CHROM. 22 164

Characterization of humified compounds by extraction and fractionation on solid polyvinylpyrrolidone

C. CIAVATTA*, M. GOVI, L. VITTORI ANTISARI and P. SEQUI

Institute of Agricultural Chemistry, University of Bologna, Viale Berti Pichat, 10-40127 Bologna (Italy)

ABSTRACT

New humification parameters are proposed for characterizing soils and organic fertilizers or amendments. They include an index, a degree and a rate of humification, all devised to assess the ratio between humified and non-humified materials. The separation of the two types of materials is essentially performed by extraction and fractionation on solid polyvinylpyrrolidone.

INTRODUCTION

Assessing quality criteria with respect to organic matter in soils, fertilizers, sludges or composts is a difficult task, and has led to controversial results. Some workers¹, for instance, suggested the organic matter extraction of soil samples with a solution of 0.1 M sodium hydroxide plus 0.1 M Na₄P₂O₇, but they did not apply this procedure to organic materials other than soil. Others² adopted parameters based on visible spectral properties (e.g., on the degree of aromaticity), but found that the nominal molecular weight distribution of humic acids decreases with increasing degree of humification, which is the opposite of normally accepted trends. Also, the results obtained using the ratio between humic acids (HA) and fulvic acids (FA) are of uncertain interpretation because this ratio depends on many factors including even the geographical distribution of soils³. The E_4/E_6 ratio, widely used as a index of humification⁴, depends on many factors, and the addition of a small amount of humic substances (e.g., HA from leonardite) is sufficient to change the results completely. Humic substances have been defined as amorphous, polymeric, brown compounds; they do not belong to recognizable classes of organic compounds, such as polysaccharides, polypeptides or, altered lignins⁵. The procedure suggested by some workers¹ considers the alkaline extract (from soil or other organic materials) as the total humic extract, but it consists of both humic and non-humic substances. After precipitation of HA by acidification of the alkaline extract, the supernatant contains both FA and other classes of organic materials (e.g., polysaccharides).

Polyamide columns have been used to retain the coloured fractions of FA^{6,7}, whereas Amberlite XAD-8 has been preferred for adsorbing selectively humic substances from freshwater^{8,9}. This last procedure has been recommended by the International Humic Substances Society (IHSS).

Polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP), a cross-linked adsorbent for the chromatographic separation of aromatic acids, aldehydes and phenols^{10,11}, has been used to separate phenols from different organic extracts^{12,13}. Insoluble PVP has been found to allow strong adsorption and good recoveries of humic substances¹³.

The use of a selective extraction and fractionation on solid PVP has been suggested in order to distinghuish non-humified from humified materials in soil, dung, compost and sludge extracts¹⁴. This paper reports further results obtained using this procedure.

EXPERIMENTAL

Soil samples

Soil samples were air-dried, crushed to pass a 2-mm sieve according to ISSS (Italian Society of Soil Science) methods¹⁵ and stored in plastic bags.

Samples of organic materials

Samples of organic fertilizers, amendments, composts, sewage sludges and swine slurries were dried at $40-50^{\circ}$ C in a forced-air oven, crushed to pass a 0.5-mm sieve and stored in black plastic bags.

Preparation of the polyvinylpyrrolidone resin

About 50 g of insoluble PVP resin (Aldrich) were placed into a 1-l glass cylinder. After washing twice with tap-water and twice with distilled water, discarding the fines each time, 0.005 M sulphuric acid was added and the suspension was stored at room temperature.

Recommended extraction and fractionation procedure

Fig. 1 shows a scheme of the proposed extraction and fractionation procedure for organic extracts using insoluble PVP to separate non-humified materials in the so-called fulvic fractions. A standard procedure can be suggested as follows.

