



Influence of Spent Lubricating Oil Spiked Compost on Microbial Counts and Hydrocarbon Degradation Rate in Soils

**M. E. Ntekpe ^a, M. A. Ekpo ^a, U. U. Ndubuisi-Nnaji ^a,
E. O. Mbong ^{b*} and E. Ntino ^a**

^a *Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.*

^b *Department of Biological Science, Faculty of Natural and Applied Sciences, Ritman University, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJI/2023/v27i4687

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/100667>

Original Research Article

Received: 27/03/2023

Accepted: 29/05/2023

Published: 15/06/2023

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the influence of organic fertilizers produced from spent lubricating oil (SLO) spiked aerobic composting technique on hydrocarbon degradation rate in soils. The compost windrows (F_{t2} and F_{t4}), consisting of kitchen and agricultural wastes, were spiked with varying concentrations (2% and 4%) of SLO. The resultant organic fertilizers were employed as amendment in pollution simulated potted soils laid out in a complete randomized block design with three replications for 90 days. Results revealed higher counts of hydrocarbon utilizing microbes (HUB: $4.2 \pm 0.02 \times 10^4$ cfu/g in F_{t2}, $3.0 \pm 0.02 \times 10^4$ cfu/g in F_{t4}; HUF: $3.9 \pm 0.2 \times 10^4$ cfu/g in F_{t2}, $2.5 \pm 0.02 \times 10^4$ cfu/g in F_{t4}) in spiked compost compared to the control, F_{t0} (HUB: $7.9 \pm 0.02 \times 10^3$ cfu/g; HUF: $6.0 \pm 0.2 \times 10^3$ cfu/g). Mean count in amended soils reflected a dose-dependent increase which

*Corresponding author: E-mail: Mbongemem@yahoo.com;

followed the trend: $Ft_2 > Ft_0 > Ft_4$ for the 5% (3.7×10^8 cfu/g), 10% (9.2×10^7 cfu/g) and 15% (6.9×10^7 cfu/g) levels of fertilizer treatments respectively. There was a significant ($P < 0.05$) reduction in the TPH content of soils after 90 days treatment with organic fertilizers. Generally, remediation efficiency followed the order: $Ft_2 > Ft_0 > Ft_4$, with the highest (11.51%) achieved at 5% Ft_2 application. Spiking technique was responsible for the higher counts of hydrocarbon utilizing microbes and enhanced bioremediation associated with the use of fertilizers Ft_2 .

Keywords: Composting; spiking; pollution; biodegradation; bioremediation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Petroleum has deleterious effects on biological, chemical and physical properties of the soil depending on the dose, type of the oil and other factors. Microbiological components of soil take a downward turn following oil application [1,2]. Worse still, the natural recovery of soil from petroleum oil pollution is slow such that communities affected by this problem are denied utilization of their agricultural lands for very long periods [3]. Therefore the need for cost-effective but viable remediation technologies becomes imperative.

Bioremediation, according to Kensa [4], is “an ecologically sound and state of the art technique that employs natural biological processes to completely eliminate toxic contaminants”. It refers to the enhancement of the native capability of microorganisms by the addition of oxygen and nutrients to the soil system to support biological growth and improve the degradation. It mainly involves biostimulation where organic or inorganic components were introduced to enhance indigenous microbial growth that directly degrades the contaminants [5,6].

Moreso, Ekpo and Ntekepe [7], in a deliberate search for an environmentally sound and productive use of solid organic waste, reported the production of organic fertilizers rich in nitrogen and phosphorus, among other nutrients, from organic waste materials using simple aerobic composting technique. The said fertilizers were evidently useful as soil amendments, with great potential in stimulating the population growth of indigenous soil microbes, competing favourably with its synthetic counterparts. Soil contaminations by petroleum hydrocarbons have been reported to be threatening as it can negatively impact soil macro/micro-flora, destroy the food chains, disrupt biogeochemical cycling of elements, thus reducing soil fertility/productivity, with attendant economic implications. Soil remediation has been identified amongst expensive treatments

options worldwide. Thus, various strategies have been employed in the identification of cost-effective remediation and restoration technique for contaminated sites. However, according to reports by Akpoveta et al. [8] and Agamuthu et al. [2], the addition of nitrogen and phosphorus-rich fertilizers/organic materials to petroleum contaminated site stimulates the growth of indigenous hydrocarbon utilizing microbes, thus enhancing the rate of oil degradation. It is against these backdrops that this study is designed to convert solid organic wastes materials to organic fertilizers fit for enhanced bioremediation of petroleum oil contaminated sites through a manipulated aerobic composting process.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Organic Waste Collection

