DOM on 125 forest soil samples and found that the majority of the soils preferentially sorbed hydrophobic dissolved organic carbon. Shen [4] evaluated some important physical-chemical factors determining the sorption of DOM onto natural soil and demonstrated that DOM sorption on soil is largely due to ligand exchange between DOM and hydroxyl groups on the soil mineral surface. He also found that soil sorption capacity of DOM is positively correlated to the soil clay content as well as the soil water solution ionic strength and pH. The sorption of DOMs on soils can decrease the mobility of the associated pollutants. Furthermore, the adsorbed DOMs can change the physicochemical properties of the soil surface, which will have an effect on the fate of some other contaminants. Thus, it is essential to better understand the processes that alter the concentration and properties of DOMs in soils.

The aims of this study was to explore the sorption and desorption behaviors of two DOMs derived from agricultural wastes and the changes in their physiochemical characteristics before and after sorption.

## 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Materials

CaCl<sub>2</sub> and NaN<sub>3</sub> were analytical grade purchased from Sinopharm Chemical Reagent Co. ltd and Sigma-Aldrich, respectively.

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence. Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI. Published under licence by IOP Publishing Ltd 1

3rd International Conference on Energy Materials and Environment Engin	eering	IOP Publishing
IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 61 (2017) 012009	doi:10.1088/17	/55-1315/61/1/012009

An uncontaminated soil was collected from the suburb of Jinan city, China. The soil was air dried and sieved through a 2 mm mesh. The  $K_2Cr_2O_7$  titration method was used to determine the soil total organic carbon (TOC). The soil pH was determined in 1:5 soil – water slurries using a glass electrode. The cation-exchange capacity (CEC) of the soil was determined by the  $NH_4^+$ -acetate method. Selected soil properties are shown in Table 1.

		Table 1. Selecte	d soil properties		
пЦ	Grai	CEC	$TOC(\alpha/k\alpha)$		
рп	<0.002 mm	0.002-0.02 mm	0.02-2 mm	(cmol/kg)	TOC (g/kg)
6.8	53.2	24.4	22.4	6.84	7.19

#### 2.2. Dissolved organic matter extraction and characterization

Two forms of dissolved organic matter were used. One form of DOM was extracted from wheat straw (SDOM) and the other from cow manure (MDOM). The DOMs were extracted as described in our previous study [1]. Briefly, wheat straw and cow manure were extracted with deionized water using a solid/water ratio of 1:10 and 1:5 (w/v, dry weight basis), respectively, in a reciprocal shaker at 200 rpm and 25 °C for 24 h. The suspensions were centrifuged at 5000 rpm for 30 min, then, vacuum filtered through a filter paper (Whatman 20-25 µm pore size), and a 0.45 µm cellulous acetate filter (Whatman, Maidstone, UK) successively. The filtrates were freeze dried as powders and stored in a desiccator for later use. The concentrations of DOMs were measured at mg L<sup>-1</sup> dissolved organic carbon (DOC) using a total organic carbon (TOC) analyzer (Shimadzu TOC-L CPH/CPN, Japan). The electrical conductivity (EC) of the DOM solution was measured at 25 °C by a YSI 3100 conductivity instrument (YSI, US). The salt ions in the DOM solution were determined using an inductive coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) (PerkinElmer, Optima 7000 DV). The molecular weights were measured using the high-pressure size exclusion chromatography method as described by Yue et al. [5]. Specific UV absorbance at 254 nm was used to evaluate the aromaticity of DOM samples [6]. Absorbance of DOM solution at 465 and 665 nm was also measured to calculate the E4/E6 ratio, which is negatively correlated with molecular size [7]. The <sup>13</sup>C CP/MAS NMR spectra were obtained using a Varian Infinity Plus-300 spectrometer equipped with a 4 mm double-resonance magic angle spinning probe head, operating at <sup>13</sup>C frequency of 75.4 MHz. The aliphatic carbon and aromatic carbon were determined by quantifying the peak area in the 0-109 ppm [8] and 110-160 ppm [9] chemical shift bands, respectively. The polar carbon of the DOMs was determined by quantifying the peak area in the 50-109 ppm and 145-220 ppm chemical shift band [8].