Place 10 g of soil sample or 2 g of organic material in a 150-ml centrifuge tube with 100 ml of 0.1 M sodium hydroxide plus 0.1 M Na₄P₂O₇ (NaOH + PP). Let nitrogen bubble through the solution for 2 min, then plug the tube immediately. Shake for 2 h at 160 oscillations per minute at room temperature, then centrifuge at 13000 g for 20 min. After centrifugation, filter through a 0.45-µm Millipore filter using a vacuum pump. Transfer 25 ml of the extract (total extract, TE) into a centrifuge tube (usually 40 ml) and acidify to pH <2 by adding a small volume (0.3–0.5 ml) of 50% sulphuric acid. Centrifuge at 5000 g for 20 minutes, collect and store the precipitate (apparent humic acid fraction, HA) and feed the supernatant solution onto a small column (normally a common 10-ml plastic sirynge) packed with about 4–6 cm³ of insoluble PVP previously equilibrated in 0.005 M sulphuric acid. Collect the eluate in a 50-ml volumetric flask, after discarding the first 2-3 ml, elute the column with about 20 ml of 0.005 M sulphuric acid, then dilute to volume with 0.005 M sulphuric acid and store for subsequent analyses (non-retained, or non-humified fraction, NH). Elute the retained fraction, generally brown (apparent fulvic fraction, FA), with 0.5 M sodium hydroxide solution, discarding the first 2–3 ml, and collect in the centrifuge tube containing the HA precipitate, which redissolves. Wash the col-



Fig. 1. Separation of humified (HA + FA) from non-humified materials (NH) by means of columns packed with insoluble PVP. Non-humified fractions are not retained on PVP; after washing with 0.005 M H₂SO₄ the fulvic fraction is eluted with 0.05 M NaOH and added to humic acids.

umn with about 20 ml of 0.5 M sodium hydroxide solution, transfer the combined HA + FA fractions quantitatively into a 50-ml volumetric flask and dilute to volume with 0.5 M sodium hydroxide solution. Store the TE, NH and HA + FA fractions in a refrigerator at 4°C for subsequent analyses.

Determination of total organic carbon

Total organic carbon (TOC) was determined according to the dichromate acid oxidation method¹⁶. For liquid extracts (TE, NH and HA + FA), an aliquot (normally 1–10 ml, depending on the organic carbon concentration of the sample) was used for the determination according to the same procedure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Some results achieved for selected samples of soils, organic amendments and fertilizers, composts, sewage sludges and swine slurries are given in Table I.

Three new parameters of humification are used in Table I, namely the humification index (HI)¹⁴:

HI = NH/(HA + FA)

i.e., the ratio between non-humified (NH) and humified compounds (HA + FA); the degree of humification $(DH)^{17}$:

$$DH(\%) = [(HA + FA)/TEC] \cdot 100$$

TABLE I

Sample		Total organic carbon (%)	Humification index (HI)	Degree of humification (DH) (%)	Humification rate (HR) (%)
Soil 1: protorendzina,		7.4	0.14	77.5	20.9
A horizon Soil 2: mollisol, A horizon		2.5	0.18	99.0	70.9
Soil 3: historol		19.0	0.13	82.5	22.1
Soil 4: typic veronsamments		15	0.42	63.9	19.0
Soil 5: fluventic xerochrept		1.9	0.42	67.9	17.1
Soil 6: podzol, A. horizon		7.5	0.28	68.0	21.8
Soil 7: podzol, B, horizon		2.7	0.17	71.0	35.4
Cow manure, well matured		18.5	0.32	76.0	8.0
Peat 1: Italy		31.1	0.30	76.9	19.3
Peat 2: Norway		48.1	0.29	77.6	22.1
Leonardite 1: U.S.A.		40.5	0.00	100.0	84.4
Leonardite 2: U.S.A.		41.3	0.05	94.9	82.7
Horn and hooves:	Italy	35.6	2.87	25.9	4.2
Ground feather:	Italy	47.0	34.00	2.9	0.2
Distillery washes:	Italy	17.5	4.53	18.1	8.6
Leather meal:	Italy	43.7	19.71	4.8	1.6
Compost: raw, from urban refuse		21.0	1.32	43.1	21.7
Compost: after stabilization		17.1	0.75	57.3	24.4
Sewage sludge: partially stabilized, from thickening bed		22.0	1.20	45.0	2.6
Sewage sludge: raw, from the outlet of anacrobic digester		26.0	2.13	31.0	2.8
Swine slurries: raw		49.5	1.20	35.7	13.9
Swine slurries: after 120 days of stabilization		30.4	0.80	48.7	12.5

TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON AND INDEX (HI), DEGREE (DH) AND RATE OF HUMIFICA-TION (HR) OF SOME SAMPLES OF SOILS, AMENDMENTS, ORGANIC FERTILIZERS, COM-POSTS, SEWAGE SLUDGES AND SWINE SLURRIES

i.e., the percentage of humified compounds with respect to total extracted carbon (TEC); and the humification rate $(HR)^{17}$:

 $HR(\%) = [(HA + FA)/TOC] \cdot 100$

i.e., the percentage of humified compounds with respect to TOC in the sample.