Composting requires the presence of two types of materials, (a) Nitrogenous (materials rich in nitrogen) and, (b) Carbonaceous (materials rich in carbon) materials in a proportion. This proportion is determined by the quality of fertilizer intended [9]. A ratio of 1:1 is usually preferred. In this study, kitchen wastes (mainly vegetable, tubers and fruit peelings) and cow dung were used to meet the requirements of nitrogen, while dry garden wastes were employed for carbon requirements.

2.2 Composting Process

The manually separated wastes materials were shredded into workable sizes, and then air-dried to reduce the moisture content to below 60%. Aerobic composting technique of Haydar and Masood [10] was adopted, and three composting pads (Ft_2 , Ft_4 , Ft_0) were prepared (Plate 1). Windrows Ft_2 and Ft_4 were contaminated with 2% and 4% (w/w) spent lubricating oil (soluble fractions) respectively, as spiking agent. The physicochemical properties SLO (spiking agent or pollutant) are described in Table 1. Windrow Ft_0 did not receive any oil spiking. The moisture

content of windrows were monitored periodically, and maintained at 60% during the first four weeks. Also, regular turning of the windrows was carried out for uniform provision of heat, oxygen and moisture until beginning of curing period/maturity, during which the compost temperature ceases to rise and assume an earthy smell. The matured compost- organic fertilizer- was sieved through a 2.5mm sieve to achieve the final product.

Table 1. Physicochemical properties of the pollutant (SLO)

Parameters	Values
API Gravity	31.5
Density (g/cm ³)	0.82
Nitrogen (ppm)	1000
Pour point (°C)	42.8
Specific Gravity	0.81
Carbon (wt%)	86.0
Hydrogen (wt%)	14

Key: API = American Petroleum Institute;
ppm = Part per million

2.3 Field Test Methods

The produced organic fertilizers were subjected to field test through Experiment layed out in Randomized Complete Block Design [11]. Bulk soil taken from an agriculture field was air-dried and filtered, by passing through a 2mm sieve. Three hundred kilogrammes of the filtered soil was placed in a large polythene sheet. The soil was artificially contaminated with 10% (w/w)

spent lubricating oil. Thirty kilogrammes contaminant were sprayed and mixed thoroughly, such that the whole soil becomes homogeneously contaminated. The contaminated soil was moistened to 20% water holding capacity with distilled water to ensure proper mixing with the contaminant. 10% contamination was adopted to achieve severe contamination (pollution), because beyond 3% concentration, oil has been reported to be increasingly deleterious to soil biota and crop growth [12]; Vincent et al., 2011; [2]. Eight kilogrammes each of the polluted soil was placed in thirty (30) clean dry perforated plastic containers (9887.43cm² approx. 9.89L); divided into four (4) groups (A, B, C, and D) in triplicates as shown in Fig. 1. These contaminated soil samples were allowed undisturbed for two weeks to stabilize. Group A was amended with varying quantities (5%, 10%, and 15%) of organic fertilizer Ft₀, Group B amended with varying quantities (5%, 10%, and 15%) of organic fertilizer Ft₂, Group C amended with varying quantities (5%, 10%, and 15%) of organic fertilizer Ft₄, and Group D left without any amendment (Control). The moisture contents were adjusted to 60%, using distilled water. Equal rates of tilling (three times a week throughout the duration of experiment) was used to provide the necessary aeration and mixing of nutrients and microbes with the contaminated soil, following the methods of Ayotamuno et al., [13]; Choron et al., [5]; Agamuthu, et al., [2]. The remediation experiment lasted for ninety (90) days.