#### 2.3. Adsorption and desorption experiments

Batch adsorption experiments were conducted in 30-mL glass vials with teflon-lined caps. Soil sample (3.00 g) was mixed with 30 mL of DOM solution in 0.01 M CaCl<sub>2</sub> as the background electrolyte and 0.2 g L<sup>-1</sup> NaN<sub>3</sub> as a biocide. The initial concentrations of DOMs were in the range of 0–150 mg L<sup>-1</sup>. The mixtures were shaken for 48 h at 25 °C on a rotary shaker (200 rpm) and afterwards centrifuged for 30 min at 5000 rpm. After the sorption period, desorption was conducted by withdrawing 28 mL supernatant and replenishing the samples with the same volume of background electrolyte solution. The vials were sealed, shaken and centrifuged as described in the sorption experiments. The supernatant of sorption and desorption experiments was filtered through a 0.45 µm cellulous acetate filter (Whatman, Maidstone, UK). A portion of the filtrate was used for the determination of TOC and the remaining was used for UV detection at 254 nm, 465 nm and 665 nm.

Sorbed DOM concentration in the sorption experiments was calculated by the following mass balance equation

$$Q_e = \frac{(C_0 - C_e + C_{ck})V}{W} \tag{1}$$

where  $C_e$  is the liquid phase equilibrium concentration in mg L<sup>-1</sup> and  $Q_e$  is the concentration on the solid phase in mg kg<sup>-1</sup>,  $C_{ck}$  is the DOM concentration that released from the soil to the solution when no SDOM and MDOM was added, V (mL) is the volume of solution and W (g) is the mass of soil used.

For the desorption experiments, the desorption amount of DOM can be calculated with the following equation

$$Q_d = \frac{(C'_e - C'_{ck})V - C_e V_1}{W}$$
(2)

(5)

(6)

where  $Q_d (\text{mg kg}^{-1})$  is the desorption amount of DOM at equilibrium,  $C'_e (\text{mg L}^{-1})$  is the equilibrium concentration in the liquid phase,  $C'_{ck}$  is the DOM concentration that released from the soil to the solution in the desorption treatment with no SDOM and MDOM was added initially,  $V_l$  is the residual solution volume before the desorption experiments.

#### 2.4. Adsorption isotherm models

Linear, Langmiur, Freundlich and Temkin isotherm which have the following forms were used to fit the adsorption data

Linear isotherm: 
$$Q_e = aC_e + b$$
 (3)

Langmiur isotherm: 
$$\frac{C_e}{\rho} = \frac{C_e}{\rho} + \frac{1}{k\rho}$$
 (4)

Freundlich isotherm:  $\ln Q_e = lnK_f + nlnC_e$ 

Temkin isotherm:  $Q_e = A + B \ln C_e$ 

where  $Q_m$  is the Langmuir parameter related to maximum adsorption capacity (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), k is the Langmuir parameter related to energy of adsorption,  $K_f$  is the Freundlich affinity coefficient [(mg kg<sup>-1</sup>)/(mg L<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>n</sup>], n is the Freundlich nonlinearity factor, A and B are constants.

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Characterization of DOMs

The major properties of the two DOM samples were reported previously [1] and are shown in Table 2. Higher A<sub>254</sub>/DOC values for MDOM indicate that MDOM has relatively higher aromaticity than SDOM. The E4/E6 ratios of SDOM and MDOM were 8.83 and 7.66, respectively, indicating that MDOM had a relatively higher molecular weight. The differences between SDOM and MDOM might affect their adsorption on the soil, thus their interaction with other pollutants. Table 3 presents the molecular weights and structural composition of the two DOMs. It can be seen that MDOM has a higher molecular weight than SDOM. The contents of aliphatic and polar carbon for SDOM are higher than those for MDOM, while the content of aromatic carbon for SDOM are lower than that for MDOM.