Table I shows that HI ≈ 0 (0–0.5) for humified materials (soils, organic amendments), and is much higher than 1 for non-humified materials (organic fertilizers, raw composts, sewage sludges and swine slurries). Fig. 2 shows the trend of HI during the organic matter stabilization processes in a compost from urban refuse. HI decreases continuously during humification processes, and reaches values lower than 1 at the



Fig. 2. Trend of the humification index (HI) during the (1) thermophilic, (2) mesophilic and (3) final phases of the organic matter stabilization process in a compost from urban refuse²³.

end of the stabilization. In other studies HI has been used to characterize organic matter from animal manures after digestion by earthworms¹⁸ and to evaluate the maturity of organic wastes¹⁹ and organic matter stabilization in sewage sludges²⁰ and swine slurries²¹.

DH is higher than 60% for humified materials (soils, organic amendments), and close to 100 only for leonardites (fossil humic substances). Less humified samples (organic fertilizers, raw sewage sludges or swine slurries) show lower DH values. DH has also been used to monitor the evolution of organic matter from an organic fertil-



Fig. 3. Apparent degree of humification (DH) and soluble and EDTA-extractable chromium during humification of leather meal fertilizers in soil under aerobic conditions.

izer $(\text{leather meal})^{22}$ even after application to the soil (Fig. 3), in order to follow a possible chromium release during humification processes.

Strongly humified materials such as leonardites also show a high HR(>80%), whereas this parameter appears to be generally low for soils (except sample 2) and organic materials.

REFERENCES

- 1 M. Schnitzer, L. E. Lowe, J. F. Dormaar and V. Martel, Can. J. Soil. Sci., 61 (1981) 517.
- 2 K. Tsutsuki and S. Kuwatsuka, Soil Sci. Plant Nutr., 30 (1984) 151.
- 3 M. M. Kononova, Sov. Soil Sci., 16 (1984) 71.
- 4 Y. Chen, N. Senesi and M. Schnitzer, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 41 (1977) 352.
- 5 M. H. B. Hayes and R. S. Swift, in D. J. Greenland and M. H. B. Hayes (Editors), *The Chemistry of Soil Constituents*, Wiley, Chichester, 1983, p. 179.
- 6 P. Sequi, G. Guidi and G. Petruzzelli, Agrochimica, 16 (1972) 224.
- 7 P. Sequi, G. Guidi and G. Petruzzelli, Can. J. Soil. Sci., 55 (1975) 439.
- 8 J. A. Leenheer, Environ. Sci., Technol., 15 (1981) 578.
- 9 E. M. Thurman and R. L. Malcolm, Environ. Sci. Technol., 15 (1981) 463.
- 10 L. Olsson and O. Samuelson, J. Chromatogr., 93 (1974) 189.
- 11 M. Newton Clifford, J. Chromatogr., 94 (1974) 261.
- 12 C. Quarmby, J. Chromatogr., 34 (1968) 52.
- 13 L. E. Lowe, Can. J. Soil. Sci., 35 (1975) 119.
- 14 P. Sequi, M. De Nobili, L. Leita and G. Cercignani, Agrochimica, 30 (1986) 175.
- 15 SISS, Metodi Normalizzati per l'Analisi del Suolo, Edagricole, Bologna, 1985.
- 16 C. Ciavatta, L. Vittori Antisari and P. Sequi, Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal., 20 (1989) 759.
- 17 C. Ciavatta, L. Vittori Antisari and P. Sequi, Agrochimica, 32 (1988) 510.
- 18 F. Petrussi, M. De Nobili, M. Viotto and P. Sequi, Plant Soil, 105 (1988) 41.
- 19 A. Saviozzi, R. Levi-Minzi and R. Riffaldi, BioCycle, 198 (1988) 54.
- 20 M. De Nobili, G. Cercignani, L. Leita and P. Sequi, Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal., 17 (1986) 1109.
- 21 M. Govi, C. Ciavatta, L. Vittori Antisari and P. Sequi, in A. Frigerio (Editor), Acque Reflue e Fanghi, Centro Scientifico Internazionale, Milan, 1989, p. 422.
- 22 C. Ciavatta and P. Sequi, Fert. Res., 19 (1989) 7.
- 23 M. De Nobili and F. Petrussi, J. Ferment. Technol., 66 (1988) 577.