Plate 1. Organic waste composting Pads

Treatments	Varying Quantity of Organic Fertilizers (%)		
	5	10	15
A	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉
B	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉
C	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉
D	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉	☉ ☉ ☉

Fig. 1. Field test layout

KEY: A = 8.0 kg of Polluted soil + 5% (0.4 kg); 10% (0.8 kg); and 15% (1.2 kg) of organic fertilizer Ft₀ respectively; B = 8.0 kg of Polluted soil + 5% (0.4 kg); 10% (0.8 kg); and 15% (1.2 kg) of organic fertilizer Ft₂ respectively; C = 8.0 kg of Polluted soil + 5% (0.4 kg); 10% (0.8 kg); and 15% (1.2 kg) of organic fertilizer Ft₄ respectively; D = Polluted soil without any treatment (control)

2.4 Laboratory Analyses

Analysis (Microbiological and physicochemical) of various samples, including the organic fertilizers produced, spent lubricating oil, and soil samples were undertaken at various times. Soil analyses were done before, after contamination, and after remediation. TPH measurement in soil samples were performed following the methods of Akpoveta et al. [8], and Agamuthu, et al., [2]; while chromatographic and mass spectral analysis was carried out following the method earlier described by Sara et al., [14]. Enumeration and Identification of Soil Bacteria and Fungi were performed following standard protocols described by Cruickshank et al., [15]; Holt et al. [16]; Barrow and Feltham [17]; Cheesbrough [18].

2.5 Biodegradation Rate (Hydrocarbon Loss)

Average biodegradation loss rates (mg kg⁻¹ day⁻¹) of hydrocarbons under different treatments were estimated according to Yeung et al. [19] as:

$$\Delta HL = (HC_i - HC_e) / \text{Time inc}$$

Where,

ΔHL = the average hydrocarbon loss (mg kg⁻¹ day⁻¹)

HC_i = the initial hydrocarbon content in soil (mg kg⁻¹)

HC_e = the hydrocarbon content when the experiment ended (mg kg⁻¹)

Time inc = the degradation time (days)

2.6 Remediation Efficiency

The Remediation Efficiency (R.E) which shows (in percentage) the effectiveness of the organic fertilizer amendments (nutrients) relative to the un-amended soils in reducing the total hydrocarbon content (THC) of soils treated with same quantity of spent lubricating oil was calculated thus:

$$R.E = \frac{THC_{ci} - THC_{ti}}{THC_{ci}} \times 100$$

Where:

THC_{ci} = total hydrocarbon content in control soil under a given oil loading.

THC_{ti} = total hydrocarbon content in an amended plot under a given oil loading.

2.7 Statistical Analysis

Treatment means were subjected to two way analysis of variance and significant differences separated using Least Significant Difference test as described by Ubom [11], Okon et al. [20] and Mbong et al. [21]. All analyses were carried out using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 18.0) (IBM Corporation, Armonk USA).

2.8 Ethical Considerations

There was no conflict of interest. Where this study interferes with the interest of others, due permission was sought and obtained before any progress was made. Direct lifting of other researcher's reports was avoided. All materials and authors consulted in the course of this study are duly acknowledged using reference list.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Composting is a microbiological process that depends on growth and activity of mixed populations of bacteria, actinomycetes, and fungi that are indigenous to the wastes being composted. It is a viable means of transforming various organic wastes into products that can be used safely and beneficially as biofertilizers and soil conditioners. In this study, population of different microbial groups, including total aerobic heterotrophic bacteria counts (THBC), hydrocarbon utilizing bacteria (HUB), total fungal counts (TFC) and hydrocarbon utilizing fungi (HUF) revealed higher counts of HUB, and HUF

in organic fertilizers from composting process spiked with SLO (Ft₂ and Ft₄) compared to the unspiked (control) composting (Ft₀). This observation suggest strongly that the spent lubricating oil (SLO), apart from being potent soil pollutant, also serve as agent of natural selection that drives mutations among microbial groups. Most microbes that were able to thrive in the spiked composting processes are those that had evolved the ability to survive the toxic effects of SLO, a typical hydrocarbon product.