Table 2. Properties of dissolved organic matters extracted from wheat straw (SDOM) and cow manure

(MDON)								
Sample	pН	EC	$\mathbf{K}^+$	$Na^+$	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	$Mg^{2+}$	A <sub>254</sub> /DOC	E1/E6
		(µS/cm)	$(mg L^{-1})$	$(mg L^{-1})$	$(mg L^{-1})$	$(mg L^{-1})$	$(L \cdot mg^{-1} \cdot cm^{-1})$	E4/E0
SDOM	8.86	254	12.4	1.68	1.19	0.79	1.6	8.83
MDOM	9.06	192	9.49	2.94	0.36	0.57	1.8	7.66

<sup>a</sup> Data measured at DOM concentration of 50 mg/L DOC.

### 3.2. Sorption-desorption isotherms of DOMs

The DOM concentration at sorption/desorption equilibrium and the sorption/desorption amounts are shown in table 4. In the sorption experiments, when no SDOM or MDOM was added to the solution, a concentration of 18.4 mg  $L^{-1}$  was measured at equilibrium, implying that DOM was released from the soil. The desorption amount is 184 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>. Significant desorption hysteresis was observed for both

 Table 3. Molecular weight, polydispersity, aliphatic carbon, aromatic carbon and polar carbon of DOM samples

Sampla	Max a	Mn <sup>b</sup>	Polydispersity	Aliphatic	Aromatic	Polar
Sample NW		IVIII	(ρ)	C (%)	C (%)	C (%)
SDOM	2632	1255	2.1	75.6	3.2	77.0
MDOM	3542	1964	1.8	71.1	3.8	69.1

<sup>a</sup> Weight-averaged molecular weight; <sup>b</sup> Number-averaged molecular weight.

DOMs. For SDOM, the percentage that can be desorbed is 9.86%-50%. While for MDOM, the percentage is only 2.52%-25.2%. This means that MDOM are more difficult to be desorbed than SDOM. As can be seen from table 5, the linear equation and the Freundlich equation can well fit the adsorption of the two DOMs in the soil. The sorption isotherms were also shown in figure 1. In the concentration range studied, the adsorption amount of DOM was linearly correlated with the

Table 4. Sorption/desorption amount of DOMs					
Treatment	Initial concentration (mg·L <sup>-1</sup> )	Concentration at sorption equilibrium (mg·L <sup>-1</sup> )	Sorption amount (mg·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Concentration at desorption equilibrium (mg·L <sup>-1</sup> )	Desorption amount (mg·kg <sup>-1</sup> )
DOM-0	0	18.4	-184 <sup>a</sup>	2.98	17.5
SDOM-25	25	36.6	72.5	8.01	38.2
SDOM-50	50	55.5	142	8.67	32.2
SDOM-75	75	73.9	216	10.2	34.8
SDOM-100	100	99.1	223	10.6	22.3
SDOM-150	150	127	455	16.6	63.2
MDOM-25	25	34.2	88.5	4.37	3.38
MDOM-50	50	51.8	164	9.45	42.5
MDOM-75	75	66.8	265	6.88	6.77
MDOM-100	100	83.0	354	9.82	25.4
MDOM-150	150	113	554	11.2	19.6

<sup>a</sup>Negative number means the desorption amount from soil.

Table 5. Fitting parameters of adsorption isotherms						
		SDOM			MDOM	
Linear	а	b	$R^2$	а	b	$R^2$
isotherm	4.25	-8.02	0.998	5.97	-17.8	0.995
Langmiur	$Q_m$	k	$R^2$	$Q_m$	k	$R^2$
isotherm	1111	0.006	0.862	769	0.006	0.972
Freundlich	$K_{f}$	n	$R^2$	$K_{f}$	n	$R^2$
isotherm	4.06	0.999	0.998	5.34	0.989	0.992
Temkin	A	В	$R^2$	Α	В	$R^2$
isotherm	-579	211	0.905	-652	250	0.887

equilibrium concentration in the solution phase, indicating that the adsorption of DOM onto soil may not reach saturation state, and there are still vacant adsorption sites on the soil surface. The higher the value of parameter a in the linear adsorption equation, the easier the adsorption of DOM by soil. The value of parameter a for MDOM was higher than that for SDOM, indicating that MDOM was more easily adsorbed by soil. This might be originated from the difference in composition and structure of the two DOMs. The aromaticity of MDOM is higher than that of the SDOM, implying it is more hydrophobic and more easily to be adsorbed by soil. This is also verified by the higher  $K_f$  value of MDOM.



