

9th International Conference on Sustainable Solid Waste Management

Agronomic waste-derived biochar for concurrent stabilization of multiple heavy metals in agricultural soil: Effect of feedstock variety and pyrolysis temperature

Van Bien Dao, Yuan-Wei Chen & Chu-Ching Lin daovanbien@tuaf.edu.vn; remix011269@gmail.com; chuching@ncu.edu.tw

Institute of Environmental Engineering, National Central University, Taiwan (R.O.C.)



Heavy metal (HM) pollution in soil: causes and effects



Affect

Soil property

Soil ecosystem

Crop productivity

People health

Zhao et al. (2019) *ES&T*

Biochar (BC): a fascinating soil amendment?

A stable carbon-rich porous material

A low-cost, eco-friendly sorbent - derived from agricultural wastes, including manures

Potential application in large scale - to stabilize HMs in soils

Biochar



Gomez-Eyles et al. (2013) ES&T

Factors that strongly influence the BC properties



Wang et al. (2020) Sci Total Environ

Gomez-Eyles et al. (2013) ES&T

Linear model: $C_{s} = (f_{soil}K_{d-soil}C_{w}) + (f_{BC}K_{d-BC}C_{w})$





Questions to be addressed

 How critical is the temperature on the HM adsorption (in the aqueous phase) and immobilization (in the soil matrix) capacity of BC?

 Can this factor be generalized to a variety of feedstock? If so, which type of raw materials originating from agricultural wastes is a better candidate for soil amendment?

• Can a simple partitioning equilibrium-based linear model be developed to effectively and reliably predict the ultimate efficacy of BC for *in situ* sorbent amendment to remediate HM-contaminated soil?

How to achieve the objectives?



Characteristics of synthetic biochar



Selected physical and chemical properties of adsorbents.

Properties	Ricehusk	RB300	RB600	Leaf	LB300	LB600
Moisture (%)	4.22 ± 0.08	2.32 ± 0.08	1.81 ± 0.08	7.74 ± 0.16	3.13 ± 0.10	2.50 ± 0.33
Volatile Matter (%)	67.55 ± 0.22	35.71 ± 0.34 👎	13.84 ± 0.54 🖊	68.57 ± 0.03	51.75 ± 0.59 🛛 🖊	18.98 ± 0.72 👎
Fixed Carbon (%)	12.89 ± 0.19	39.08 ± 0.42 🛉	49.14 ± 0.49 👚	16.05 ± 0.10	37.11 ± 1.00 🚹	59.49 ± 1.16 🔺
Ash Contents (%)	15.34 ± 0.05	22.89 ± 0.004 👚	35.21 ± 0.04 👚	7.64 ± 0.02	8.01 ± 0.50	19.03 ± 0.11 🔺
С%	42.319 ± 0.013	50.228 ± 0.011	56.065 ± 0.165 1	48.412 ± 0.115	55.194 ± 0.043 🛧	63.909 ± 0.005 🛧
Н%	6.031 ± 0.181	4.264 ± 0.195	2.500 ± 0.127	6.697 ± 0.021	5.589 ± 0.290 🖊	2.925 ± 0.197 🜉
N %	0.875 ± 0.016	1.075 ± 0.028	0.942 ± 0.042	1.247 ± 0.004	1.477 ± 0.081	1.486 ± 0.060
0%	41.801 ± 0.037	23.539 ± 0.018	7.013 ± 0.094 🖊	39.589 ± 0.238	32.188 ± 0.143 🖊	16.641 ± 0.281 🖊
S %	0.072 ± 0.030	7	70	0.089 ± 0.011	0.015 ± 0.021	0.033 ± 0.001
O/C	0.988 ± 0.001	0.469 ± 0.000 -	0.125 ± 0.002 🖊	0.818 ± 0.007	0.583 ± 0.003 🖊	0.260 ± 0.004 👢
H/C	0.143 ± 0.004	0.085 ± 0.004 🜉	0.045 ± 0.002 🜉	0.138 ± 0.000	0.101 ± 0.005 👢	0.046 ± 0.003 🜉
(O+N)/C	1.008 ± 0.001	0.490 ± 0.001 🜉	0.142 ± 0.001 🜉	0.844 ± 0.007	0.610 ± 0.005 👢	0.284 ± 0.003 📕
SA (m ² /g)		1.05	224.91	1	1.17	205.10
V _{total} (cm ³ /g)		0.005	0.142	1	0.004	0.146
Pore Size (nm)		19.59	3.68	 	19.30	5.74
рН		6.48 ± 0.01	8.20 ± 0.14		6.03 ± 0.03	7.90 ± 0.13

Levels of heavy metals in the tested soil (at ppm) and its porewater (at ppb)



Mono-metal systems: 300 °C > 600 °C; camphor leaf > rice huskk



Trio-metal systems: 300 °C > 600 °C; camphor leaf > rice husk For most BCs: Cu(II) > Cd(II) ≈ Zn(II), but for LB300: Cd(II) > Cu(II) > Zn(II)0



Reductions of HM concentrations in porewater of soil amended with BCs

For Cd & Zn: 600°C > 300°C



Probing the role of DOM in aqueous-adsorption and soil-stabilization of Cd by BC



Role of DOM for immobilization of HMs by biochar in the soil matrix





DOM & Cd(II) concentrations: \downarrow

Modeling pore water reductions for Cd, Cu and Zn in contaminated soil



Taking into account the competition effect of other metals in DI water matrix did not significantly improve the predicting power of the model, which might be due to that:

- The selected levels of metals were not low enough
- The influence of DOM was neglected
- The other unknown factors

Conclusions



Thank you for your attention!





Possible adsorption mechanisms- FTIR spectra



Possible adsorption mechanisms- Boehm titration & XPS analysis results

Adsorbent	Carboxylic	Lactonic	Phenolic	Total acidity	
	(mmol/g)	(mmol/g)	(mmol/g)	(mmol/g)	
RB300	0.17	0.50	1.05	1.72	
RB600	-	-	0.27	0.27	
LB300	0.24	0.76	1.08	2.08	
LB600		-	0.15	0.15	

The surface acid functional group content of various biochars

- Below detectable level.