Bio-stimulation, occasioned by the addition of different types and concentrations of organic fertilizers to the polluted soil, resulted in a significant increase in population of hydrocarbon degrading bacteria and fungi within the first few weeks. This is due mainly to the fact that organic fertilizers provided nutrients for increased cell growth and enhanced biodegradation rate. The SLO also supported rapid microbial growth since hydrocarbon is an energy source to some bacteria and fungi. The reduction in population of the hydrocarbon degraders, observed in later weeks, could be due to the fact that the organisms have exhausted the available nutrient supplies present in the batch system. Also, mineralization of hydrocarbons could have possibly accumulated the system with toxic metabolites which resulted in reduced growth phase of the microbes. The findings of Amadi and Odu [22]; Akpoveta et al. [8] who reported an initial gradual increase in bacterial population following the application of petroleum hydrocarbon, but a decline as the biodegradation progressed supports these observations.

Notably, higher counts of hydrocarbon degraders were observed in contaminated soils treated with SLO-spiked compost compared to those treated with pristine compost. This may not be unconnected with the higher counts of hydrocarbonoclastic bacteria and fungi observed in the organic fertilizers produced from SLO-

spiked composting processes as against lower counts in non-SLO-spiked composting process. This suggest strongly that the SLO served as a source of natural selection or mutagen that drives evolution of microbes capable of hydrocarbon degradation during the composting processes in the compost bins that were spiked with SLO.

Biodegradation of spent lubricating oil (SLO) in soil, as revealed by chromatographic analysis, at the end of study (90 days) showed higher biodegradation rate (BR) in soil amended with 5% of the organic fertilizers spiked with lower concentration of SLO compared to the control soil treatment. At the end of 90 days, polluted soils amended with spiked organic fertilizers showed highest percentage of SLO biodegradation, followed by soil amended with pristine organic fertilizers, compared to the unamended (control) soil that showed lowest biodegradation of SLO. These observation correlates positively with the increased counts of HUB and HUF earlier observed in the different organic fertilizers. However, it was observed that BR reduces with increase in quantity of spiked organic fertilizers applied. For instance, at 5% application of spiked organic fertilizer (Ft₂), BR was 0.072 mgkg⁻¹day⁻¹, but reduces to 0.033 mgkg⁻¹day⁻¹ at 10% application. This may be due to carryover of toxicants in the spiked fertilizers. Conversely, the remediation efficiency (RE) of pristine organic fertilizers increased with increase in quantity of fertilizer applied. At 5% application, RE was 10.62%, and 12.83% at 10% application. However, at 15% application, the RE took a downward turn to 7.97%. These observations are well supported by the findings of Emmanuel et al. [23]; Agamathu, et al (2013); Akpoveta et al. [8]; and Chorom et al. [5] who reported increased counts of bacteria and fungi in soils following addition of organic amendments to polluted soils and a corresponding improvement in biodegradation of spent lubricating oil (SLO) in soils.

Table 2. Counts of the various microbial groups in different organic fertilizers

Organic fertilizers	Microbial Groups (cfu/g)			
	THBC Mean ± SD	HUB Mean ± SD	TFC Mean ± SD	HUF Mean ± SD
Ft ₀	5.9 x10 ⁷ ± 0.02	7.9 x10 ³ ± 0.02	8.0 x10 ⁴ ± 0.5	6.0 x10 ³ ± 0.02
Ft ₂	3.6 x10 ⁷ ± 0.01*	4.2 x10 ⁴ ± 0.02*	6.8 x10 ⁴ ± 0.05*	3.9 x10 ⁴ ± 0.02*
Ft ₄	3.4 x10 ⁷ ± 0.2*	3.0 x10 ⁴ ± 0.02*	5.1 x10 ⁴ ± 0.2*	2.5 x10 ⁴ ± 0.02*

Key: THBC = Total heterotrophic bacterial counts; TFC = Total fungal counts; NUB = Nitrate utilizing bacteria; PSC = Phosphate solubilizing bacterial counts; SD = Standard deviation from mean; HUB = Hydrocarbon Utilizing Bacteria; HUF = Hydrocarbon Utilizing Fungi; * = Significance at P < 0.05

Table 3. Mean microbial counts in soils receiving different organic fertilizer treatments during remediation