Figure 1. Adsorption isotherms of DOM: (a) Linear isotherm and (b) Freundlich isotherm

## 3.3. Aromaticity and molecular weight characteristics before and after sorption

Table 6 shows the aromaticity and molecular weight characteristics at sorption equilibrium. The E4/E6 values of SDOM and MDOM before adsorption were 8.83 and 7.66 (Table 2), respectively. At adsorption equilibrium, the E4/E6 values of SDOM and MDOM were 2.29-2.53 and 2.07-3.26, respectively, which both decreased significantly. It is indicated that the average molecular weight of DOMs greatly increased. Some researchers [3] have reported the substance with large molecules in DOMs were preferentially adsorbed on the surface of the soil, thus the molecular weight would decrease if only the sorption process being considered, which contradicted the result of this study. The increase in molecular weight might be attributed to desorption of some substances with large molecules from the soil used in this study, which proved by the lower E4/E6 (1.89) value of DOM-0 treatment (Table 6). Comparing the data in Table 1 and Table 6, it can be found that the A<sub>254</sub>/DOC values at equilibrium was higher than those before sorption, indicating an increase in aromaticity. This might be explained by desorption of some aromatic substances from the soil, which was proved by the higher A<sub>254</sub>/DOC value (34.8) of DOM-0 treatment.

Treatment	$A_{254}/DOC (L \cdot mg^{-1} \cdot cm^{-1})$	E4/E6
DOM-0	34.8	1.89
SDOM-25	19.9	2.47
SDOM-50	17.3	2.28
SDOM-75	16.7	2.58
SDOM-100	14.4	2.53
SDOM-150	16.0	2.98
MDOM-25	24.7	2.07
MDOM-50	17.3	2.28
MDOM-75	14.7	3.10
MDOM-100	13.5	2.63
MDOM-150	14.0	3.26

Table 6. Aromaticity and molecular weight characteristics at sorption equilibrium

## 4. Conclusions

The adsorption of the two DOMs on the soil were well fitted to the Linear and Freundlich isotherms. Significant desorption hysteresis was observed for both DOMs. Compared with SDOM, MDOM are more easily to be adsorbed by soil and more difficult to be desorbed. Due to the desorption of some

aromatic substances with larger molecular weight from the soil, the average molecular weight and aromaticity of the DOMs increased at sorption equilibrium compared with those before sorption.

## Acknowledgments

Financial supports are from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (21207049).

## References

- [1] Li H L, Qiu Y H, Wang X N, Liu W H, Chen G C, Ma Y B and Xing B S 2016 Environ. Pollut. 210 323
- [2] Mavi M S, Sanderman J, Chittleborough D J, Cox J W and Marschner P 2012 Sci. Total Environ. 435-436 337
- [3] Kaiser K, Guggenberger G and Zech W 1996 Geoderma 74 281
- [4] Shen Y H 1999 Chemosphere **38** 1505
- [5] Yue L, Wu F, Liu C, Li W, Wang J and Mei Y 2004 Chin. J. Geochem. 23 275
- [6] Tusseau-Vuillemin M H, Gourlay C, Lorgeoux C, Mouchel J M, Buzier R, Gilbin R, Seidel J L and Elbaz-Poulichet F 2007 Sci. Total Environ. 375 244
- [7] Yu H, Huang G H, An C j and Wei J 2011 J. Hazard Mater. 190 883
- [8] Wang X, Shu L, Wang Y, Xu B, Bai Y, Tao S and Xing B 2011 Environ. Sci. Technol. 45 9276
- [9] Chin Y P, Aiken G R and Danielsen K M 1997 Environ. Sci. Technol. 31 1630