Time (week)	Microbial Groups	Microbial Counts per Fertilizer per Treatment Level										
		Controls		SctFo (%)			SctFt ₂ (%)			SctFt ₄ (%)		
		S ₀	Sct ₀	5	10	15	5	10	15	5	10	15
0	THBC (cfu/g)	2.6×10 ⁸	6.1×10 ⁷	2.8×10 ⁷	2.9×10 ⁷	3.2×10 ⁷	2.2×10 ⁷	2.8×10 ⁷	1.9×10 ⁷	1.2×10 ⁷	2.3×10 ⁷	1.6×10 ⁷
	TFC (cfu/g)	2.3×10 ⁵	1.7×10 ⁵	1.1×10 ⁵	1.4×10 ⁵	1.2×10 ⁵	2.0×10 ⁵	1.9×10 ⁵	2.0×10 ⁵	5.0×10 ⁴	1.4×10 ⁵	8.0×10 ⁴
	HUBC (cfu/g)	7.8×10 ³	4.6×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ³	2.6×10 ³	3.0×10 ³	5.6×10 ⁴	4.3×10 ⁴	1.3×10 ⁴	2.2×10 ⁴	3.6×10 ⁴	4.0×10 ⁵
	HUFC (cfu/g)	8.0×10 ³	1.7×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ³	1.3×10 ³	2.0×10 ³	2.9×10 ⁴	3.0×10 ⁴	1.8×10 ⁴	1.4×10 ⁴	2.0×10 ⁴	6.0×10 ³
2	THBC (cfu/g)	2.4×10 ⁸	3.2×10 ⁷	4.0×10 ⁷	4.8×10 ⁷	6.0×10 ⁷	9.8×10 ⁷	6.2×10 ⁷	1.8×10 ⁶	1.7×10 ⁷	5.4×10 ⁷	6.8×10 ⁷
	TFC (cfu/g)	2.0×10 ⁵	6.3×10 ⁴	2.2×10 ⁵	2.8×10 ⁵	2.4×10 ⁵	7.4×10 ⁴	4.3×10 ⁴	1.4×10 ⁵	2.0×10 ⁴	4.0×10 ⁴	2.1×10 ⁴
	HUBC (cfu/g)	7.3×10 ³	5.2×10 ⁴	6.2×10 ³	7.6×10 ³	6.2×10 ³	6.9×10 ⁴	7.2×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁴	2.9×10 ⁴	6.0×10 ⁴	8.1×10 ⁷
	HUFC (cfu/g)	1.8×10 ³	4.8×10 ³	2.2×10 ³	2.7×10 ³	4.1×10 ³	9.0×10 ³	8.9×10 ³	1.9×10 ⁴	1.6×10 ³	7.0×10 ⁴	5.0×10 ³
4	THBC (cfu/g)	8.8×10 ⁷	1.6×10 ⁷	1.4×10 ⁸	9.0×10 ⁷	1.1×10 ⁸	1.6×10 ⁸	8.2×10 ⁷	1.6×10 ⁷	1.2×10 ⁸	7.0×10 ⁷	5.0×10 ⁷
	TFC (cfu/g)	1.9×10 ⁵	2.8×10 ⁴	4.4×10 ⁵	5.0×10 ⁵	5.2×10 ⁵	1.3×10 ⁵	3.5×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁵	1.1×10 ⁵	2.5×10 ⁴	8.0×10 ³
	HUBC (cfu/g)	5.4×10 ³	1.2×10 ⁵	1.2×10 ⁴	1.5×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁴	2.0×10 ⁵	1.1×10 ⁵	1.6×10 ⁴	3.5×10 ⁵	1.0×10 ⁵	3.1×10 ⁵
	HUFC (cfu/g)	3.8×10 ²	1.0×10 ⁴	4.1×10 ³	5.0×10 ³	7.6×10 ³	1.1×10 ⁴	6.7×10 ³	2.0×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁴	4.0×10 ⁴	4.6×10 ³
6	THBC (cfu/g)	6.7×10 ⁷	1.0×10 ⁸	1.6×10 ⁸	1.8×10 ⁸	2.0×10 ⁸	1.9×10 ⁸	1.2×10 ⁸	1.5×10 ⁷	2.0×10 ⁸	8.2×10 ⁷	4.2×10 ⁶
	TFC (cfu/g)	3.2×10 ⁴	1.9×10 ⁴	4.8×10 ⁵	5.2×10 ⁵	5.6×10 ⁵	3.4×10 ⁵	3.4×10 ⁴	3.2×10 ⁵	2.6×10 ⁵	2.2×10 ⁴	3.0×10 ³
	HUBC (cfu/g)	4.9×10 ³	2.6×10 ⁵	3.6×10 ⁴	3.0×10 ⁴	2.6×10 ⁴	3.6×10 ⁵	1.6×10 ⁶	1.3×10 ⁴	1.9×10 ⁵	2.3×10 ⁵	2.8×10 ⁵
	HUFC (cfu/g)	1.8×10 ²	2.3×10 ⁴	1.4×10 ⁴	1.5×10 ⁴	2.0×10 ⁴	4.0×10 ⁴	1.8×10 ⁴	2.1×10 ⁴	1.6×10 ⁴	4.4×10 ⁴	7.0×10 ⁴
8	THBC (cfu/g)	5.9×10 ⁶	1.6×10 ⁸	1.5×10 ⁸	1.8×10 ⁸	1.9×10 ⁸	2.0×10 ⁸	2.4×10 ⁷	2.6×10 ⁷	1.3×10 ⁸	1.2×10 ⁷	6.8×10 ⁷
	TFC (cfu/g)	2.8×10 ⁴	9.2×10 ³	4.2×10 ⁵	5.0×10 ⁵	5.2×10 ⁵	3.3×10 ⁵	1.6×10 ⁴	3.0×10 ⁵	2.8×10 ⁵	1.3×10 ⁴	2.1×10 ⁴
	HUBC (cfu/g)	3.2×10 ³	3.5×10 ⁵	3.2×10 ⁴	2.9×10 ⁴	2.8×10 ⁴	4.2×10 ⁵	2.1×10 ⁵	1.8×10 ⁴	2.0×10 ⁵	1.5×10 ⁵	4.0×10 ⁴
	HUFC (cfu/g)	1.6×10 ²	3.6×10 ⁴	1.5×10 ⁴	1.5×10 ⁴	2.1×10 ⁴	3.8×10 ⁴	1.5×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	1.5×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁴	6.0×10 ⁴
10	THBC (cfu/g)	6.4×10 ⁵	1.2×10 ⁷	8.0×10 ⁷	9.2×10 ⁷	9.0×10 ⁷	3.7×10 ⁸	1.8×10 ⁷	1.9×10 ⁷	1.4×10 ⁸	8.9×10 ⁶	6.9×10 ⁷
	TFC (cfu/g)	2.3×10 ⁴	1.8×10 ⁴	3.0×10 ⁵	3.2×10 ⁵	3.8×10 ⁵	6.0×10 ⁵	1.8×10 ⁴	8.4×10 ⁵	4.2×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴
	HUBC (cfu/g)	1.8×10 ³	1.5×10 ⁵	3.0×10 ⁴	2.4×10 ⁴	2.6×10 ⁴	3.8×10 ⁵	3.0×10 ⁵	8.2×10 ⁴	1.8×10 ⁵	1.0×10 ⁵	3.0×10 ⁵
	HUFC (cfu/g)	1.6×10 ²	1.6×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁴	2.0×10 ⁴	5.0×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	2.0×10 ⁴	2.1×10 ⁴	3.9×10 ³	8.0×10 ⁴
12	THBC (cfu/g)	4.1×10 ⁵	5.4×10 ⁶	6.0×10 ⁷	7.8×10 ⁷	7.4×10 ⁷	2.9×10 ⁷	1.4×10 ⁷	1.2×10 ⁷	3.0×10 ⁷	5.6×10 ⁶	4.2×10 ⁶
	TFC (cfu/g)	1.2×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	2.6×10 ⁵	2.2×10 ⁵	3.0×10 ⁵	5.1×10 ⁵	1.6×10 ⁴	1.6×10 ⁵	2.2×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	1.0×10 ⁴
	HUBC (cfu/g)	1.0×10 ³	1.2×10 ⁵	2.2×10 ⁴	2.1×10 ⁴	1.8×10 ⁴	2.2×10 ⁵	2.4×10 ⁵	7.6×10 ⁴	8.8×10 ⁴	6.4×10 ⁴	3.8×10 ⁴
	HUFC (cfu/g)	1.3×10 ²	1.3×10 ³	2.3×10 ³	6.8×10 ³	1.4×10 ⁴	3.1×10 ⁴	1.2×10 ⁴	1.6×10 ⁴	1.1×10 ⁴	3.4×10 ³	1.9×10 ⁴

Table 4. Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Biodegradation Analysis after 90 days Treatment

Parameter	SC ₀ (Control)	Treatments								
		SctFt ₀ 5	SctFt ₀ 10	SctFt ₀ 15	SctFt ₂ 5	SctFt ₂ 10	SctFt ₂ 15	SctFt ₄ 5	SctFt ₄ 10	SctFt ₄ 15
TPH ₀	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219	56.219
TPH ₉₀	51.99	50.249	49.005	51.741	49.751	53.234	52.985	50.751	56.651	56.776
BDR (mgkg ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)	0.047	0.066	0.080	0.050	0.072	0.033	0.040	0.061	-0.149	-0.127
R.E (%)	7.52	10.62	12.83	7.97	11.51	5.31	5.75	9.73	-0.77	-0.99

Key: TPH₀ = Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Content in Contaminated Soils before Bioremediation Treatments; TPH₉₀ = Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon Content in Contaminated Soils after 90 days Bioremediation Treatments; BDR = Biodegradation Rate (Hydrocarbon loss) R.E = Remediation Efficiency




Fig. 2. Chromatogram of the pristine soil (without any contamination)




Fig. 3. Chromatogram of a 10% (w/w) spent engine oil-contaminated soil after stabilizing for two week




Fig. 4. Chromatogram of Contaminated Soil, Treated with 5% Ft_0 for 90 days




Fig. 5. Chromatogram of contaminated soil treated with 5% Ft₂ for 90 days




Fig. 6. Chromatogram of contaminated soil, treated with 5% Ft₄ for 90 days




Fig. 7. Chromatogram of contaminated soil, left without any treatment with organic fertilizer for 90 days

However, it was also observed that organic fertilizers from composting process spiked with elevated concentration of SLO (Ft₄) was grossly inefficient as soil amendments, since its application resulted in an increased TPH concentration in soils. This suggested that the compost spiking technique should be done with very low concentration of the contaminant to avoid build-up of contaminant in compost (organic fertilizer).

4. CONCLUSION

Whereas there exist a dire need to re-use or recycle the huge proportion of organic wastes generated by agricultural and food processing activities to reduce the volume of organic wastes that ultimately get to the dump-sites, curb their potential risk of pollution and environmental nuisance. Similarly a growing expanse of wastelands occasioned by petroleum contamination is begging for remediation. This study utilized aerobic composting technology to convert organic wastes into organic fertilizers fit as agents in bioremediation technology to enhance the decontamination of soils polluted with petroleum hydrocarbon compounds. Based on the findings of this study it is safe to conclude that:

- (i) Organic wastes, which constitute a nuisance to the environment, are rich sources of nutrients, which can be converted into different types of organic fertilizers through manipulated aerobic composting technique.
- (ii) Spiking of Composting process with low concentration of hydrocarbon compounds increased viable count of hydrocarbon degrading microbes in the resulting compost (organic fertilizers).
- (iii) Application of low quantity of spiked compost to polluted soils stimulates the growth of hydrocarbon degrading microbes, with a corresponding increase in hydrocarbon degradation rate in treated soils.
- (iv) Hydrocarbon-spiked organic fertilizers (Ft₂), and pristine organic fertilizers (Ft₀) are effective agents for bioremediation of petroleum polluted soils.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Dela Cruz NE, Aganon CP, Patricio MG, Romero ES, Lindain SA, Galindez JL. Production of organic fertilizer from waste, and its utilization in intensive organic-based vegetable production, and for sustaining soil health and productivity. Ramon Magsaysay Centre for Agricultural Resources and Environment Studies (RM-CARES). Nueva Ecija: Central Luzon state University, Science City of Munoz, 3120, Philippines. 2010;1-12.
2. Agamathu, P., Tan, Y. S., and Fauziah, S. H. Bioremediation of hydrocarbon contaminated soil using selected organic wastes, *Procedia Environmental Science*. 2013;18(2013):674–702.
3. World Bank. Trends in solid waste management; 2021. Available:Datatopics.worldbank.org. Access on 23 September, 2021,07:57pm.
4. Kensa, V. Mary. Bioremediation-An Overview. *Journal of Industrial Pollution Control*. 2011;27(2):161–168.
5. Chorom M, Sharih HS, Motamedi H. Bioremediation of crude oil-polluted soil by application of fertilizers. *Iran Journal of Environmental Health Science and Engineering*. 2010;7(4):319–326.
6. Okpashi VE, Ushie OA, Abeng FE, Inyang IH. Monitoring the in-situ bioremediation of spend engine-oil contaminated soil after irrigation with fermented chicken-droppings. *Journal of Applied Science and Environmental Management*. 2020;24(3): 411–416.
7. Ekpo MA, Ntekpe ME. (). Microbiological and Environmental Changes during Organic Fertilizer Production from Solid Wastes. *Agricultural Science Research Journal*. 2014;4(10):174–184.
8. Akpoveta O, Vincent EF, Medjor OW, Osaro KI, Enyemike ED. Microbial degradation and its kinetics on crude oil polluted soil. *Research Journal of Chemical Sciences*. 2011;1(6):8–14.
9. Modupe SA, Oluwaseyi SO, Olubukola OB, Olu O. Waste management through composting: Challenges and Potentials, *Sustainability*. 2020;12:4456. DOI: 10.3390/su12114456
10. Haydar S, Masood J. Evaluation of kitchen waste composting and its comparison with compost prepared from municipal solid waste. *Pakistan Journal of Engineering and Applied Science*. 2011;8:26-33.

11. Ubom RM. Analysis of variance. In: *Biometry; a Fundamental approach*. Uyo: Abaam Publishing Co., Nigeria. 2004;65–137, ISBN: 978-701-004-3.
12. Osuji LC, Egbuson EJG, Ojinnaka CM. Chemical reclamation of crude-oil-inundated soils from Niger Delta Nigeria. *Chemistry and Ecology*. 2005;21(1):1–10.
13. Ayotamino MJ, Kogbara RB, Ogaji SOT, Pobert SD. Bioremediation of crude oil polluted agricultural soil in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Applied Energy*. 2006;83(83):1249–1257.
14. Sara S, Alfonso R, Richard W, Noel WD, Paul RH, Robert AS, Pavel NN, Brain PK, Brett P. Chromatographic methods for the isolation, separation and characterisation of dissolved organic matter, *Environmental Science: Processes and Impacts*. 2015;9.
15. Cruickshand RJ, Dujid P, Marmuon BP, Swan RHA. *Medical Microbiology*, 12th Ed. Churchill Livingstone, London. 1975;426–437.
16. Holt JG, Krieg NR, Sneath PH, Stanley JJ, Williams ST. *Bergeys Manual of Determinative Bacteriology*, 9th Edition. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Publishers; 1994.
17. Barrow GI, Feltham RKA. *Cowan and Steel's manual for the identification of medical bacteria*. 3rd Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2003.
18. Cheesbrough M. *District Laboratory Practice in Tropical Countries*. Part 2, Cambridge Low-Price eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom; 2010.
19. Yeung PY, Johnson RL, Xu JG. Bioremediation of petroleum hydrocarbons in soil as affected by heating and forced aeration. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 1997;26:1511-1516.
20. Okon OG, Okon IE, Mbong EO, Eneh GD. Mitigation of salt induced stress via arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (*Rhizophagus irregularis*) inoculation in *Cucurbita maxima* Duch. *International Journal of Molecular Biology*. 2019;4(1):30-36.
21. Mbong EO, Ogbemudia FO, George UU, Okon JE. Modeling growth response of cucumis sativa growing under spent engine oil contamination stress in an ultisol. *International Journal of Applied Research*. 2022;8(4):150-154.
22. Amadi A, Odu CTI. Effect of simulated chemical Demulsifier (Separal NF. 36 and Servo 6602) Contamination of Soil, on Carbon Dioxide evolution and shifts in Microbial Population in a fresh Water Mangrove Ecosystem. *International Journal of Biochemphy*. 1993;2(1-2):97–99.
23. Emmanuel E. Okoro, Ikechukwu S. Okafor, Samuel E. Sanni, Tamunotonjo O, Taiwo S. Olugbenga, Paul Igbinedion. *In-situ* remediation of petroleum contaminated soil by application of plant-based surfactant toward preventing environmental degradation. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*. 2021;23(10):1013–1020.

© 2023 Ntekpe et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/100667>